**Overview and Conceptual Core**

*I.1 Summarize the institution’s mission, historical context, and unique characteristics*

Ohio University holds as its central purpose the intellectual and personal development of its students. Distinguished by its rich history, diverse campus, international community, and beautiful Appalachian setting, Ohio University is also known as well for its outstanding faculty of accomplished teachers whose research and creative activity advance knowledge across many disciplines.

Established in 1804, Ohio University (OHIO) is the oldest university in the Northwest Territory. Located in the college town of Athens in southeastern Ohio, OHIO enjoys exceptional natural beauty. Nestled in the foothills of Appalachia, the classic residential campus is one of the most attractive in the nation.

OHIO has earned a reputation for its rich educational tradition and outstanding academic programs. The main campus population of more than 21,000 includes students from nearly every state and approximately 100 nations. Five regional campuses extend access to the University to additional students across central and southern Ohio. OHIO offers more than 250 undergraduate programs, grants masters degrees in nearly all of its major academic divisions and doctoral degrees in selected departments.

OHIO is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and is designated as a Research University (high activity) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. According to the *US News and World Report* ranking (2012) OHIO was rated 65th among public national universities and The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education (PCOE) is currently ranked among the top 6% of graduate colleges of education in the nation. Further, OHIO was ranked first in the nation for overall student satisfaction, based on a myplan.com survey ranking more than 600 colleges and universities andsecond in the nation by President Obama’s new collegiate ranking system for colleges that offer students the best “bang for their buck”. Finally, Ohio’s first kindergarten opened on our campus in 1907.

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

Ohio University’s (OHIO) Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) spans multiple colleges, with the primary being the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education (PCOE). Programs in Music Education are in the College of Fine Arts. Methods courses for Modern Languages (Spanish, French, and German), Mathematics and English and the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) endorsement are in the College of Arts and Sciences. The College of Health Sciences and Professions houses the Speech and Language Pathology program, accredited by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA).

Undergraduate Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education programs are offered at the five regional campuses: OU-Chillicothe, OU-Eastern, OU-Lancaster, OU-Southern, and OU-Zanesville. Two Centers, the Pickerington Center (associated with OU-Lancaster) and the Proctorville Center (associated with OU-Southern), increase candidate accessibility to OHIO and increase the UPEP’s opportunity to recruit diverse candidates from urban settings. While Athens remains the academic home for all graduate programs, the locations where these programs are offered change according to rotation plans established by each program.

Beginning in 2011-12, the PCOE Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee was charged to update our mission and vision. In the next two years, the committee developed a framework, sought feedback from each program, engaged the entire college, and provided the dean with the completed mission and vision statement. The PCOE’s mission is to provide transformative experiences that cultivate a passion for learning. We enhance our community through critical discourse to promote innovative scholarly collaboration for positive change. The PCOE’s vision is to be a globally recognized, diverse learning community that develops leaders who bring positive change to their professions and the world.

*I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels, status of state approval, national recognition, and findings of other national accreditation associations*

The UPEP consists of 33 initial teacher licensure programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and includes programs at the early, middle, secondary, and multiage levels. With the exception of Modern Languages- French and Spanish at the graduate level which received “Need Further Development” by the American Council on The Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL), all received either full national recognition or recognition with conditions. Due to low enrollments for the graduate Modern Language programs, UPEP opted to defer national recognition. UPEP has placed these programs into dormancy through the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) until further notice. UPEP also deferred Integrated Mathematics at the graduate level due to low enrollments. Physical Science-Physics and Physical Science-Chemistry are new programs, just approved by the OBR in November 2012, and Ohio University’s University Curriculum Council (UCC) in April 2013. UPEP plans to submit these programs to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) during the regular NSTA approval cycle.

UPEP has one advanced program for the continuing preparation of teachers (Curriculum and Instruction, offered only online) and four programs for other school professionals (School Principal, School Superintendent, Reading Education, and Computer Technology in Education). The other school professional programs are all SPA recognized or recognized with conditions by ELCC, IRA, and ISTE, respectively. Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) is a new program approved by OBR in spring 2012 and UCC in spring 2013. A SPA report was submitted to TESOL and it was determined additional development was needed. Because the program is only starting to admit candidates, the UPEP decided to wait to submit this program to TESOL during the next SPA review cycle.

A table outlining each program, level, and SPA or state approval status is included as Exhibit I.5.f.

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

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) philosophy and purpose are grounded in a set of identified core values. Our educator preparation programs prepare educators to be leaders in their fields. Candidates prepare for, and engage in, the changing needs of education. Candidates meet the diverse human and social needs of those they interact with. Candidates value and participate in lifelong learning. We believe our candidates, as well as the UPEP as a whole, is “CALLED to Lead” (CA=Change Agents; LL=Lifelong Learners; ED=Embracing Diversity; Lead=Leader-Educators/Practitioners).

From this philosophical base, we prepare leader-educators/practitioners who share our commitment to serve society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human/social needs and in lifelong learning. This commitment captures the essence of the mission and vision of Ohio University and UPEP. The conceptual framework, with its foundation being the four Conceptual Cores (CALLED to Lead), provides direction for the programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. Each of the four Conceptual Cores is grounded in theory, research, and/or educational policy. An extensive literature review is located with the exhibits.

**Leader-Educators/Practitioners:**  UPEP prepares expert, ethical, and reflective leader-educators/practitioners and decision-makers who are committed to holistic learning, and engage in collaborative and professional service to society.

**Diversity**: UPEP prepares leader-educators/practitioners who appreciate the variety of human cultural expression, employ multiple approaches to inquiry, use knowledge and practice for the benefit of a diverse society, and promote social equity and justice for effective civic engagement.

**Change Agents:** UPEP prepares leader-educators/practitioners who address the changing human/social needs through inquiry, research, assessment, critical thinking, problem solving, and proactive technology use.

**Lifelong Learners:**  UPEP prepares leader-educators/practitioners who engage in self-reflection and professional development for continuous personal growth, and inspire those practices in those they serve.

Based on our philosophy and purpose, we have identified Candidate Proficiencies (unit standards) to demonstrate the values that have been adopted by UPEP. We use UPEP standards to hold candidates accountable for being leader-educator/practitioners, committed to diversity, change agents, and lifelong learners. The Candidate Proficiencies are organized around each of the four cores. These proficiencies represent what we expect candidates to achieve in terms of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions at initial and advanced levels. In addition to the proficiencies, UPEP has outlined four distinct Professional Dispositions that further guide the practice and development of UPEP. The Candidate Proficiencies and Dispositions are similar and align to the Proficiencies; however the Proficiencies primarily address candidate knowledge and skills.

Our Candidate Proficiencies are aligned throughout the curriculum and assessments in UPEP and to state and professional standards. Exhibit 1.4.c provides an alignment chart of state, professional, and institutional standards. These standards and proficiencies are at the heart of the key assessments that have been developed by each program. Candidates are expected to master these standards and proficiencies through coursework and completion of key assessments, each reported through our Unit Assessment System (UAS). Their mastery is shown through data collected on these key assessments.

It is important to note that with our work to fully implement clinically-based educator preparation; our Candidate Proficiencies and Dispositions will undergo revision. Included in the exhibits are the current Proficiencies and Dispositions. In fall 2013, a revised Dispositions Assessment was piloted.

Finally, the Cycle of Unit Assessment Data for Program Improvement (UAS) is implemented every semester. All data from key assessments are required to be entered on LiveText, a data management tool. Following each term, the Office of Assessment and Academic Improvement organizes and distributes unit and program data in aggregate and disaggregate (by program and campus) form to programs. UPEP’s data are also reported to the appropriate Assessment Council (AC) subcommittee. Based on an annual data-reporting (described further in Standard 2) calendar the designated AC subcommittee reports the data analysis to the AC and provides recommendations for improvements and/or changes. These recommendations are then sent to UPEP review and recommendation. Members of UPEP share the recommendations with their respective stakeholders (e.g., cooperating teachers, clinical educators) for feedback and input into possible revisions.

**Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

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

* 1. *What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates’ meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results.*

With the exception of two programs at the initial level, all of the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) programs received either full national recognition or recognition with conditions by their respective Specialized Professional Associations (SPA). Modern Languages French and Spanish at the graduate level received “Need Further Development” by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) due to low enrollments. UPEP requested to the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) to have both of these programs be placed in dormancy. Also national recognition for our Integrated Math program at the graduate level was deferred due to low enrollments. Therefore, of the 29 recognized programs, 17 are fully recognized and 12 are recognized with conditions. Programs that are recognized with conditions are making revisions and collecting revised data to be submitted in either March 2014 or September 2014.

Candidate knowledge and skills are assessed in a variety of ways. In addition to SPA data, all Education candidates are required to maintain a 2.75 GPA both overall and in their content area(s). While many programs utilize GPA data as a SPA assessment of content knowledge, several have specific assessments that achieve this goal. For example, the aggregate data for the Early Childhood program reveals that 97% of candidates met or exceeded the standards outlined in the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) content assessment. The aggregated data for the Integrated Language Arts program shows that at least 80% of candidates are at the Target level with four out of the six rubric items being higher than 80%. The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) content assessment data shows that 100% of candidates have met the CEC standards with at least 90% at the two highest levels on the rubric.

Additional data collected by UPEP provides evidence that candidates at the initial levels meet knowledge, skills, and dispositions standards. Candidates complete a Technology Assessment in EDCT 2030-5012 *Technological Applications in Education*. In 2012-2013, at least 95% of candidates were rated as Acceptable or Target for each of the five International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) NETS\*T standards. In the Professional Internship (PI), candidates are assessed collaboratively by their mentor teacher and clinical educator on the PI Final Evaluation, which is directly aligned to our Conceptual Core values. Aggregate data from 2012-2013 revealed that the mean score (on a 3-point rubric with 1-unacceptable, 2-acceptable, 3-target) was a 2.57 with a range of 2.27-2.82. Beginning in fall 2013, Ohio University will be in full implementation of the national Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). UPEP began piloting the edTPA with one program and one task in 2010 and each year has increased the number of candidates completing the assessment. In spring 2013 OBR randomly selected 56 of our Early Childhood candidates to submit their edTPA for national scoring through Pearson. All edTPA data are in the LiveText Exhibit Center.

In UPEP, professional dispositions in the areas of ethics, professional competence and ongoing professional development, social justice, and wellbeing of families, peers, and community are formally assessed at three points in the program. For initial candidates, dispositions are assessed at Professional Education, Advanced Standing, and the PI. The 2012-2013 data reveal the following: (a) at least 85% of candidates were rated at the acceptable level on the ‘commitment to ethics’ rubric with the remaining 15% rated as no opportunity to observe; (b) at least 93% were rated as acceptable on the ‘commitment to professional competence and ongoing professional development’ rubric with 5% rated as no opportunity to observe and 1% as unacceptable; (c) at least 98% were rated as acceptable with 3% as no opportunity to observe on the ‘commitment to social justice’ rubric; (d) at least 83% were rated as acceptable with 17% as no opportunity to observe on the ‘commitment to well-being of families, peers, and community’ rubric.

UPEP also has four programs at the advanced level that are SPA approved. These are Reading Education, approved by International Reading Association (IRA) with full National Recognition, and Educational Administration-Principal and Superintendent (Educational Leadership Constituent Council, ELCC) and Computer Education and Technology (ISTE) with are both Nationally Recognized with Conditions. In fall 2012, a new online Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Advanced Master’s program and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) endorsement were reviewed and approved by the OBR. The C&I program started its cohort of 26 students in summer 2012 and the TESOL endorsement program admitted its first candidates in fall 2013. Additionally, UPEP has three programs accredited by other professions, including School Counselor (Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, CACREP), School Speech-Language Pathologist (American Speech-Hearing Association, ASHA), and Music Education (National Association of Schools of Music, NASM).

Assessment data reported to the SPAs or OBR show that advanced candidates in UPEP are well prepared in the areas of content knowledge, pedagogical skills and dispositions. For example, 100% of Reading Education candidates met the IRA standards outlined in their Assessment 2. Educational Administration candidates continue to do extremely well on state licensure exams for both the Principal Preparation program and the Superintendent Licensure program. The content assessment for Educational Administration shows 99.7% of candidates scored at either the Acceptable or Target level. Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator Endorsement must meet all NETS\*T standards to pass each course in their program.

The online advanced Reading Education program familiarizes and updates candidate knowledge of technology. Instructors and students use the Blackboard Learning Management System hosted by Ohio University and additional online tools to facilitate various activities. For example, candidates participate in asynchronous discussions, watch videos, and submit assignments online. Candidates access certain videos of lectures using Vimeo (http://vimeo.com). To participate in synchronous discussions, Skype (www.Skype.com) is used. Candidates participate in asynchronous discussions of journal articles by using Crocodoc (http://personal.crocodoc.com) to post and comment on articles pertaining to course topics.

In the absence of a designated SPA for C&I, and in concert with others in Ohio offering a similar program, C&I chose the 5 Core Propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) to serve as the standards for the program assessment. A series of assessments were designed to support systematic review of the knowledge, skills and dispositions of teachers enrolled in this program. With regard to dispositions, C&I joined with other advanced programs in use of the shared assessment rubric, which is collected at the commencement, mid-point, and conclusion of the program. In the inaugural year (2012-13) for C&I, assessment data were collected on LiveText with Cohort 1 to demonstrate candidates’ achievement in regards of the NBPTS’ 5 Core Propositions. Comparisons with assessed performance in Cohort 2 will be possible in spring and summer 2014.

In 2012-13, two assessment rubrics were adopted for use with the first Cohort of the Advanced Candidates in spring 2013. The Portfolio Entry uses the assessment rubrics and scoring guides available on the NBPTS website. It requires candidates to provide a 15-minute video of a lesson that demonstrates how they interact with students working in small groups to promote and develop understanding about an important concept among students and shows how they model questioning strategies, critical thinking and reasoning processes to promote interactions with, and among the students in small groups. Candidates provide reflections on the recorded lesson. A second assessment was designed to draw alignments between each of the 5 Core Propositions through the candidate’s development of an Action Research Project conducted in his/her own classroom. Both of these assessments can be viewed in the LiveText Exhibit Center in the “Program Data” then “Curriculum & Instruction” folders.

As previously mentioned, advanced candidates’ dispositions are assessed at admissions, a designated midpoint, and prior to completing the program. The admission data for advanced candidates is collected by sending the disposition form to each of the three people designated as writing a letter of recommendation. Aggregate data in 2012-2013 reveal that professional dispositions data ranged from a 2.63-2.85 on a 3-point scale with 1-needs improvement and 3-exemplary. The process through which these data are submitted, however, has become arduous and we have realized that issues with the submission process have resulted in us not receiving timely data. Therefore, the advanced programs are revisiting the best place to assess dispositions early in their respective programs.

*1.2b Continuous Improvement:*

 *-Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

 *-Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement articulated in this standard.*

As discussed more thoroughly in Standard 3, the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) has moved to be a clinically-based teacher preparation program. As a result of the various initiatives involved in this change, the faculty are actively engaged in conversations on ways our curriculum can best support clinically-based teacher preparation. The way our teacher candidates will be prepared will impact our entire curriculum in some way. Believing deeply that extensive clinical experiences will build pedagogical skills, affect student learning in schools, and increase job opportunities for candidates, faculty of Teacher Education have explored and developed for initial programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, yearlong teaching experiences. These are through innovative programs such as the Senior Clinical Experience, the Clinical Master's program and the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellowships (WWTF). WWTF, a grant-funded initial graduate program, is a highly selective program that seeks to recruit and prepare math and science majors or career changers as teachers to work in high-need districts. The Ohio University program is unique in its partnership and support of Appalachian schools.

The Communications and Connections committee composed of Patton College of Education (PCOE) faculty and staff as well as area superintendents, teachers, and other educational partners have charged five design teams to implement new initiatives to improve educator preparation. Several initiatives relate specifically to plans to continue to enhance our candidate performance as it relates to Standard 1. Design Team I- Curriculum and Design Team II- Mentoring created a Developmental Curriculum for Clinical Experiences that outlines specific activities candidates should be expected to do as they engage with P12 students in the classroom. This has provided the faculty, candidates, and P12 partners with a guide to provide specific, concrete feedback to candidates in their field experiences. Design Team III has created online modules for pre-service and in-service teachers, mentors, teacher educators, and administrators. Design Team IV has created a draft Developmental Curriculum for online teaching opportunities. Additional ways our design teams have been instrumental in our program improvement will be outlined throughout this institutional report.

In fall 2012, Ohio University transitioned from quarters to semesters (Q2S). As a result, all of the PCOE’s curricula were reviewed beginning at the program level and progressing to the department chair, to the PCOE’s Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee, and finally to the University Curriculum Council (UCC). Accordingly, each program and UPEP, as a whole, had to review the assessments that take place and decide whether or not revisions were needed to more clearly and closely align to the revised semester curricula.

As graduate and employer surveys in the past called for enhanced training for candidates in the areas of classroom management and assessment, AYA and Multiage programs reformulated the two general methods courses EDSE 3500 *Secondary School Planning and Instruction* and EDSE 3510 *Secondary School Teaching and Learning*, and dedicated EDSE 3510 to classroom management and assessment. It was renamed *Secondary School Managing and Monitoring of Learning.* Other programs have infused these topics into their curriculum.

Since the last NCATE visit, all of our undergraduate teacher candidates at the initial level now participate in the Rural Urban Collaborative (RUC), which seeks to develop a deeper awareness of how to examine, understand, and assess a variety of cultural experiences and issues based on gender, race, social class, language, and geographic locale through cultural exposure and critical classroom dialogue based on a solid foundation of cultural knowledge.

UPEP is also engaged in efforts to increase the overall rigor of our teacher preparation programs. In addition to an increase in clinical hours and a re-envisioning of how curriculum is organized and developed around the clinical model, in fall 2013 UPEP voted to increase the GPA requirement for admission into Professional Education from a 2.75 to a 3.00.

**Advanced Programs**

Since 2009, there have been many new initiatives at the advanced level to improve the quality of the programs and performance of candidates. The Reading Education program approved by the International Reading Association (IRA) became completely online in the 2012-2013 academic year; in fall 2012, newly approved by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Endorsement program started accepting students; and the evolving program, Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) debuted with its first cohort in summer 2012.

In fall semester 2012, the Computer Education and Technology program implemented an online course, EDRE 5010 *Research in Education*, which is paired in the second semester with EDCT 6052 *Assessment and Evaluation in Technology Rich Classrooms*.  The research projects (EDRE 5010) are designed and reviewed (including Institutional Review Board (IRB) process/informed consent) in the fall semester and implemented in spring semester as part of EDCT 6052.  The fall semester goal is to learn how to design research and research methods while the spring semester goal is to implement the research into a classroom and use the technology to assess learning by students through the use of technology-rich lessons.  The candidates complete a three-part series where they determine if the ISTE NETS for Teachers and Students are being implemented in the school and determine whether the ISTE Essential Elements are present in their school. Then, with this knowledge, the candidate revises the research project and implements. A final presentation of the research is conducted and peer-reviewed with a peer-developed rubric. A research paper is also completed to discuss the research that supports the implementation of the candidate research project.

Since fall 2012, UPEP, adopting an infusion model of English Language Learners (ELLs) instruction, has conducted a series of professional development programs to raise awareness among faculty, to update knowledge of teaching the diverse populations in U.S. schools, and to review course syllabus and programs looking for areas where the content for teaching ELLs may be infused. This is an ongoing project and a grant proposal has been submitted. If funded, the plan is to revise and update Teacher Education programs across UPEP at both initial and advanced levels to address the Education Standards for Teachers of ELLs by TESOL and NCATE. With EDTE 4200 *Reading in the Content- area and ELLs*, a required course for initial programs, candidates practice scaffolding strategies to teach content subject and develop academic English for ELLs using a model called Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). At the advanced level, the infusion of instruction of ELLs into *EDTE 5260 Secondary Reading Instruction and ELLs* enhances content of ELLs’ instruction for the Reading Education and C&I programs. Both EDTE 4200 and EDTE 5260 come with clinical experiences that require candidates to form learning partners with ELLs to interact and tutor ELLs on and off campus.

To address continuous improvement, over past academic years, the Educational Administration (EdAd) program has designated a portion of the program’s faculty meetings to discussion and decision-making regarding program improvement. Candidate and program data analysis are a large part of this discussion. Examples of recent program improvements to the Principal Preparation program include, a reformulation of the EdAd curriculum to eliminate the stand-alone course EDAD 604 *Technology for Principals*; the integration of technology use into all the EdAd courses; the redesign of EDCS 5040 *Social Change in Education* to include a field experience component that requires candidates to interact with students from diverse cultures and with ELLs; to more intentionally incorporate school finance into EDAD 6110 *School Law*, allowing candidates to integrate skills and theory of both areas of study with a concentration on building level law and finance; and to strengthen candidate skills in working with school and community constituents, the course EDAD 6610 School-Community *Relations* is a new requirement for Principal candidates.

In general, advanced programs are built on a research-based and experience-based community. As illustration, faculty mentors collaborate with students in projects and grant work, and present their research together. UPEP provides travel funds to graduate students for research-related activities. While the monthly college research forum for faculty and graduate students keeps them informed about the current educational policies and research, the various initiatives to make the programs more field-based allows candidates ample opportunities to apply research in the “real world.”

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

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

*2.1 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?*

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) which includes faculty representatives from the colleges on campus that are a part of UPEP as well as faculty from the regional campuses, Ohio University (OHIO) administrators, the Patton College of Education (PCOE) candidates, and P12 constituents as well as the Assessment Council (AC) drive our Unit Assessment System (UAS). The AC oversees the planning, development, administration, analysis, evaluation, and reporting of assessments used to monitor the performance of UPEP and its candidates and programs. UPEP-wide assessments include candidate evaluations of field experiences, satisfaction surveys, alumni and employer surveys, dispositions, diversity, licensure and GPA data, technology, and the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). While assessments take place across a candidate’s program, candidate performance is formally monitored at three transition points. For initial teacher preparation programs the transition points are Professional Education, Advanced Standing, and Professional Internship (PI). Advanced Program candidates are monitored at admission, a midpoint, and prior to completing.

UPEP has made a concerted effort to include candidates in the AC, AC Subcommittees, and UPEP, as well as other college-wide committees. Minutes of the AC and UPEP meetings are posted on LiveText, the electronic tool used by UPEP to collect, report, and share data, for faculty to review. Individual faculty members also discuss assessment data with candidates in their courses. Several times a year, the PCOE Dean at the Athens Campus hosts “Dinner with the Dean” to provide candidates with opportunities to share feedback about their experiences. During this time, the Dean shares with the candidates some examples of recent data-driven decisions that have been made in UPEP. The PCOE also sends a biannual Student Satisfaction Survey to gather data to improve the entire college.

The key assessments developed for SPA review aim to demonstrate candidate performance as aligned to their respective standards. SPA assessments are aligned to UPEP’s Conceptual Core and state and professional standards. Exhibit 1.4.c provides a comprehensive alignment chart. Course syllabi also include the appropriate standards as a means to help candidates see how standards are a central focus of the coursework.

With the exception of two initial programs, all programs have either full national recognition or recognition with conditions. Modern Languages French and Spanish at the graduate level received “Need Further Development” by the American Council on The Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL). Due to low enrollments for the graduate Modern Language programs as well as Integrated Math at the graduate level, UPEP opted to defer national recognition for these programs.

Prior to the beginning of each semester, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement sends data collection schedules to all faculty who teach a course with an identified key assessment. The candidates submit key unit and program assessments via LiveText. All key assessments are shared from the Director of Assessment’s central administrative account. When faculty or supervisors assess candidate work, the data are automatically entered into the central account. From that account, the Director of Assessment compiles data reports in aggregate form as well as disaggregated by program and campus and places the reports in an electronic exhibit center in LiveText, which is accessible to unit faculty.

The UAS is a continual process with data reports beginning at the level of the AC Subcommittees and progressing through the full AC and then to UPEP for final recommendations. Assessments and data are systematically reviewed and reported on an annual basis and during the review. Each subcommittee consults with the appropriate faculty, programs, or departments and produces written reports of the data that were examined, who reviewed them, the date(s) of review and analysis, the current status of the data, a reliability and validity check, and recommendations for program improvement.

UPEP ensures its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias in a number of ways. First, having rubrics for the assessments ensures that all assessors use the same criteria for all candidates. This holds true not only across assessors and candidates assessed, but also across different terms and campuses. Having descriptors for the rating levels of each criterion and for all assessment tasks increases the consistency of assessors’ ratings. Second, no decisions about candidates’ progress throughout the program are made on a single source of evidence; but decisions are made holistically via multiple assessments. This ensures that decisions include input from multiple perspectives. Finally, UPEP has had several opportunities to bring faculty/assessors together for a scorer training to ensure inter-rater reliability. For example, in spring semester 2013, the Office of Clinical Experiences (OCE) hosted a one-day local evaluation workshop for the edTPA. The agenda is attached as one of the exhibits for 2.4.c.

An additional measure of fairness is the sharing of assessments with candidates. Typically candidates receive a copy of the rubric at the time the assignment is assigned. The rubric clearly outlines what candidates must do to be successful on the assignment. Many assessments also include a specific template to follow as candidates complete their assignments. This ensures candidates are aware of the assessment tools, and how they will be used.

The PCOE conducts an evaluation of UPEP with annual reports at the faculty, program, and department level. Faculty members in PCOE are required to submit reviews of scholarship, teaching and advising, and service activities for each calendar year. Department Chairs review their annual reports as a basis for merit pay, tenure, and promotion decisions. Department Chairs are required to consolidate their faculty reports into a departmental annual report that is submitted to the Dean for review. The Dean compiles the annual review information from the departments to develop the College’s Annual Report that is submitted to OHIO’s President, Provost the Dean’s Circle of Engagement (alumni) and other key stakeholders. At all levels of review, the data are evaluated for trends of improvement or areas of concern that need improvement. Yearly goals are developed from these annual reports and reevaluated each year. The PCOE report is also shared with the faculty as a whole. Therefore, the annual review serves as a continuous loop of evaluation and goal setting addressing trends in data.

Finally, the Operational Assessment and Improvement Cycle is used to assess UPEP’s operations and to review issues such as faculty development, service and outreach, admissions and retention, and student support services including advising and field placements. The Academic Leadership Team (ALT) systematically reviews these items.

Candidates may raise concerns by contacting an individual professor, the candidate’s advisor, Department Chair, the Director of Student Affairs, or the Associate/Assistant Deans. When a formal complaint arises, the person who receives the contact schedules an appointment to hear the candidate’s concern. If the concern is not rectified in that meeting, the candidate may be referred to the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs or one of the Associate Deans to hear the candidate’s concern. Sometimes concerns are about grades; other concerns may regard some aspect of fair treatment in the classroom. The person hearing the concern will then contact people pertinent to the concern for a more thorough investigation of the issue or complaint. Candidates may also address their concerns through an official Petition to the Credential Review and Candidate Progress Board. Depending on the nature of the concern and the level to which higher administrators have been involved, the pertinent Department Chair, Director of Student Affairs, or the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Academic Advising keep records of formal complaints and their resolution. Records of petitions, judiciary offenses, and background check offenses are maintained in the Unit of Student Affairs.

At the end of every course, candidates complete evaluations that ask them to provide feedback about the faculty member, the course content, strengths and weaknesses, and how they believe both the course and instructor’s methods could be improved in the future. These data are reported to the respective department and are used as a part of the faculty members’ annual dossiers for promotion and tenure and merit review. At least annually, each faculty member meets with the department chair to discuss and review possible plans for improvement or enhancement.

Each program and/or licensure band systematically meets to review program SPA data and unit data that have been disaggregated by program. During this review, programs make recommendations for changes and/or improvements and send revisions to the Director of Assessment so the rubrics can be changed in LiveText.

Based on triangulated data from focus groups, stakeholders, key assessments, and other mechanisms, UPEP has developed five Design Teams that represent various stakeholders and are charged with designing ways in which we can meet the unique educational needs of children in our region. The five Design Teams are as follows: Design Team I- Innovative Teacher Preparation and the Clinical Model; Design Team II- School-Based Innovation; Design Team III- Teacher Residency Program and the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES); Design Team IV- Technology for our Region’s Educators, the Infrastructure Challenges, and the Efficient Use of Resources Available in Ohio, and Design Team V- Health and Wellness. These Design Teams provide systematic reports at UPEP meetings.

*2.2b Continuous Improvement:*

 *-Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

 *-Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement articulated in this standard.*

Numerous activities and data-driven changes on the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) and program levels have occurred that have led to continuous improvement of our candidate performance and program quality. Perhaps the largest change has been Ohio University’s (OHIO) change from quarters to semesters (Q2S). This transition required UPEP and the programs to review overall curriculum, policies, and procedures to align to a fall-spring semester structure.

Since 2007, UPEP has partnered with Eduventures, a research and advisory firm, to assist us in data collection and analysis of various education initiatives. To date, The Patton College of Education (PCOE) has developed and implemented various unit-wide surveys including an alumni survey and an employer survey. Data from those surveys pointed to the need to increase candidates’ ability to teach English Language Learners (ELLs). As a result, the faculty in the Department of Teacher Education engaged in professional development to better understand the issue of ELLs in U.S. schools and the importance of preparing teachers to work with ELLs. Faculty have reviewed specific content standards required for pre-service teachers about teaching ELLs and identified specific areas of instruction to ELLs that could be integrated into the curriculum. As mentioned in Standard 3, UPEP is engaging in numerous initiatives surrounding the clinical preparation of teachers. In fall 2013, PCOE worked with Eduventures to identify institutions that assess clinical field experiences in innovative ways. The goal is to design new assessment tools that are designed to align to clinical practice including observation tools, co-teaching evaluations, student surveys, and student achievement data.

In 2010-11, UPEP started piloting the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). We started with one program and a few candidates and each year have scaled up adding additional components of the edTPA as well as programs and candidates. In 2012-13, all candidates in all programs participated in the edTPA. Because of the state-negotiated agreement between the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), Stanford University, and Pearson, only a randomly selected group of early childhood edTPA portfolios were nationally scored in spring 2013 with the remaining portfolios locally scored by OHIO faculty, clinical educators, and P12 partners. Beginning in fall 2013, all candidates will submit their edTPAs to Pearson for national scoring. Because of this scaling up, UPEP has an increased focus on topics like academic language and assessment of student learning by observing videotaping of teaching performance. For example, Computer Education and Technology faculty are working with Teacher Education faculty to redesign EDCT 2030/5012 *Technological Applications in Education* to better prepare candidates to integrate videotaping in their classrooms.

The Assessment Council (AC) has redesigned two UPEP-wide assessments, the Dispositions and the Diversity assessments. The Dispositions assessment has taken on many forms since its 2006 creation. It has ranged from a four-item survey to a detailed rubric. Over the years, the Dispositions Subcommittee of AC has attempted to design an assessment that was easy to use but with a clear protocol for reporting concerns. However, it was determined that the assessment still required alteration. Therefore, including the aforementioned information, as well as the move to the clinical model and the need for an easy to use assessment to track candidates as they spent a longer time in the field, a revised assessment was piloted in fall 2013. The tool was drafted by an ad-hoc committee of AC, reviewed by the full AC and external P12 stakeholders to solicit feedback, and discussed at UPEP. UPEP hopes that this iteration of the assessment will provide useful information and ensure that a clear process is in place should dispositional issues arise.

Similarly, the Diversity Subcommittee of AC also redesigned the Diversity Assessment. This assessment has taken many forms. The assessment was piloted in spring 2013 and was fully implemented in fall 2013.

In January 2013, OBR released the first annual Educator Preparation Program Performance Report. In addition to gathering data that PCOE had not collected before, including value-added data for our teacher and principal graduates, detailed admissions data, and teacher residency data, UPEP had to report data on a new statewide pre-service teacher candidate survey. Preparing the data for the OBR report as well as working to increase the rigor of teacher preparation programs, UPEP engaged in discussion about increasing admissions standards from a 2.75 GPA to a 3.0. UPEP formally approved this recommendation at the fall 2013 meeting.

In the summer 2013, the Candidate Evaluation of Field Experience was revised to more clearly assess both the mentor teacher as well as the overall field experience. The survey formerly was inclusive of both field experiences and professional internship, but because OBR’s pre-service teacher candidate survey asked many of the same questions as the assessment, UPEP decided to move the focus of the assessment specifically to field experiences. However, UPEP realized that an outcome of replacing the candidate evaluation survey with the OBR survey was that candidates did not have the opportunity to formally evaluate their Clinical Educator. Therefore, a shorter Candidate Evaluation of Clinical Educator was developed and implemented in fall 2013.

With regard to unit operations, beginning in 2010-11, the Communications and Connections Design Teams provide reports at each UPEP meeting. This allows UPEP to stay abreast of initiatives and updates that impact educator preparation. In 2012-13, the Clinical Model Implementation Team began providing regular reports and updates at these meetings.

UPEP also instituted a biannual Student Satisfaction Survey in 2010-11. Based on data from the survey that expressed a need to improve advising, especially for first and second year candidates, the Unit of Student Affairs now employs professional advisors to help candidates with class scheduling, understanding graduation requirements, equating transfer credits, and career exploration. Additionally, though McCracken Hall, where several of the departments of PCOE are housed, is slated for major renovations in 2015, UPEP opted to invest in electronic boards in the hallways to distribute announcements and purchased new furniture and artwork for the halls.

The PCOE is also engaging in a Program Planning Process. This process is designed to fulfill four unique functions. First, it will provide opportunities to examine the extent to which programs are fulfilling the mission and core values of the PCOE. Second, it will provide opportunities to examine the interrelationship of academic units within the College and illuminate ways that programs can achieve greater levels of collaboration and synergy in working together. Third, it will ensure time to intentionally and systematically plan for the future. Fourth, it will provide a basis for policy analysis and decision-making with regard to program planning and resource allocation within the college. Initial discussions began at the Faculty Forum of the Winter 2013 Colloquium.

In addition to a variety of unit-wide activities, initial and advanced programs have made a multitude of data-driven changes. For example, the Physical Education program instituted a new Skill and Fitness Portfolio (SFP) to provide evidence of their candidates’ minimum competency in a variety of different activities to be an effective physical education teacher. Candidates who do not perform at the acceptable or higher level of the rubric will receive a letter grade of an “Incomplete” or “Progress” and will be referred to the program coordinator to develop an action plan for student growth and development in the area(s) of deficiency. The Science Education programs revised several of their National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) assessments to align to the 2012 standards.

At the advanced levels, as a result of formal and informal feedback from candidates as well as end-of-course evaluations and Q2S, the Educational Administration programs merged the content from two courses, Law and Finance, to form a single course, *Education Law and School Finance*, and created new assessments to align to the ELCC 2011 standards. The Computer Education and Technology (CET) program created a "creative portfolio" which requires candidate reflection and revisions on two previous assignments (to produce new products), and evaluation of the changes. There is also an increased emphasis on use of technology to support student learning and student assessment in classroom and school settings. This has increased the amount of involvement in P12 schools. In addition, the CET faculty have revised several of their ISTE assessments to align with 2012 standards.

Two of our advanced programs, Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and Reading Education are now offered only online. This was based on an expressed need to provide advanced programs for teachers in a way that could accommodate the challenges of time, pace, and place in rural regions, in southeast Ohio, as well as other areas of Ohio. To be successful, extensive recruitment efforts for a C&I program were carried out in 2010 and 2011 that revealed limited responsiveness to a traditional instructional format. Transition to an online delivery format made a difference, and made program approval possible.

**Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

*3.1 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?*

**Initial Programs**

1. ***Partnerships****:* The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) coordinates university-wide efforts in initial and advanced programs for teachers and other school personnel to ensure that state and national standards for professional education are met. Representation includes regional campus faculty and administrators and faculty from three colleges on the Athens campus, including The Patton College of Education (PCOE), College of Fine Arts, and College of Arts and Sciences. UPEP has constructed an extensive network of partnerships to better serve field and clinical experiences for both initial and advanced programs, as described below.
* *The Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS)* is a partnership amongthe PCOE, 134 school districts, other institutions of higher learning, and other educational agencies in the 32-county region of Ohio designated as Appalachia. Its mission is to advocate for and support the public schools of Appalachian Ohio in the continuous improvement of educational opportunities available to all the region's children.
* *The Southeast Ohio Teacher Development Collaborative (SEO-TDC)* is a partnership among five teacher preparation programs in southeast Ohio including Ohio University, Shawnee State, Muskingum, Marietta, and Rio Grande. In recent years, SEO-TDC has been engaged in a many projects, including offering an online workshop for mentoring teachers, offering online demonstrations of standards-based teaching, and sponsoring an annual conference on rural education, the Appalachian Assets Conference.
* *The Communications and Connections Group* includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff, and other educational partners. The mission is to establish an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society. To achieve this mission, this group has charged five design teams to develop and implement new initiatives for the improvement of educator preparation.
* *The Center for PDS Partnerships*fosters and supports outreach activities that connects the College with regional schools. The Director of the Center oversees four different models of teacher candidate supervision for the purpose of improving P12 education for all students, enriching field and clinical experiences, building mentoring capacity, and supporting continuing professional development.
* *The Office of Clinical Experiences (OCE)* plans, arranges, and tracks field experiences and professional internships in initial programs.
1. ***Clinical Experiences for Initial Programs:*** All teacher candidates at Ohio University (OHIO) engage in two common experiences*. The Rural Urban Collaborative*isa forty-hour clinical experience in diverse urban schools. The *Professional Internship (PI)* is the capstone clinical experience for each program. The other clinical experiences vary by program as described below.
* *Early Childhood Education (ECE)*During the sophomore year, for each semester, ECE candidates participate for one half day each week in community public or private prekindergarten classrooms, including Head Start, child care centers, and classrooms for children with special needs. During the junior year, candidates on the Athens Campus spend two full days a week in the school and over 500 hours in the five Early Childhood Professional Development School (PDS) Partnerships. On regional campuses, junior ECE candidates spend two half days per week in a public or parochial K-3 classroom. During their senior year, both Athens and regional campus teacher candidates complete two internships, one semester in a prekindergarten classroom for five half days a week and one semester in a K-3 classroom for five full days each week for an entire semester.
* *Middle Childhood Education* *(MCE)*majors (grades 4-9) on the Athens Campus spend a minimum of 165 hours in a PDS partnership during their junior year and prior to their PI. On the regional campuses, middle childhood candidates spend approximately 160 hours in clinical setting during their junior year. In their senior year, candidates spend additional hours in clinical experiences associated with methods courses.
* *Special Education* During their sophomore year, Special Education candidates complete 55 hours of clinical experience associated with EDTE 3250 *Literature Centered Developmental Reading Instruction* and EDEC 3300 *Teaching Mathematics in Early Childhood P-3*. During their junior year, Special Education candidates complete 240 hours of clinical experience, many of them in the Alexander School District partnership site.
* *Adolescent-to-Young Adult (AYA) and Multi-Age*majors complete 80 hours in a clinical experience associated with EDSE 3500 *Secondary School Planning and Instruction* and EDTE 3730 *Instructional Adaptations for Young Adult Learners with Exceptionalities and Diverse Needs* during their junior year. Prior to their PI, they spend between 20-40 hours in clinical experiences that are associated with methods courses.
* *CARE PDS Partnership (Creating Active and Reflective Educators)*is an undergraduate partnership program for MCE, AYA, and Multi-Age majors during their sophomore and junior years. It provides candidates with an opportunity to spend approximately 120 hours per year in a clinical setting exploring the nature of the child as a learner and a focus on democratic education.

**Advanced Programs**

1. ***Partnerships***: The advancedprograms also partnerwith organizations for the purpose of obtaining input regarding clinical experiences. Two examples are the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) and the Ohio University Leadership Project (OULP), which provide requested direction for the Educational Administration Program’s clinical programs.
* *The Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools* (previously described under Initial Programs) supports the continuous development of educational leadership throughout the region's public school systems and sponsors the use of research and to share successful practices for improving educational opportunities for all children in the CORAS region. Its Associate Director is a member of the Educational Administration Program faculty.
* *The Ohio University Leadership Project (OULP)*, which is housed at OHIO’s Southern Campus, is responsible for the identification, development, and implementation of needed professional programs for current and aspiring school administrators. Its Director, a faculty member, is also the current Coordinator of the Educational Administration Program. The OULP is comprised of an elementary principal, a secondary principal, a superintendent, and a treasurer cohort. The organization began with 15 participants and now has approximately 300 annual participants. Many of the participants are graduates of the Educational Administration Program, serve as mentors in the clinical programs, and provide insightful input regarding the manner in which the programs are operated and clinical experiences are delivered.
* *The Computer Education and Technology Program* has built a network with candidates and alumni that provide requested input to its clinical program.
* *The Reading Program* and *Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)* programs have formal and informal advisory groups of school people, university faculty, and candidates to provide input on clinical experiences. These working relationships contribute significantly to the delivery of the experiences, which would not be possible without the involvement of the partners.
1. ***Clinical Experiences for Advanced Programs:***
* *Educational Administration* Candidates in the Principal Preparation program and the Superintendent License program engage in clinical experiences in the majority of their respective programs. The experiences occur in the candidates’ schools and districts and in other locations with differing demographics. The candidates are expected to obtain the willingness and approval of the principals, supervisors, and superintendents to serve as their primary mentors.

University faculty members visit the candidates, mentor principals, and superintendents in the school and district settings to discuss the expected dimensions and dynamics of the clinical learning experiences. Mentors use the visits as an opportunity to share their evaluation of the candidate’s progress and to offer suggestions to make the experiences more useful. The university faculty members make visits at least once per term. The visits demonstrate the importance that UPEP attaches to clinical experiences.

* *Curriculum and Instruction, Computer Education and Technology, Reading Education* The primary facilitators in the clinical experiences of C&I, the Computer Education and Technology, and the Reading Education programs are the programs’ faculties, candidates, and the teachers and administrators of the schools where the candidates participate in clinical experiences. The input of school-based teachers and administrators is sought to strengthen the clinical experiences in UPEP’s advanced programs and to make certain that the candidates are making desired progress toward the goals of the clinical experiences.

For example, the Action Research projects of the candidates in C&I are conducted in their classrooms with the involvement of the schools’ principals. Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement are supervised by their advisors and school-based supervisors. The Reading Education program candidates engage in conversations among university faculty and the teachers, administrators, and the teachers for the purpose of sharing professional knowledge and enhancing the experiences of candidates.

*3.2a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level- Initial Programs (maximum characters 15,000 - current characters 14,722)*

* *Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.*
* *Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.*
* *Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.*

***Areas of the Standard at Which The Unit is Currently Performing at the Target Level:*** TheInitial Licensure programs in the Teacher Preparation Unit are moving towards a clinically-based teacher program that is constructed around practice, reflection, and theory. (See Exhibit 3.2.a.1) The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) chose to move to target on Standard 3 for three reasons: 1) because it is an extension of UPEP’s long, rich tradition of partnering with schools to design, implement, and evaluate field experiences; 2) because UPEP has embraced the NCATE Blue Ribbon panel report (2010) as a vision for the future of teacher preparation; and 3) because UPEP believes that transforming clinical practice will lead to a unit-wide transformation across the other NCATE standards. The Patton College of Education (PCOE) has conceptualized the differences between clinically-based teacher education and the more traditional, course-based teacher education, as shown below. (Exhibit 3.2.a.2)

When the Blue Ribbon Panel Report was released in November 2010, UPEP programs were firmly rooted in a long history of strong partnerships established with public schools, other universities, and other colleges within the university, as described in Section 3.1. UPEP was continuing to make systematic improvements based on the feedback received from partners in 2007 and the 2009 NCATE accreditation visit. In addition, a strong infrastructure was in place for designing and implementing program enhancements.

For example, the Communications and Connections group charged five design teams with leading the continuous improvement process. Preparation in the field and for the field is the central concept guiding the efforts of these design teams. Design Team I is working to develop an approach to teacher preparation that aligns practice, reflection, and theory across the teacher education curriculum. Design Team II is developing initiatives to support the role of mentor teachers, who are widely viewed as themost powerful, impactful component of the teacher education process, and often considered the most important part of candidates’ experiences. Design Team III is developing initiatives to link teacher preparation to the four-year teacher residency program in Ohio. Design Team IV is developing technology initiatives to serve 21st century education, such as the development of K12 online clinical experiences. Design Team V is developing projects that serve health and wellness education throughout the region.

The design team initiatives have been organized and presented in the sections below based on Cochran-Smith and Lytles’ (1999) description of the three domains of teacher knowledge. For ease of communication, we refer to knowledge-in-practice as practice, knowledge-of-practice as reflection, and knowledge-for-practice as theory.

***Practice (Clinical Experiences):*** The initiative to implement yearlong clinical experiences began with the development of the SciMath Teaching Fellows program. In fall 2010, four master’s candidates participated in a yearlong clinical experience as part of a one-year master’s degree program. Another four joined the program in fall 2011. The development of the Senior Clinical Experience followed in fall 2011, and the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows (WWTF) program in fall 2012. In the fall semester of these programs, candidates spent from one to three days per week in classrooms while finishing college classes. To address the increased demands for field experience sites and to respond to the increased need for preparing candidates for digital instruction, UPEP is also engaged in developing K12 online field experiences. Summaries of all these programs, accompanied by the relevant NCATE standards and design principles, are provided below.

* *The Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellowship Program (WWTF)* is an innovative and accelerated one-year initial teaching license program with a master's degree. The program is designed for recent college graduates from science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM). It includes an intensive one-year in-school experience that is directly connected with coursework as a part of preparing new teachers for careers in middle school mathematics and science or high school chemistry, life science, or physics.  During 2012-2013, 12 teacher candidates participated in the program, and 11 joined the program in 2013-2014. (Design Principles 1, 2, 7, & 10) (Exhibit 3.2.a.3)
* *The Clinical Master’s Program* has been developed as a strategic outcome of WWTF. It is a clinically-based master’s program that can be completed in four semesters and involves a yearlong clinical experience. During 2012-2013, 10 teacher candidates participated in the program, and 14 joined the program for 2013-2014. Beginning, with fall 2013, all incoming master’s candidates must adhere to the requirements of the Clinical Master’s Program. (Design Principles 1, 2, 7, & 10) (Exhibit 3.2.a.4)
* *The* *Senior Clinical Experience* is a yearlong clinical experience for undergraduates, which involves an extensive clinical experience during the fall semester while finishing coursework and the completion of the Professional Internship (PI) during the spring semester. In 2011-2012, 12 teacher candidates in the Adolescent-to-Young Adult (AYA) program participated in the program, followed by 50 in 2012-13, and 45 in 2013-14. Middle Childhood majors on the Athens Campus were recently informed that completing a yearlong experience or its equivalentwould be a requirement beginning in 2014-15.Similar announcements are expected to follow in the AYA and Special Education programs and on the regional campuses. (Design Principles, 1, 2, 7, & 10) (Exhibit 3.2.a.5)
* *A series of K12 Online Field Experiences* are currently being developed and piloted by Design Team IV in partnership with two K12 online schools, Electronic School of Tomorrow (ECOT) and The Virtual Community School of Ohio. These experiences will take place at three different levels of the teacher preparation program, including PI, to address the increasing need to prepare teachers for digital instructional environments. (Design Principle 8) (Exhibit 3.2.a.6)

***Reflection:*** Extending the clinical experience increased an already existing need to strengthen and expand support for mentoring teachers. In 2010, UPEP received the first of several small grants to establish a series of workshops to address mentoring during early clinical experiences. These workshops were used as vehicles for identifying or developing mentoring strategies, clearly articulating them, and developing strategies for communicating them through websites, written materials, workshops, and online courses. These initiatives have also been enhanced by the work of Design Team II to develop a set of criteria for selecting mentor teachers for the PI and individual program efforts to foster mentoring, such as those associated with the WWTF or Senior Clinical Experience programs.

* *Mentoring Teacher Candidates Workshop* examines various approaches to mentoring field experiences for teacher candidates. Topics include examining the role of a mentoring teacher, setting expectations, getting teacher candidates involved with students, helping teacher candidates reflect on their teaching, and engaging teacher candidates with inquiry projects. Workshops were offered at all Ohio University (OHIO) campuses during 2010-12. Approximately 175 teachers participated. (Design Principles 5 & 6) (Exhibit 3.2.a.7)
* *The Co-Teaching Workshop* encourages a partnership between the cooperating teacher and the PI to increase student learning in K12 classrooms (Design Principles 5 & 6). The workshop, Co-Teaching for Innovation in Appalachian, originated with a small pilot project begun by Design Team II during the winter and spring quarters of 2011. During 2012-2013, 17 teachers participated in the workshop. In 2013-2014, 23 additional teachers are expected to participate. (Design Principles 5 & 6) (Exhibit 3.2.a.8)
* *Mentoring Quality Matters: Supporting Ohio’s Continuum of Teacher Development* is an online professional development workshop designed to support mentor teachers and build administrators who are actively involved in the mentoring of Professional Interns and first year teachers. In 2012-2013, 19 teachers participated. (Design Principles 5 & 6).

***Theory:*** To support learning in clinical settings, UPEP has developed several features that are intended to strengthen the connection between practice and theory, as described below.

* *The Developmental Curriculum for Clinical Experiences* is a one-page description of a developmental sequence of clinical experiences that moves from simpler to more complex teaching skills, from working with fewer to larger numbers of students, and from less to more planning and decision-making. The skills described by the Developmental Curriculum serve as the foundation for the core curricular component in Ohio’s teacher preparation programs. They are aligned with the Ohio Continuum for Teacher Development and the seven Ohio Educator Standards. It serves as a useful guide for gradually introducing candidates into increasingly complex activities and also provides a useful framework for organizing mentoring workshops, co-teaching workshops, and clinical seminar curricula. (Exhibit 3.2.a.9)
* *The Senior Clinical Experience and the Clinical Master’s Seminar* have been added to serve undergraduate and graduate candidates who are engaged in a yearlong senior clinical experience. The seminars help teacher candidates organize their experience by making strong connections between practice, reflection, and theory.A special focus is placed on practicing reflection skills associated with the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). (Design Principles 4 & 5) (Exhibit 3.2.a.10) (Exhibit 3.2.a.11)

***Summary of Activities and their Impact on Candidate Performance and Program Quality that Have Led to Target Level Performance.***

UPEP is rapidly moving forward to institutionalize clinically-based teacher education based on the: 1) strongly positive response of teacher candidates to the program; 2) the enthusiastic support received from teachers and school administrations; and 3) the findings from PCOE research and development program. The College’s research and development program has been engaged in a systematic effort to promote the kind of discussion and reflection that leads to innovation. (Design Principle 9) These efforts are of three kinds, as described below.

* Investigating existing conditions, such as descriptive studies on mentoring, including mentoring for assessment, mentoring for learning, and mentoring across different skill levels of candidates. (Exhibit 3.2.a.12) These studies identify problems, needs, and opportunities.
* Evaluation of the program interventions created by Design Teams I and II, such as the extended clinical experiences (Exhibit 3.2.a.13) and the Developmental Curriculum for Clinical Experiences. These studies gauge the impact of new initiatives.
* Examining teacher development in greater detail through studies on instructional decision-making, classroom discourse, assessment, etc. These studies seek to develop new concepts and directions for improving the program. (Exhibit 3.2.a.14)

***Plans and Timelines for Attaining and/or Sustaining Target Level Performance:***

The College’s goal is to institutionalize clinically-based teacher education in the next two years. As the PCOE moves towards full implementation, it plans to execute three strategies: 1) institutionalize the extended clinical experiences developed through the pilot programs, 2) fully implement a practice-based teacher education curriculum, and 3) foster a strong research and design agenda.

* *To institutionalize extended clinical placements, the PCOE plans to****:***
	+ Make the Senior Clinical Experience a requirement for most candidates, while allowing a flexible alternative for candidates who elect PI out of area or overseas. (Design Principle 2)
	+ Reform PCOE procedures for making placements to meet the requirements of yearlong experiences. (Design Principle 7)
	+ Increase the amount of clinical experience hours for AYA and Multi-Age majors during methods courses from approximately 30 hours to 80 hours. (Design Principle 2)
	+ Expand the College’s PDS structure to include AYA and Multi-Age majors. (Design Principle 7)
	+ Continue to work with Department Chairs in English, Mathematics, and Modern Languages in the College of Arts and Science. The Chairs have engaged their faculty in rearranging departmental schedules so seniors can spend Tuesdays and Thursdays in the clinical settings. This work will be extended to include Department Chairs in Science and Social Studies. (Design Principle 4)
	+ Reorganize the concept of the PDS to include an expansion of current supervisory models to accommodate full implementation of the extended clinical experiences. (Design Principle 10).
* *To Institutionalize a Practice-based Teacher Education Curriculum, the College plans to:*
	+ Develop a unified plan for supporting mentoring by aligning professional development in mentoring across early field, PI, and induction year experiences. (Design Principles 1, 5 & 6)
	+ Offer professional development for mentoring online to better serve the region.
	+ To clearly articulate an approach to teaching the reflective thinking skills needed by teacher candidates through the development of the Reflective Thinking Skills Curriculum (Design Principle 4) (Exhibit 3.2.a.15)
	+ Increase the rigor of clinical placements by making the connection of practice to theory, increasing the minimum GPA for admission, revising the standards for teaching dispositions, and requiring a more rigorous review of performance in clinical settings. (Design Principles 3 & 4) (Exhibit 3.2.a.16)
* *To Foster a Strong Research and Development Agenda, the College plans to*:
	+ Issue a request for protocol that will provide significant support for research projects that assess the effectiveness of clinically-based teacher education. The purpose of these projects is to both establish empirical support for clinically-based teacher education and to implement new methods for measuring the growth of candidates. (Design Principle 9)
	+ Develop innovative approaches to assessing clinical experiences. The Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement has initiated a study a comparative study through *Eduventures,* a research and advisory firm, to assist the PCOE in data collection and analysis of various education initiatives to explore innovative approaches to assessing clinically-based teacher preparation. (Design Principle 3)

*3.2b Continuous Improvement (Advanced programs) (maximum characters 10,000 - current characters 8,449)*

* *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*
* *Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.*

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) five advanced programs are engaged in continuous improvement. The faculty members of the programs recognize the importance of improvement that the candidates of their programs have meaningful clinical experiences that will prepare them, in the best manner possible, for their professional work after completion of the programs. For example, in fall 2012 the university changed from a quarter to a semester-based structure (Q2S). The advanced programs approached this change as an opportunity to transform the clinical aspects of their programs in way that would serve the candidates in an even more effective manner.

As noted in section 3.1 above, each of the advanced programs seeks the input of its school partners and other related organizations. The input is considered carefully and used to make improvements with the design, implementation, and evaluation of the clinical experiences of the programs. The advanced programs also seek input from other sources to engage in continuous improvement. The reactions of UPEP’s faculty members, the candidates themselves, and the outcomes of the efforts of the candidates with external testing, such as the Praxis II, which the Educational Administration Program candidates have had to pass to obtain Ohio administrative licensure, are analyzed with the intent of making improvements. For example, the Praxis II examination, which has been used in Ohio, is divided into sections. The collective results of the candidates on each of the sections of the test have been used to adjust and refocus the clinical experiences.

***Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)****:* The current advanced C&I program is in the first cycle.The program is being delivered in an online instructional format, with 26 practicing teachers enrolled. The program is setting baselines for the pursuit of continuous improvement. Assignments and assessment rubrics have been established to monitor the learning and experiences of advanced candidates. The clinical aspects have been situated in a manner that is compatible with, and will deepen the understanding of, the candidates in three core courses. They are Portfolio Development Processes, Teacher as Action Researcher, and Master’s Research Project.

Assessments are aligned to the Core Propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Performance assessments for the course in portfolio development, in which teachers select and develop a single entry portfolio, include assessment rubrics that have been calibrated for each particular entry and have been drawn entirely from the NBPTS website.

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement, as articulated in Standard 3, will begin as soon as a full set of baseline data becomes available and prior to the time that data for cross-cohort comparisons becomes available in May 2014. Adjustments in instructional format and pacing of support to facilitate the candidates’ development of project and portfolio processes in their own classrooms will be initiated in course development and design for the 2013-14 academic year.

***Educational Administration****:* The Educational Administration programs consistently strive to engage in continuous improvement to their clinical experiences. The experiences are based on the aspects of the Educational Leader Constituent Council’s (ELCC) standard seven building and district standards. The standards and elements have been interpreted and implemented in a manner that is reflective of the contexts in which the clinical experiences occur.

As described in section 3.1, regular input is sought from the program’s school partners. Since the faculty visits with the candidates and mentors at least once per term, in the schools and districts in which the Principal Preparation program and Superintendent License program candidates are engaged in their clinical experiences, regular feedback is received as part of the process, without being requested. The feedback, in turn, is discussed, analyzed, and used as deemed appropriate by the faculty to enhance the quality of the experiences for the candidates.

Feedback regarding the Principal and Superintendent programs, which are based on the standards of the ELCC, has generally been positive, with the receipt of regular suggestion that the program should not be altered. This feedback has most recently been obtained from an outcome of a research project in which the reactions of the candidates of one cohort from the last eight cycles of the Principal Preparation program were sought via an autonomous electronic survey and two focus group sessions.

Occasional feedback is obtained that the Principal Preparation program. It currently is delivered in a mixed in-class and online format, but should be offered in a completely online format. The faculty is struggling with this suggestion, as a perception exists that you cannot prepare effectively for a people-business, such as the principalship, in a completely online format.

Like the other three advanced programs, the Educational Administration programs examined and revised the Principal Preparation program and the Superintendent License program to accommodate the university’s Q2S switch. A major change that emerged from this endeavor has been the removal of program content that no longer is current and applicable, and its replacement with more current content. While the revisions pertain particularly to the programs’ coursework, the clinical experiences of each of the programs are inextricably linked to each other.

Another change pertains to the Educational Administration program’s effort to be attuned to a perceived need for teacher-leader program offerings. A Teacher-Leader Endorsement program was developed and approved by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) to augment and possibly replace the Teacher-Leader Master’s Degree program.

***Computer Education and Technology***: Primary changes have been made to enhance the quality of the Computer Education and Technology program, particularly as it pertains to its clinical experiences. Every course in the program has been redesigned as part of the Q2S transition. Some courses have been eliminated entirely, like EDCT 6360 *Media and the Young Adult*, and others were added, like EDCT 6012 *Teaching and Learning Online*. Additionally, courses have been redesigned to be more responsive to technological changes and workplace expectations. Courses in the program now contain a greater emphasis on online instruction, assessment, and ethics.

Technology is continually evolving. The program’s faculty recognizes that the program may require adjustments each semester to ensure that the technologies, which are available where the candidates are located, are being used to enhance the delivery of the program. UPEP has created a Design Team IV- Technology. This design team, in part, functions as an advisory board for the program, with representatives from local schools, including teachers, administrators and technical facilitators, local businesses, and statewide educational technology specialists. The participants in the design team plan to review the program’s curriculum on an annual basis. A particular focus of the design team is to improve the field and clinical experiences in order that they are more responsive to online pedagogy of the program.

***Reading Education****:* Candidates in the Reading Education program are expected to complete 160 hours of clinical experiences as part of their programmatic coursework. They are required to work with students in grades K12 on administering and interpreting assessments, designing and delivering instruction that is based on the results of the assessments, and monitoring student progress over an extended period of time. Each candidate is also required to work with a reading specialist to address activities such as, but not limited to, co-teaching, planning, assessment, and professional development.

Feedback is sought and obtained from the candidates about these clinical experiences. The feedback, as well as their performance on the course assessments, has been used to alter the clinical course instruction and assignments that they more effectively meet the needs of candidates. The primary objective is to engage the candidates in clinical experiences that will prepare them to work effectively with K12 students and reading specialists.

**Standard 4. Diversity**

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidate to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P12 school faculty; candidates; and students in P12 schools.

*4.1 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?*

UPEP’s commitment to prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area is reflected in our Conceptual Core component seeking to meet **diverse** human and social needs.

**Initial programs**

Except Early Childhood Education (ECE) candidates who are required to take EDEC 1001 *Introduction to Early Childhood*, all undergraduate candidates begin by taking EDTE 1500 *Introduction to Teacher Education*.In these courses, candidates are introduced to such diversity concepts as family structures, exceptionalities, racial diversity, social class, and language background.

Sophomores take EDTE 2010 *Characteristics of Learners with Exceptionalities* and are required to differentiate between cultural, linguistic, and diverse learning needs, define multiculturalism, multicultural and bilingual education, as well as become familiar with parental struggles and with factors that contribute to over- and under-representation in Special Education, including Talented and Gifted programming. In addition, all sophomores complete EDTE 2020 *Field Experience* and participate in the Rural Urban Collaborative (RUC) in a diverse urban school setting. Participants complete five reflective papers on aspects of diversity. The RUC also requires attendance at an all-day symposium that brings together candidates and provides interaction between traditional and non-traditional candidates from different geographic regions. It also includes a speaker to offer information about English Language Learners (ELLs) and the new Teaching English to Students of Other Languages (TESOL) certificate that was approved by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) in 2013.

During their junior year, General Education candidates are required to take EDTE 3710/3720/3730 *Instructional Adaptations*, which addresses the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) categories of disability, at-risk and ELL students as well as cultural and socioeconomic differences. In addition, except ECE candidates who are required to take EDEC 3701 *Diversity in Early Childhood Education*,all juniors take EDCS 3010 *Education and Cultural Diversity*. These courses encourage candidates to explore their own position on diversity as it relates to power, language, culture, gender, gender orientation, religion, ethnicity, class, family structure, and poverty.

In the senior year methods courses, issues of culturally relevant teaching and differentiating specific content for diverse learners are addressed.

At the graduate level, candidates take EDSP 5700 *Nature and Needs of Children and Adults with Exceptionalities* and EDTE 5100 *Principles of Curriculum*. These courses include assignments and assessments that specifically address developing various culturally appropriate curricula that address student diversity. Graduate candidates also take EDCS 6010 *Education and Cultural Diversity*, which addresses how the act of teaching is both personal and political. It challenges the candidates to reflect on fundamental questions such as, “Who is marginalized by the way we ‘do’ education?” or “What is my responsibility in building a learning community?”

Diversity proficiencies are assessed in multiple ways including a Diversity Assessment, Professional Dispositions, the Professional Internship (PI) Final Evaluation, and the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). Prior to 2012, the Diversity Assessment was a pre-post assessment based on a service learning activity in which candidates sought out and interacted with diverse peers. In spring 2013, the Assessment Council (AC) Diversity Subcommittee revised the assessment to the “Think Through: Becoming Anti-Bias Educators” paper. Data from that assessment found that PCOE candidates demonstrated an Acceptable/On Target understanding of Socio-Cultural Environment (88%), Reflective Identity Environment (97%) and School, Curriculum and Pedagogical Environment (96%).

The PI Final Evaluation is directly aligned to our Conceptual Core Diversity proficiencies. On a 3-point scale, aggregate data from 2012-13 for the PI Final Evaluation, indicate that candidates successfully differentiate instruction to address students with diverse and special learning and/or behavioral needs (2.55), demonstrate knowledge of the influence of context and culture on behavior (2.51), and foster students’ self-esteem, motivation, character, civic responsibility and respect for individual, cultural, religious, class and racial differences (2.62).

During 2012-13, UPEP fully implemented the edTPA and locally scored the portfolios. The edTPA includes attention to the multiple aspects of diversity, including context for learning information, developing and applying varied students’ curricular needs, considering research and theory about how diverse students learn, and reflection on and analysis of the effects of their instruction on diverse student learning. Beginning in fall 2013, all candidates will submit their edTPA portfolios for national assessment by validated scorers.

**Advanced Programs**

Coursework and experiences vary by advanced program. While specific courses are listed below, diversity proficiencies are integrated throughout advanced programs curricula. Course syllabi are available in the Overview and Conceptual Framework folder in the Exhibit Center.

The Educational Administration (EDAD) Principal program requires EDCS 5040 *Sociology, Politics and Change in Education*,which includes a field experience that requires candidates to interact and respond to diverse learners including: minority students, ELLs, students with special needs, and students of poverty. Superintendent candidates take EDAD 6830 *Human Relations at the District Level*, which emphasizes meeting the needs of diverse students in both course materials and assessments.

Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and Reading Education candidates are required to also take EDCS 5040as well as EDSP 5700 *Nature and Needs of Children and Adults with Exceptionalities.* Computer Education and Technology candidates take EDCT 6360 *Media and the Young Adult* and EDCT 6030 *Visual Literacy for Educators*. Both courses examine the media and imagery related to individual and cultural differences.

Assessments conducted in advanced programs provide evidence of candidates’ proficiencies related to diversity. For example, in 2012-2013, 100% of Reading Education candidates were rated as Expert in their ability to use assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise instruction for students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds on their International Reading Association (IRA) Assessment 5 Progress Report. The C&I candidates complete a portfolio aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) standards and describe differences among learners as well as demographic and racial/ethnic characteristics.

In addition to various curricular opportunities to articulate and assess diversity proficiencies, the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) continues to embrace and adhere to the Ohio University President’s Faculty/Administrative Staff Diversity Initiative to achieve and retain greater diversity amongst its faculty. A chart of UPEP’s faculty diversity is included in Exhibit 4.4.d.

Over several years, our faculty have actively engaged in increasing their knowledge of serving ELLs by participating in presentations to the Department of Teacher Education by the ELL Infusion Task Force. This task force has assisted UPEP in identifying ways in which ELLs can be integrated into the curriculum.

The PCOE Diversity Committee also hosts Soups and Substances, which provide professional development to both faculty and candidates on diversity issues. During the 2012-13 academic year, there were two Soups and Substances, one focusing on the diversity within the local region including sexual orientation, race, and religious diversity and the second on LGBT issues.

Every effort is made to increase the diversity of the candidate body. From 2010-2011 to 2012-2013 the percentage of diverse candidates increased from 12.04% to 13.23% in PCOE with an increase from 8.4% to 8.8% in undergraduates and from 20.7% to 21.2% for graduate students. More detailed data are included in 4.4.e. The PCOE continues its efforts to increase the diversity of its candidates through policies and practices such as the Urban and Appalachian Scholars program, the Cultural Connections program, targeted letters, the LINKS program, the Retention Strategies Committee, the Holmes Scholars program, the PCOE Diversity Committee, and the Rural Appalachian Committee.

Finally, UPEP’s candidates engage in educational opportunities with diverse students. However, the predominantly white P12 student population in our region (typically above 95%) means that providing experiences for candidates to work with racially and ethnically diverse students is a challenge. However, our candidates do obtain significant experiences working with students with disabilities. From the last NCATE meeting to the present, UPEP has fully implemented the RUC across all six campuses, which provides candidates with extensive experiences working with urban students of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and ELL students. A total of 310 candidates completed a RUC placement at 64 different urban school sites.

**4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

*4.2.b. Continuous Improvement*

* *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*
* *Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.*

As previously mentioned, the Assessment Council’s (AC) Diversity Subcommittee redesigned the Diversity Assessment. Based on data gathered by the rubric as well as discussions among the faculty and the AC, it was determined that the rubric was not adequate to assess candidate awareness, knowledge, and skills with diversity. Additionally, there seemed to be a lack of inter rater reliability between assessors and campuses. The rubric was revised multiple times over several years, but it was ultimately determined by the Cultural Studies faculty, who have professional expertise in this area, that a new assessment was needed. This new assessment was designed to assess the candidate's ability to synthesize and apply the diversity curriculum and develop a proposal to present to a school board, faculty and principal, or superintendent. The new assessment was designed in the fall 2012 and piloted in spring 2013. Prior to the pilot, the AC’s Diversity Subcommittee met with each faculty member who taught EDCS 3010 *Diversity in Education* and EDEC 3701 *Diversity in Early Childhood Education* to establish a shared meaning for the assessment and rubric items and to works towards increasing inter-rater reliability.

At the advanced level, an example of continuous improvement regarding diversity includes the Educational Administration Superintendent program which revised its internship requirement to have candidates complete their last internship in a district different than the one in which they work and typically have engaged in their initial internships. The other district is to have different socioeconomic demographics from their home district, the location in which the initial internships have been conducted.

* 1. *Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review*

*Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.*

Since our previous NCATE visit in 2009, the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) has diligently worked to address our one Area for Improvement (AFI) which was, "The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P -12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners." As evidenced in the NCATE Annual Reports submitted in 2010, 2011, and 2012, UPEP has taken various steps to address the AFI at both the initial and advanced levels. UPEP now requires all candidates at the initial level to participate in the Rural Urban Collaborative (RUC) for their EDTE 2020 *Field Experience* class. The RUC provides candidates with both rural and urban experiences and provides opportunities to work with students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and ELL students.

A second substantial change is the infusion throughout the entire Teacher Education curriculum of pedagogical strategies for meeting the needs of ELLs. The Teacher Education faculty gathered data to determine where and how both diversity and ELLs were addressed throughout their courses.

In the advanced programs, Reading Education candidates are required to work with diverse P12 students as part of EDTE 5210 *Foundations of Language and Diversity*. As part of this course, which is designed specifically for the Reading Education online program, candidates are required to participate in two literacy-based discussions with P12 students; the first to include at least one ELL, and the second to include ethnically/racially diverse students. Candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) program enroll in an online section of EDTE 5210 *Foundations of Language and Diversity* that is specific to C&I candidates. This course requires a 100-hour extended clinical experience in a classroom that includes two or more ELLs, each representing a cultural/ethnic background different from the other ELL as well as the majority of the class. Teachers carry out structured observations, conduct informal assessments, and engage in instructional support activities that include the ELLs. Candidates in Computer Education and Technology provide diversity and ELL data for the schools in which they work. Dr. Greg Kessler from the Ohio University Linguistics Department provides professional development to candidates to work effectively with ELL students. Candidates also identify technology-focused websites that can be used by teachers and students to improve communication, translation, and lesson design for diverse and ELL students. As noted above, since summer 2013, candidates in Educational Administration complete a field experience as part of EDCS 5040 *Sociology, Politics and Change in Education* that requires them to interact and respond to diverse learners including: minority students, ELLs, students with special needs, and students of poverty. Finally, the Superintendent program candidates are now required to complete the last part of their internship in a different school than where they work. The other district is to have different socioeconomic demographics from their home district.

**Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

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

*5.1 How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?*

**Faculty overall:** The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) employs faculty members who hold appropriate degrees and whose experiences have prepared them well for the higher education teaching for which they have been employed. In addition, faculty vitae reveal that tenured and tenure-track faculty members routinely contribute to teaching, scholarship, and service. Their contributions to research fit with the expectations that are typically held of faculty members at research-intensive institutions.

In a few cases UPEP employs faculty members without a terminal degree because of their relevant professional expertise, which includes (1) outstanding performance in P12 classrooms or programs with children and/or young adult learners; (2) development and delivery of professional development workshops; (3) membership in, including leadership positions in, professional associations; and (4) research and related scholarship. Several also hold certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and all receive strong candidate evaluations.

**School-based faculty:** The Patton College of Education (PCOE) employs a Coordinator of Professional Internships who uses information about school faculty members’ professional licensure to determine the match between school faculty and professional interns. A similar process applies to candidates in early field experiences. The Coordinator of Early Field Experiences relies on principals to provide appropriate teachers for the candidates who are being placed. The Coordinator also has access to a database from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) that lists every school where Ohio University (OHIO) places candidates for early field experiences. This database includes (1) the percentage of teachers at each school who are highly qualified; (2) the percentage of teachers who are licensed in the subjects and levels to which they are assigned; and (3) the percentage of teachers who hold provisional licenses.

**Higher education clinical faculty:** These faculty members have a strong record of direct involvement with personnel in school settings, and all have had extensive experience as classroom teachers. Their involvement in school settings includes (1) development and delivery of professional development workshops; (2) membership, including leadership positions, in professional organizations; (3) research and related scholarship; and (4) assessment, data analysis, and program evaluation.

**Faculty performance:** The faculty teaches and models pedagogies that reflect UPEP’s Conceptual Core and current research. The Conceptual Core has four foci—leadership, change agency, life-long learning, and diversity—which are evident in the programs’ curricula as well as in the methods faculty use.

Faculty members use, and thereby model, various authentic and powerful instructional strategies. These include backward design, formative instructional practice, cooperative learning, universal design for learning, project-based and inquiry learning, service learning, and culturally-relevant and place-based education. They also use, and through their use model, many different types of clinical performance assessments. These include observation of teaching, either face-to-face or through video, and development of relevant products (e.g. lesson plans, professional development plans, codes of ethics), and action research.

Faculty members also use three strategies for applying and modeling the application of Computer Education and Technology. These are (1) technology tool for inquiry, like word processing, presentation, data analysis; (2) technologically mediated communication, such as Blackboard, clicker technology; and (3) technologies for making connections to academic content, such as flipped learning.

Tenured and tenure-track (T&TT) faculty members also engage in systematic scholarship. Across the T&TT faculty, peer-reviewed publication at the rate of about one publication per year is the norm. Clear department criteria for “graduate faculty status” are strengthening expectations for the extent and quality of faculty scholarship. The faculty, including T&TT as well as teaching-only faculty members, routinely disseminates scholarship at state and national conferences and district and regional workshops, also sharing their expertise through research and action bulletins, textbooks, instructional software, and other electronic media.

Across UPEP, faculty members play significant roles in professional, community, and institutional outreach activities that contribute to their own leadership and life-long learning as well as the leadership and life-long learning of those they serve. These outreach activities promote needed reform within the profession; nurture a commitment to positive change among candidates, colleagues, and partners; and provide opportunities to engage in collaborative work with diverse populations. This scope of faculty work is exemplified through involvement with partnerships; work on committees and task forces; performance of leadership roles in professional organizations; service on editorial review boards; delivery of professional development workshops; collaboration with P12 partners on school-based research and evaluation; delivery of talks at service clubs and other organizations; mentoring of new faculty; judging entries, such as science fair projects, research posters, at public school and university competitions; and actions on behalf of local, state, and national advocacy, such as AACTE’s “Day on the Hill”, advocacy for school funding reform.

**Evaluation of faculty:** Assessment of teaching is tied to the annual merit review process, in which both full- and part-time faculty participate. In each department in UPEP, policy requires Department Chairs to incorporate faculty self-assessment into their evaluation processes.

Each department also uses a course evaluation instrument, which is completed by candidates in each course to provide a systematic way to assess each faculty member’s teaching. Department Chairs also review the course evaluations of all faculty members in their respective departments and discuss each faculty member’s course evaluations with him or her in the annual merit-review meeting. The course evaluation instrument typically consists of items in three domains, Instruction, Course, and Overall Evaluation, and also gives candidates the opportunity to offer narrative comments. Beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year, the instruments are delivered to candidates electronically, enabling faculty members to receive feedback from the courses they teach and for department chairs to receive feedback about individual faculty members and the department as a whole. In the PCOE, agreement on a set number of college-wide items now permits comparison across departments as well. Overall, faculty ratings for teaching are high. In the few cases where ratings show teaching difficulties, the departments put improvement plans in place. If a faculty member is unable to improve, the departments use available university policies to terminate employment.

In addition to evaluation of individual courses, candidates have the opportunity to evaluate their experience overall through UPEP’s biennial Student Satisfaction Survey. Results over the past five years, which are based on high return rates, show high levels of satisfaction with program relevance and quality (3.30 on a 4-point scale). The survey has allowed UPEP to identify and improve advising and communication procedures. And efforts to correct the one major source of dissatisfaction—McCracken Hall facilities—are now underway with a full building renovation scheduled for 2015.

All T&TT and continuing teaching-only faculty participate in annual formal performance review processes. This process occurs at the department level; and whereas variations in procedure and criteria across departments and colleges are expected, domains for evaluation are common (teaching, scholarship, service) and have remained stable over time. T&TT faculty’s performance is judged in all three domains. Teaching-only faculty members are judged on teaching, curriculum development, and other work specified explicitly in letters of offer or memoranda of agreement. Each faculty member submits a dossier for peer-review at the department level. Assessment ratings and narrative recommendations are then forwarded for a department-level review that culminates in preparation of an annual letter of performance evaluation for the faculty member, with complimentary copy to the Dean.

**Professional development:** Department chairs meet annually with faculty members in their respective departments to discuss merit evaluations and goals for the subsequent year. These goals are written and included as one basis for the annual evaluation in the subsequent year. All faculty members are also required to attend three Colloquia yearly. Example of activities that Colloquia focus on are (1) the alignment of program curricula with the Conceptual Core; (2) diversity; (3) health and safety; and (4) technology. The PCOE also offers (1) research forums; (2) the Violet L. Patton lecture series; (3) workshops sponsored by the Diversity Committee and the Rural Appalachia Advisory Committee; and (4) workshops promoting the development of technological and research competence. In addition, UPEP faculty members have access to an online community of practice. For example, the Associate Dean for Academic Engagement and Outreach as well as PCOE faculty created a “Designing your Syllabus with Learning Outcomes in Mind” for adjunct faculty. UPEP also provides funding that permits each faculty member to pursue professional development that relates to his or her own teaching assignment and scholarship.

**5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

*5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level- Advanced Programs*

* *Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.*
* *Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.*
* *Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.*

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) advanced programs have selected Standard 5 as the standard to which they are moving to Target. The advanced programs include Computer Education and Technology, Reading Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Administration-Principal and Superintendent.

**Qualified Faculty:** In addition to holding doctoral degrees, or working towards completing such degrees, all faculty members in UPEP’s advanced programs have extensive experience as practitioners in their fields of specialization, with the majority additionally having at least five years teaching and/or leadership experience in P12 schools.

**Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching:** All courses at the advanced levels are aligned with the appropriate standards. These include National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Ohio Educator Standards, International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) for Computer Education and Technology, International Reading Association (IRA), and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). The Patton College of Education’s (PCOE) core values are informed by research and current demands and expectations in the field. Courses are built to introduce core content material, allow for the application of the learning objectives in authentic project-based learning experiences, and to familiarize with research in the field.

A variety of formative and summative assessment strategies are employed. These include peer assessment, instructor feedback, project rubrics, group and individual synchronous conferences, reflective blogging, critical questioning, test, and oral interviews. All assessments are aligned with specialized professional standards, such as ELCC assessments or NBPTS, and some program area faculty members, such as Educational Administration, collaborate to review assessment results.

**Modeling Professional Practices in Scholarship:** The faculty members in the advanced programs are heavily invested in scholarship. Scholarship includes presentations at professional conferences and publications in journal articles and book chapters. Research threads include:

* Teaching and Teacher Preparation;
* Curriculum studies;
* Action research;
* Portfolio development processes;
* Teaching as an inquiry process;
* Application of a sociolinguistics/ethnographic perspective for the study of teaching/learning processes in classrooms, schools and communities;
* Technology integration into formal and informal learning environments;
* Learning, game design, and gaming media studies;
* Delivery methods and course environments;
* Approaches to facilitating peer review;
* Employment of various web 2.0 tools in the learning process including flipped classroom and formative instructional practices.

**Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service:** As part of their service to the PCOE, Ohio University (OHIO), community, state, and nation, faculty members in UPEP’s advanced programs:

* Collaborate with colleagues across OHIO on grants (e.g. National Science Foundation funded Boat of Knowledge in the Science Classroom impacting a total of 525 students in the region; the Ohio Board of Regents funded Better Mathematics through Literacy grant impacting over 100 teachers in the region; and the OHIO funded 1804 grants to advance mentoring capacity and development of a clinical curriculum for teacher preparation throughout southeast Ohio);
* Lead and organize key PCOE committees (e.g. Design Team IV: Technology, the Communications and Connections team for gathering information on regional teaching and technology needs);
* Design and deliver professional development opportunities to empower faculty at the OHIO to more effectively integrate professional constructs into teaching;
* Serve and network with regional educators, organizations, and statewide advisory boards (e.g. Ohio Leadership Project; Athens City Schools (East) Technology Committee; Consensus Validation Studies for adoption of Ohio Educator Assessments/Middle Childhood);
* Participate and present at conferences at the regional (e.g. E-Tech Ohio Conference to facilitate PK12 teachers’ development of 'flipped classrooms'), national, and international levels to develop professional teams in Ohio and across the nation (reviewers and committee members for professional organization meetings such as ISTE, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and Society of Information Technology and Teacher Education (SITE) Conferences).

**Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance:** UPEP relies on formal course evaluations to evaluate the performance of faculty in all advanced programs except the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) program. All faculty members in the advanced programs collect informal formative feedback from candidates throughout their courses. Faculty members in the advanced programs undergo a merit as well as a promotion and tenure review each year. Evaluations have consistently demonstrated strong merit, tenure and promotion levels. In many cases, evaluations demonstrate outstanding teaching.

**Unit Facilitation of Professional Development:** The departments and PCOE provide professional development funds to each faculty member. Additionally, PCOE supports mentorship for new faculty and faculty renewal/sabbatical. Experienced faculty have mentored new faculty, providing insight into processes and expectations at the program, department, college and university level. Seasoned faculty are approachable and willing to assist individuals who are new or less experienced. The department serves as a strong support network and veteran faculty are invaluable resources for teaching, scholarship, and service.

*5.2.b Continuous Improvement- Initial Programs*

* *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*
* *Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.*

Several of the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals’ (UPEP) accomplishments over the past three years have led to continuous improvement in initial faculty qualifications, performance, and development.

A process for new faculty hires was standardized across The Patton College of Education (PCOE) to ensure that the requested position meets a need within the program or department and fits with the direction and mission of the department, College, and university. As a result we were able to recruit highly qualified faculty for needed positions. We were additionally able to increase the diverse profile of the faculty body through a series of diverse hires. A science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) vision was established and used to inform quests for external funding and STEM faculty hires.

The Faculty Teaching Release Time policy was passed with the purpose to specify arrangements relating to release from teaching responsibilities that maximize the effectiveness of faculty support in the PCOE. The policy governs three circumstances relating to release time from teaching: (1) the award of release time by departments or the PCOE in order to support non-teaching activities such as program coordination or other service, but excluding research; (2) the award of release time by departments or the College in order to support research or to enhance pedagogy through technology or course design; and (3) the use of release time as a way to enable faculty to perform work supported by external grants and contracts.

Three budget forums were conducted to orient faculty to PCOE sources of financial resources, the process of allocation of College resources, the model for Regional Distribution Programs, and the Responsibility Centered Management system. These will be conducted each semester.

A mentoring program was developed and facilitated to provide professional development to the clinical faculty and mentor teachers who work with our teacher candidates in the field. As part of the mentoring focused efforts, Design Team II, in collaboration with State University Education Deans (SUED) and the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) published a list of criteria used to identify and recruit high quality mentor teachers.

A new workload policy was adopted that endorses performance workload agreements that take into consideration the needs of the individual, consistent with the needs of the program area, department, and PCOE. The policy clarifies expectations for full-time faculty members with respect to (1) teaching classes and engaging in related instructional activities; (2) research, scholarship, and creative activities, (3) outreach and service. These essential elements of the work of faculty should be taken into account in making promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

In 2012-2013, an Ohio University Faculty Senate resolution was passed to establish a mechanism for promotion within the non-tenure teaching track (Group II) to attract and retain non-tenure track, high quality teaching faculty for the benefit of students. The policy provides guidelines regarding Group II faculty workload, salary negotiations, contract renewal, rank, and criteria and policies for evaluation, promotion, and professional development.

Within the Department of Teacher Education, a Graduate Faculty Status Policy was established to maintain rigor in academic programs at the doctoral level. The Special Education program faculty collaborated with external consultants and local and state stakeholders to clarify the program’s mission and vision. Program faculty will use recommendation of the external consultants to continue developing the program and hiring new faculty members. Additionally, several faculty development activities occurred including (1) the establishment of an English Language Learners (ELLs) Taskforce to provide faculty professional development in infusing diverse principles and practices for promoting ELLs learning; (2) a series of workshops focusing on Race to the TOP Ohio initiatives affecting teachers and teacher education; (3) evaluation training for the newly adopted Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), a capstone assessment administered during the Professional Internship (PI).

**Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources**

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

*6.1**How do the unit’s governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?*

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) is the structure responsible for planning, delivering, and operating all programs that prepare candidates for P12 schools. The Patton College of Education (PCOE) is the primary college in which teacher licensure programs reside. The Speech and Language Pathology program is housed in the College of Health Sciences and Professions (HSP). Initial programs in Music Education are in the College of Fine Arts (FAR). Some faculty members teach methods courses in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S), such as Modern Languages, Mathematics, Sciences, and English. The undergraduate Early and Middle Childhood programs are offered at five Ohio University (OHIO) regional campuses: OU-Chillicothe, OU-Eastern, OU-Lancaster, OU-Southern, and OU-Zanesville. Two Centers, the Pickerington Center, associated with the Lancaster Campus, and the Proctorville Center, associated with the Southern Campus, increase candidate accessibility to OHIO and increase UPEP’s opportunity to recruit diverse candidates from other settings. All of these elements constitute UPEP.

Dean Renée A. Middleton heads UPEP and has ultimate responsibility for the overall administering of programs and for facilitating communication and collaborative decision-making among the other colleges in UPEP. The five academic departments in the PCOE are Teacher Education, Counseling and Higher Education, Educational Studies, Human and Consumer Sciences, and Recreation and Sport Pedagogy, offer support to the TE mission. Several committees including the PCOE Academic Leadership Team (ALT) and the College Coordinating Council (CCC) facilitate communication between all levels of the College. The PCOE employs a grant writer, instructional designers, and a communication and design manager who serve as resources to the college administration, faculty, and candidates.

Each PCOE department has a Department Chair and programs within a department have designated program coordinators who work with the Department Chairs and Graduate Student Services on making admissions decisions, leading the process of curriculum development with their faculty colleagues, overseeing advisement for students in their programs, and serving on Assessment Council, a subcommittee of UPEP. The coordinators report to their department chairs at monthly meetings to ensure that candidates are admitted with appropriate backgrounds and that the curriculum in each department aligns with our guiding standards.

To meet professional, state, and institutional standards, the PCOE also works regularly with the professional community via the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS), an organization of 136 school districts in a 35-county region of Appalachian Ohio. Dean Middleton and other faculty representatives meet monthly with CORAS to fulfill their mission of providing continuous improvement of educational opportunities to the region's children. CORAS has also been used as a sounding board for curricular changes in the Educational Administration programs.

The Communications and Connections group, formed in 2006, includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff, and other educational partners including other universities. The group’s mission is to establish an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society. This group was instrumental in creating and analyzing data from focus groups of graduates and employers. As a result of those data, five design teams have been created: Design Team I- Curriculum, Design Team II- Mentoring, Design Team III- Teacher Residency, Design Team IV- Technology, and Design Team V-Health and Wellness. These teams are task forces that allow work on specific projects to improve candidate preparation.

**Faculty Resources:** UPEP allocates personnel funding to departments in accordance with needs for tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as non-tenured track faculty. When a faculty line is vacated, a data-based planning process reviews department and program productivity to determine whether a replacement faculty member will be hired or if resources will be redirected.

UPEP also allocates resources to the PCOE’s Unit of Student Affairs to support candidates' clinical experiences and to support the advising of freshmen and sophomores. Standards-based programs depend on adequate support for faculty and student support services and also rely on resources for staff to assist with departmental operations, equipment, instructional materials, supplies, and professional development. The budget in the PCOE has several different revenue streams to support these activities. For example, support personnel are primarily funded through the monies in the PCOE's operating budget provided by tuition and state subsidy; and funds for technology come in part from a State of Ohio House Bill allocation, in part from the technology fees that candidates pay, and in part from profit-sharing arrangements related to graduate teaching on regional campuses. These funds are allocated to the various personnel and offices that require them through a combination of formula-based and needs-based approaches. Occasionally, extra funds to support standards-based instruction are allocated using competitive processes.

The allocation of graduate assistantships provides an example of a formula-based allocation. Except for special earmarks designed to meet university needs, graduate assistantships are allocated proportionally to departments based on the magnitude of each department's efforts toward providing graduate education in the PCOE. OHIO’s five regional campuses support full- and part-time faculty dedicated to teacher education programs; those faculty are considered part of UPEP.

Within departments, chairs discuss the needs of each program with program coordinators and allocate funds accordingly. For some activities, such as faculty professional development, providing equal allocations to each individual tends to be the approach used. For other activities, such as the start-up of a new program, within-department allocations are based on need. All funding decisions are data driven and utilize UPEP’s governing structure to inform, facilitate and communicate decisions. Funding is allocated according to PCOE’s Conceptual Core values.

**Technology Resources**: The Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC), located in McCracken Hall, contains two computer labs with PC and Apple computers, which are refurbished every other year. The Director of Online Programs and the CTC leads the center.

OHIO and its regional campuses are wireless, so candidates have Internet access in all classrooms and offices. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools. All of the instructional environments in the PCOE and regional campuses are equipped with an instructor's computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Beyond the computer labs in McCracken Hall and Grover Center and the labs at the regional campuses, instructors also have multiple mobile laptop carts with 64 computers at their disposal to use in classrooms when candidates require hands-on computer access.Regional campuses each have a minimum of two Computer Education and Technology support personnel. Faculty and candidates are able to check out an array of multimedia devices (e.g., digital audio recorders, digital cameras, digital video cameras, LCD projectors, laptop computers) from the CTC to use in their courses and clinical experiences. In addition, the CTC has three SMART Boards, located in the Social Studies Classroom, Math Lab, and Science Lab. The technology resources available to candidates provide them with the opportunity to develop the life skills necessary to meet the demands of modern schools as exemplified in the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards our candidates follow.

UPEP currently uses LiveText as the primary technological tool to maintain our Unit Assessment System. Resources are available for the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement to employ a full-time graduate assistant.

**Library and Curricular Resources:** In addition to the resources available in the PCOE, Alden Library, OHIO's main library, is a seven-story building constructed between 1966 and 1969. For items that may not be located in the CTC, a designated librarian from Alden Library is available as a bibliographer and a resource for faculty and candidates in UPEP. Alden Library resources are accessible to all candidates regardless their campus. Further, though independently operated, libraries are located on each of OHIO's regional campuses.

OHIO, including each regional campus, is a part of the Ohio Library and Information Network, Ohio LINK, a consortium of Ohio’s college and university libraries and the State Library of Ohio. Ohio LINK offers faculty, students, and researchers access to more than 45.3 million library items statewide, 300 electronic research databases, and an electronic journal center containing more than 6,900 scholarly journal titles from more than 90 publishers across a wide range of disciplines.

**Advising Resources:** The Unit of Student Affairs (SA) assists candidates in the PCOE and the Educational Unit (graduate and undergraduate) as well as candidates in all teacher preparation programs on all OHIO campuses. To meet the needs of candidates, services are categorized as walk-in appointments, scheduled appointments, advising, or group advising meetings. SA has four full-time advisors who are knowledgeable of the PCOE’s and OHIO’s resources to assist students. In addition to the Athens Campus, a designated advisor visits each regional campus once per term. Regional campus faculty participate in advising and work directly and more frequently with students on their respective campuses.

*6.2. B Continuous Improvement (maximum characters 10,000 - current characters 9,203)*

* *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*
* *Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.*

In 2009, Ohio University (OHIO) called for a re-evaluation of academic programs and ultimately approved re-alignment of programs in two newly formed departments that joined The Patton College of Education (PCOE), and re-aligned the early childhood education program to be housed exclusively within the Department of Teacher Education (TE) in PCOE. The Department of Human and Consumer Sciences (HCS; with Family and Consumer Sciences Education - FCS) and The Department of Recreation and Sport Pedagogy (RSP; with Physical Education - PE) officially joined the PCOE July 1, 2010. The Child Development Center (CDC), a clinical site for early childhood candidates serving approximately 100 children (age six weeks to pre-k) and their families, also re-aligned to PCOE. These changes have strengthened the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) by providing common governance structures that support collaboration and administrative efficiencies. With these education programs housed within PCOE, UPEP resources more appropriately support the education licensure programs. Candidate recruiting for these programs is enhanced, as the PCOE Unit of Student Affairs (SA) promotes these newly aligned programs. Additionally, program development in the new departments has been supported through focused efforts for outreach, such as FCS’ new track for non-licensure to serve students beyond the teaching licensure programs as admission criteria become more stringent. Program and faculty collaborations have increased, as evidenced by research projects in HCS and TE using the CDC population and site. This realignment has strengthened the roles of faculty from the departments new to PCOE in UPEP.

The PCOE’s centers, in particular the Center for Professional Development Partnerships (Center for PDP) and the Stevens Literacy Center (SLC), have responded to data driven assessments to improve candidate learning and faculty scholarship. Both of these centers provide undergraduate and graduate candidates with on-site clinical experiences. Many candidates who engage in work with these centers have opportunities to conduct research, and present it, with support by PCOE travel awards, at national/international conferences.

July 1, 2013 was the start of a new OHIO budget model – Responsibility Centered Management (RCM). With RCM, PCOE is positioned to strategically allocate its resources, which are directly aligned with student enrollment/tuition revenues. This budget model ensures that PCOE receives budgetary allocations at least proportional to other units on campus and enables unit-level decisions about budget priorities. The RCM structure provides opportunities for the PCOE to prioritize and align activities and resources transparently with the needs of candidates, and PCOE’s mission and vision. Within the RCM model, the PCOE has embarked on strategic partnerships with academic support units particularly to identify graduate assistant (GA) opportunities that will enhance learning experiences for candidates. For example, PCOE is supporting, with tuition waivers, two graduate teaching assistants, funded through a grant secured by the Office of International Studies and the Department of African Studies, to teach Swahili and Akan. These candidates will gain valuable teaching experience as they pursue their graduate degrees, while also contributing to diversity of the student population and experiences at OHIO. Similarly, teaching fellows are supported through the Center for PDP, providing opportunities for candidates to teach in local schools for an entire academic year. Prioritizing these types of investments is possible with the RCM budget model.

To effectively implement a transparent and priority-driven budget planning strategy, PCOE has established and RCM Executive Committee, chaired by the Dean and comprised of the Senior Associate Dean (Chief Financial Academic Officer - CFAO), Financial and Budget Unit Manger, Statistical Forecast Analyst, and Assistant Budget Manager. The RCM Executive Committee is informed by an RCM Work Group, Chaired by the CFAO and comprised of all Department Chairs, a additional tenure-track faculty member from each department, a Center Director, and a classified staff member. The RCM Work Group vets proposed financial initiatives and provides information, and sometimes recommendations, to the Executive Committee.

To enhance teacher candidate’s efficacy and career-seeking activities, two online post-baccalaureate programs have been developed. The Reading Education and the Early Childhood Generalist Endorsement (fourth and fifth grades) provide focused coursework leading to state-recognized endorsements that position candidates for expanded career positions in public schools. These programs are offered online, taking advantage of current technologies and responding to student needs to balance work, family, and educational endeavors. In Ohio in 2013, legislation mandated that all teachers in grade three possess a Reading Endorsement by fall 2013. PCOE was responsive to the demand for this endorsement, and partnered with school districts affiliated with the Coalition for Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) to offer access to the courses in this curriculum at a reduced rate. Development, delivery, and competitive and accessible pricing of these programs are increasingly possible due to the RCM budget platform.

In PCOE, data-driven planning is enhanced with the work of a Statistical Data and Forecasting Administrator, hired in 2010, who compiles annual data about faculty workload, student enrollment, faculty and instructional resources. Most tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to teach these 12 credit hours, and to dedicate themselves to research and service and outreach. Faculty members in non-tenure-eligible lines, such as Group II-yearly contract with instruction as the primary focus, Group III-quarterly contract, and Group IV-three-year visiting professor, are, in most cases, expected to teach 12 credit hours per quarter because their primary mission is instructional. These workload targets have been incorporated into planning strategies led by each Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and Associate Dean. Implementation of this data forecasting and analysis strategy has enabled tracking of faculty work over time, leading to well-documented support for adding faculty positions when needed, and adjusting faculty resources as appropriate.

While currently McCracken Hall houses three departments including TE, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education, the Dean’s Offices, and PCOE Unit of Student Affairs, the facility is slated to undergo a complete $31.8 million dollar renovation in 2015-2017. The result will be all five PCOE departments housed in the new space. State-of-the-art classrooms, technologies, and laboratories will result. This will improve learning environments for students and enhance recruiting for students, faculty, and staff. Additionally, instructional spaces used for PE will be expanded through collaborations with the Ping Recreation Center and as a result of the newly constructed Walter Field House. FCS will benefit through food production and demonstration laboratory space. The renovation will also include classroom/laboratory spaces to support Early, Middle, and Adolescent-to-Young Adult candidate instruction in math, science, social studies, and language arts. These renovations will ensure a cohesive and comprehensive physical environment for our candidates to focus on performance. The timeline for the renovations is included as Exhibit 6.4.i.

Despite the age and condition of the McCracken Hall building, the Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) in PCOE remains current and accessible to all students in the College. As online instruction and instructional technologies have become infused in the curriculum, the Director of Online Programs and the CTC has led efforts to engage staff, consisting of two instructional designers and a communication and design manager, and GAs in supportive work to faculty. Strong support for, with strategic plans to continue to enhance, faculty and candidate use of information technology in instruction is offered through six dedicated GAs, specialized in instructional design, who work closely with the two instructional designers and the Director of Online Programs and the CTC. Specifically, a learning community for faculty engaged in online instruction was established in 2011; a series of workshops focused on implementing new instructional technologies is planned each academic year; and candidates are encouraged to incorporate state-of-the-art instructional technologies in their lesson planning, supported through resources in the CTC.

In an effort to provide adequate resources to develop and implement UPEP’s assessment plan, the CTC provides video equipment and staff who assist candidates in preparing materials for their Teacher Performance Assessments (edTPA). Additionally, library resources that are available in the CTC for convenience and access to faculty and candidates are also listed in the electronic catalog of OHIO’s Alden Library. Several distance-learning classrooms are available at OHIO. One is in McCracken Hall and another in Grover Center. The Office of Information Technology (OIT) provides the technology support for these classrooms. For distance learning students, in addition to the classroom space, with monitors and interactive speakers, the CTC provides access to Adobe Connect for use in meetings of smaller groups – which can occur off-site at the convenience of any meeting participant. The close working relationships between OIT and the CTC staff ensures reliability of the technologies. OHIO has invested in the technologies in efforts to provide appropriate speed and confidentiality of communications and documents loaded into the delivery systems.