Continuous Improvement

Date of Submission September 27, 2010

Date of On-Sight Visit March 27, 2010

To access the Exhibit Center, please go to http://www.livetext.com and sign-in with the Visitor Pass code: CFF839EF.

*Standard 2 is the standard on which the unit is moving to the Target Level.*

**Standard 1**

**Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

The West Liberty University AIMS website was updated to reflect the current state-approved certification offerings. Of particular note, the three separate categories of special education (behavior disorders, learning disabilities, and mentally impaired) were removed as stand-alone certifications when multi-categorical special education was added.

The following certifications are part of the Teacher Education Program at West Liberty:

**Undergraduate**

- English/Language Arts  5-9
- English  5-Adult
- General Science  5-9
- General Science  5-Adult
- Biology  9-Adult
- Chemistry  9-Adult
- Mathematics  5-9
- Mathematics  5-Adult
- Social Studies  5-9
Social Studies 5-Adult
Art PreK- Adult
Art 5-Adult
Art 5-9
Physical Education PreK-Adult
Health Education PreK-Adult
Music Education PreK-Adult
Special Education K-6 or 5-Adult
Elementary K-6
Early Childhood PreK/K

Graduate

Master of Arts in Teaching (MA)

Special Education track K-6 or 5-Adult

Two other tracks (without certification options) are Advanced Teaching and Technology Specialist. All undergraduate certification based programs are offered at the main campus. The Highlands Center is considered an off-site location; only the graduate program (and a few professional education degrees for non-traditional students as part of other programs – i.e. Leadership in the Workforce) is offered entirely at the Highlands Center. Additional sections of undergraduate courses are sometimes offered at the Highlands Center.

Curriculum Analysis Reports

Though the Curriculum Analysis Reports (CARs) were submitted to the State of WV, Office of Personnel Preparation, on September 24, 2011, many of the CAR reports have yet to be returned to the institution. The first of the reports were returned the first week of February with requests for additional clarification. An outline of the status of the reports is included below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF CAR</th>
<th>STATUS *</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education pre-K-Adult, 5-Adult, 5-9</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Education 5-Adult</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Education 5-Adult</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education PreK-K</td>
<td>Still in draft pending additional follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education K-6</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 5-9</td>
<td>Still in draft pending additional follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 5-Adult</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science 5-9</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science 5-12</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health PreK-Adult</td>
<td>Still in draft pending additional follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 5-9</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 5-Adult</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-categorical Special Education K-6; 5-9; 5-12 – Initial</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-categorical Special Education – Advanced</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music – Choral</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Nationally recognized by NASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music – Instrumental</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Nationally recognized by NASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education PreK-Adult</td>
<td>Still pending WVDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 5-9</td>
<td>Recognized with Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 5-Adult</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* WVDE decision on recognition of the program(s):
  Recognized
  Recognized with conditions
  Not recognized

**Conceptual Framework**

Throughout the past year and a half, the conceptual framework has been reviewed, revised, and affirmed. The resulting program goals and outcomes were developed and vetted by the constituents of the Unit including the various departments impacted by certification on campus, members of EPPAC (the Advisory Council), and school partners. The goals and outcomes of the conceptual framework were aligned with the revised state standards and, throughout the 2010-2011 school year, the programmatic assessments have been aligned as well. All professional education core courses reflect the conceptual framework outcomes, in addition to the state standards, technology standards, and Praxis II PLT standards. Within all professional education
syllabi (all courses with an EDUC, SPED, EED, or READ prefix), all course objectives (drawn from the above-mentioned standards) are aligned to all course activities and assessments.

Included in the exhibits of this addendum report are the program assessments used by the unit for all teacher candidates and those assessments tailored for specific content/certification program areas. A description of the assessment, the accompanying scoring rubric, and aggregated data (per certification area) is included. The rubric domains are disaggregated in the reports generated by LiveText.

List of all unit and certification specific assessments

Capstone (formerly called Teacher Work Sample)

This assessment documents the impact of candidate teaching on the learning of PK-12 students during student teaching

Beginning next semester, Fall 2011, a modified version of capstone, documentation on student learning, will take place in all curriculum and method courses. By the time of the NCATE on-site visit, the assignment and scoring rubric will be created.

Numerical rating (formerly called PA-90) for student teaching

This assessment is a standard rating for all certification areas; however, a content specific addendum was added for every area of certification. All cooperating teachers rate the teacher candidates during student teachers on content mastery. Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE (in Standard 1 of online exhibits) for these addendum scoring rubrics.

Throughout this year, based on feedback from cooperating teachers, the Advisory Council (EPPAC), and the members of the Education Unit, the numerical rating was revised to reflect the outcomes of the conceptual framework. Additionally, a second narrative instrument, also aligned to the Unit’s conceptual framework, was added. This second rating instrument provides feedback that is more formative to teacher candidates on their teaching performance throughout the student teaching semester. Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE (in Standard 1 of online exhibits) for the revised forms that will be implemented in Fall 2011.

Content Portfolio

Prior to entrance into clinical student teaching, all candidates complete a content portfolio with artifacts demonstrating alignment to the national standards for the respective certification areas. If candidates have more than one area of certification, they complete additional content portfolios. For an example of a content portfolio, please see Exhibit 5. For the aggregated data by certification area, please see Fall 2010 Key Assessments. For the Content Portfolio Description and Rubric, see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE (in Standard 1 of online exhibits).
**Professional Portfolio**

This assessment is completed at the end of the clinical student teaching semester. Candidates compile a non-linear electronic portfolio in LiveText aligned to the program’s conceptual framework and related outcomes, the ISTE standards, and the Praxis II standards for their respective certification area(s). During the Fall semester, 2010, the portfolio assignment was more clearly defined, aligned to the Unit’s conceptual framework, and the rubric revised for clarity and specificity. Training sessions have been held with student teachers throughout the Spring semester, 2011, and all current student teachers will be using the revised portfolio assessment and rubric. Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE for the portfolio assignment and rubric and Fall 2010 Key Assessments (in Standard 1 of online exhibits) for the aggregated data.

Additionally, based on feedback from area administrators, principals in the professional development schools network, the EPPAC (Advisory Council), and the Teacher Education Unit, an oral defense of the portfolio was designed for implementation this spring semester, 2011. All candidates will have a thirty-minute interview-style defense of the portfolio with a three-panel committee comprised of the Dean or the Chair of Professional Education, a Professional Education faculty member, and an outside principal, administrator, or veteran teacher.

**Unit Plan**

In either EDUC 293 (for secondary and comprehensive certification candidates or in the Elementary Methods Block courses), all candidates complete a comprehensive unit with alignment of unit activities to the national standards of the respective content/certification areas. For the unit plan assignment and corresponding rubric used through Fall 2010, see Exhibit 3. For the unit plan data gathered through Fall 2010, please see Exhibit 4. (in Standard 1 of online exhibits)

**Individualized Education Plan**

In either the secondary or elementary major special education course, all candidates complete a performance-based IEP project. For the IEP assignment, corresponding rubric and data please see Exhibit 3 (in Standard 1 of online exhibits).

Candidate must complete the unit assessments, and all identified “course specific key assessments” with a proficient or acceptable rating in all rubric categories in order to advance in program or pass the course. Teacher candidates have an opportunity to revise and rework these critical assessments until a passing score is achieved (assuming time allocations within the semester).

Failure of the key unit assessments will prevent a teacher candidate from continuing in the program or completing the program. Those teacher candidates with poor or unacceptable ratings in specific sections on a rubric (without evidence of revision) may have been part of an initial pilot for a specific assessment. Additionally, the Assessment Director recently discovered that while teacher candidates have been revising and resubmitting key assessments in LiveText, unless the faculty member selects the re-score button, an updated copy of the rubric scores were not sent to
the student, nor was that information filtering back to the Director of Teacher Education and senior seminar professor.

**Graduate Program**

In the graduate program, all courses in the common core have identified performance-based assessments; corresponding rubrics were designed as well. **Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE (in Standard 1 of online exhibits) for these assignments and rubrics.** Given the infancy of the graduate program, and the lack of clearly defined and/or implemented common assessments, limited data currently exists. All graduate students and faculty have been moved to the LiveText platform for assignment collection and data aggregation. The culminating project in the graduate program, the Capstone project, has three separate requirements. Candidates must complete an electronic portfolio aligned to the national standards respective to the selected track/concentration area (special education, technology, or advanced teaching), an action research project related to the PK-12 classroom, and a dispositions rating from a current employer or school-based personnel.

**Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE for sample Capstone project and please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE for the collection of disposition information on graduate students (in Standard 1 of online exhibits).**

Dispositions are evaluated at various points throughout the undergraduate program. **Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE (in Standard 1 of online exhibits) for the discussion of disposition data collection.**

**Standard 2**

**IR Addendum**

Throughout the past year and a half, the conceptual framework has been reviewed, revised, and affirmed. The resulting program goals and outcomes were developed and vetted by the constituents of the Unit including the various departments impacted by certification on campus, members of EPPAC (the Advisory Council), and school partners. The goals and outcomes of the conceptual framework were aligned with the revised state standards and, throughout the 2010-2011 school year, the programmatic assessments have been aligned as well. All professional education core courses reflect the conceptual framework outcomes, in addition to the state standards, technology standards, and Praxis II PLT standards. Within all professional education syllabi (all courses with an EDUC, SPED, EED, or READ prefix), all course objectives (drawn from the above-mentioned standards) are aligned to all course activities and assessments.

Included in the exhibits of this addendum report are the program assessments used by the unit for all teacher candidates and those assessments tailored for specific content/certification program areas. A description of the assessment, the accompanying scoring rubric, and aggregated data (per certification area) is included. The rubric domains are disaggregated in the reports generated by LiveText.
List of all unit and certification specific assessments

**Capstone** (formerly called Teacher Work Sample)

This assessment documents the impact of candidate teaching on the learning of PK-12 students during student teaching.

Beginning next semester, Fall 2011, a modified version of capstone, documentation on student learning, will take place in all curriculum and method courses. By the time of the NCATE on-site visit, the assignment and scoring rubric will be created.

**Numerical rating** (formerly called PA-90) for student teaching

This assessment is a standard rating for all certification areas; however, a content specific addendum was added for every area of certification. All cooperating teachers rate the teacher candidates during student teachers on content mastery. Please see the ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS in standard 2 of the online exhibits.

Throughout this year, based on feedback from cooperating teachers, the Advisory Council (EPPAC), and the members of the Education Unit, the numerical rating was revised to reflect the outcomes of the conceptual framework. Additionally, a second narrative instrument, also aligned to the Unit’s conceptual framework, was added. This second rating instrument provides feedback that is more formative to teacher candidates on their teaching performance throughout the student teaching semester. Please see ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS in standard 2 of the online exhibits for these revised forms that will be implemented in Fall 2011.

**Content Portfolio**

Prior to entrance into clinical student teaching, all candidates complete a content portfolio with artifacts demonstrating alignment to the national standards for the respective certification areas. If candidates have more than one area of certification, they complete additional content portfolios. For an example of a content portfolio, please see ADDITIONAL EXHIBIT 5 in standard 2 of the online exhibits. For the aggregated data by certification area, please see Fall 2010 – Key Assessments (online in Exhibits).

**Professional Portfolio**

This assessment is completed at the end of the clinical student teaching semester. Candidates compile a non-linear electronic portfolio in LiveText with alignment to the program’s conceptual framework and related outcomes, the ISTE standards, and the Praxis II standards for their respective certification area(s). During the Fall semester, 2010, the portfolio assignment was more clearly defined, aligned to the Unit’s conceptual framework, and the rubric revised for clarity and specificity. Training sessions have been held with student teachers throughout the Spring semester, 2011, and all current student teachers will be using the revised portfolio assessment and rubric. Please see ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS in standard 2 of the online exhibits for the portfolio assignment, rubric, and Fall 2010 – Key Assessments (online Exhibits) for a sample of aggregated data.

Additionally, based on feedback from area administrators, principals in the professional development schools network, the EPPAC (Advisory Council), and the Teacher Education Unit, an oral defense of the portfolio was designed for implementation this spring semester, 2011. All candidates will have a thirty-minute interview-style defense of the portfolio with a three-panel
committee comprised of the Dean or the Chair of Professional Education, a Professional Education faculty member, and an outside principal, administrator, or veteran teacher.

Unit Plan

In either EDUC 293 (for secondary and comprehensive certification candidates or in the Elementary Methods Block courses), all candidates complete a comprehensive unit with alignment of unit activities to the national standards of the respective content/certification areas. ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS in standard 2 of the online exhibits for the portfolio assignment, rubric, and Fall 2010 – Key Assessments (online Exhibits) for a sample of aggregated data.

Individualized Education Plan

In either the secondary or elementary major special education course, all candidates complete a performance-based IEP project. For the IEP assignment and Rubric please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE in standard 2, and for the corresponding data see Fall 2010/Key Assessments.

Candidates must complete the unit assessments, and all identified “course specific key assessments” with a proficient or acceptable rating in all rubric categories in order to advance in program or pass the course. Teacher candidates have an opportunity to revise and rework these critical assessments until a passing score is achieved (assuming time allocations within the semester).

Failure of the key unit assessments will prevent a teacher candidate from continuing in the program or completing the program. Those teacher candidates with poor or unacceptable ratings in specific sections on a rubric (without evidence of revision in the current data set) may have been part of an initial pilot for a specific assessment. Additionally, the Assessment Director recently discovered that while teacher candidates have been revising and resubmitting key assessments in LiveText, unless the faculty member selects the re-score button, an updated copy of the rubric scores were not sent to the student, nor was that information filtering back to the Director of Teacher Education and senior seminar professor.

As the key performance-based assessments for every EDUC, SPED, READ, and EED course (and C&M course) is created and piloted this semester, Spring 2011; all forms for disaggregated data will include a reflective component for the professor/instructor. All assessments are competed and scored in LiveText allowing teacher candidates to reflect upon professor comments and take corrective action.

The Teacher Education Unit, with representation from across campus, will also review assessment data every semester on those Unit-level assessments that frame the program. This analysis is critical to the questions already under discussion in the unit concerning placement of “gates” for program admission and continuation, revision of portfolios, benchmarking of candidate progress, and shared results with the external community.

Beginning in the Spring 2011, a group of student representing upper-level juniors and seniors from the varied certification fields will assemble with the Dean and two department chairs within the College of Education as members of a “Dean’s Council” to review programmatic data (without any identifying candidate information) and discuss Teacher Education Program areas of strengths and ideas for improvements.
Graduate Assessment

The graduate program common core of courses has identified key performance based assessments. **Please see Graduate Assessment Data (online Exhibits) for the performance-based assessment and accompanying rubric for each common core course.** The graduate program began in October 2008 with a small cohort of students. The acting Director of the graduate program was the former Dean of the College. At the time of approval by the Higher Learning Commission, key performance assessments had been identified for common core courses in the documentation created for program approval. However, none of these instruments had been developed or implemented during the Fall 2008 or Spring 2009 semester. Additionally, only course syllabi for the special education track were fully developed. Syllabi for the other two tracks (Advanced Teaching and Technology Integration) needed to be developed.

When the new Dean for the College of Education assumed her position in July 2009, she and the now current Director of the Education Graduate Program, worked to ensure correct program alignment, create the needed course syllabi and program performance based assessments. These instruments were developed throughout the 2009-2010 school year and are currently being implemented during this school year (2010-2011). Most graduate courses are only offered one time a year, including summer session. **As a result, the aggregated data that has been collected for the common core assessments are reflected in Graduate Assessment Data (online Exhibits).**

In the graduate program, all courses in the common core have identified performance-based assessments; corresponding rubrics were designed as well. **Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE in standard 2 of the online exhibits for these assignments and rubrics.** Given the infancy of the graduate program, and the lack of clearly defined and/or implemented common assessments, limited data currently exists. All graduate students and faculty have been moved to the LiveText platform for assignment collection and data aggregation. The culminating project in the graduate program, the Capstone project, has three separate requirements. Candidates must complete an electronic portfolio with alignment to the national standards respective to the selected track/concentration area (special education, technology, or advanced teaching), an action research project related to the PK-12 classroom, and complete a dispositions rating from a current employer or school-based personnel.

**Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE in standard 2 for sample Capstone project and for the collection of disposition information on graduate students.**

Assessment Summit

After two years of reviewing and realigning the Professional Education sequence curriculum to the WV Professional Teaching Standards, Praxis II standards, ISTE standards, and the West Liberty University Program Goals and Outcomes, key assessments and rubrics have been designed, piloted, and in some cases, implemented. To continue growth and reflection in this area, an Assessment Summit is planned for the summer of 2011. This summit will be led by the College’s Assessment Coordinator and will include all members of the staff of the Department of Professional Education and members of the Teacher Education Unit.

This two or three day summit will include a working agenda of active reflection on the results of key assessments, programmatic goals and objectives based on results of assessments, discussion of strengths and weaknesses and the formation of a strategic plan as the Unit moves forward.
The assessment summit will be a yearly retreat for the Professional Education Department and the Teacher Education Unit.

*Key Summit Objectives*

*Refine all assessment instruments*

*Reflect on existing data including those from pilot semester*

*Training for all faculty on LiveText assignments and submissions*

*Assess and confirm alignments for all Professional Educational Assessments*

**Standard 3**

**Field Experiences and Clinical Experiences**

The selection of field and clinical student teaching sites is a collaborative undertaking orchestrated by the Field Placement Coordinator for the Teacher Education Program. As noted by the sequence of field experiences, during EDUC, Educational Psychology, teacher candidates are placed in general public school classrooms. The Field Placement Coordinator works with the area school superintendents, assistant superintendents, personnel directors, and school building principals to identify strong field placements for teacher candidates.

Teacher candidates are also part of the site selection process, particularly for clinical student students. As part of the meeting for teacher candidates preparing for clinical student teaching, all candidates complete a request form of desired placements, including requested schools and specific in-service teachers. The field placement coordinator, after review of all requests and in consultation with the Director and Assistant Director of Teacher Education, works with the area administrative offices to secure the needed placements across a tri-state area. Teacher candidates can request one placement out-of-state (in PA or OH) if the candidate wishes to become well versed in different state standards and assessment instruments.

Professional education faculty, adjuncts, and school partners are intimately involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences. Key faculty are identified as liaisons for specific program areas and/or specific professional education core classes:

Mary Brown – Human Development and Early Education

Gail Smith – Reading

Judy Stechly – Elementary and Educational Psychology

JoJo Ullom and C&M Faculty and Unit members – Secondary and Comprehensive Program Areas

Sarah Schimmel – Special Education Undergraduate & Graduate

Mike Camden – Tech Track Graduate Program

Kay Clawson – Advanced Teaching Track
These individuals play a key role in identifying the needed performance and project-based assessments, including field experiences, for their assigned respective areas. There is a uniform field experience form that was created by the Teacher Education Unit for all field-based courses; this form can be amended for specific courses as needed. Please see Exhibit 6 (in Standard 3 online exhibits) for this evaluation form and ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE under standard 3 (online exhibits) for the current and revised student teaching numerical forms.

Last year, all field experiences were reviewed by the Unit, and, needed curriculum and catalog changes were proposed to ensure uniformity between and among the field experiences. These changes are ongoing, as are changes in the design and implementation of field experiences.

This school year, the Unit began to solicit feedback from cooperating teachers on the quality and satisfaction of the field experiences needed by the teacher candidates. Based on the feedback of the cooperating teachers (please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE under standard 3 of the online exhibits), it became very evident that within courses in the professional education sequence, the field placement experiences needed to be better defined regarding the expectations for teaching and classroom involvement of candidates during field experiences. Many cooperating teachers commented upon the over-reliance of observation in field experiences rather than defined expectations for teaching at least one lesson and participating in the curricular life of the classroom. When feedback was sought from higher education faculty, the lack of candidate reflection from the field experiences became apparent. As a result, a stronger reflection component was built into the required journal; scoring for field experiences needed to go beyond attendance in schools to active reflection that demonstrated critical thinking of participation in the life of the classroom.

Additionally, area teachers and administrators regularly participate in the EPPAC (Educational Professional Preparation Advisory Council) meetings that occur at least one time a semester. Proposed curricular changes, field, and student teaching information are shared with the Advisory Council, discussed and modified collectively and endorsed by them. All new programs, especially those with field experiences, are shared and discussed among EPPAC members. EPPAC members have recently discussed proposals for a Theatre and French certification and a Gifted endorsement.

Every year, cooperating teachers are invited to participate in the clinical practice workshop. Last year’s workshop sought input on areas of strength and weakness in teacher candidates noted by cooperating teachers and programmatic input on course and field experiences/standards. The cooperating teachers discussed how better to convey the realities of teaching in traditional course contents and how to best arrange student teaching placements to support novice and beginning teachers.

All anecdotal conversations with area teachers and administrators whether through phone, e-mail, or meeting participation is shared with the Director of Teacher Education and used in Unit discussion regarding field and student teaching design. It is not unusual for “hallway” conversations to occur regarding the Teacher Education Program and feedback on the performance of teacher candidates.
During clinical student teaching, all teacher candidates complete a “Capstone” project (formerly named Teacher Work Sample), to document the positive impact of candidate teaching on student learning. Please see ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE under standard 3 in the online exhibits for a copy of the assignment and rubric, and Fall 2010 - Key Assessment Report in the online exhibits for aggregated data table for the capstone project.

As part of this project, candidates must assess prior knowledge of students in a pre-assessment, provide instruction over the course of the week or unit, and conduct a post-assessment. The teacher candidate must conduct an item analysis of results and disaggregate the data according to class demographics.

During the spring semester of 2011, a similar project is being designed for inclusion in the curriculum and method courses for both secondary/comprehensive majors and for elementary education majors. Teacher candidates will be required to document their positive impact on student learning during field experiences in the C&M semester.

At the time of the on-site visit, it is expected that this project will be defined with an accompanying rubric.

**Diversity of Placements**

All candidates in the teacher education program at West Liberty University complete a sequence of diverse field experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 100, Introduction to Education</td>
<td>12 hours in parochial schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 207, Foundations of Education</td>
<td>30 hours in racially diverse after-school centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education 241, Exceptionalities and classroom</td>
<td>6 hours in a special education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Field Placements**

Additionally, all teacher candidates complete the following sequence of field placements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 301, Education Psychology</td>
<td>30 hours in general public school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Methods Block</td>
<td>60 hours in general public school/private school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 293, Instructional Design</td>
<td>30 hours in general public school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout program, all field experiences are tracked by the Field Placement Coordinator. These are evidenced for Standard 4 and available for review as part of exhibits. The Coordinator assures that all teacher candidates have at least one field placement or student teaching placement in a “high diversity” public school setting. Please see Additional Exhibit 4 - Field Placement Tracking Form under standard 4 in the online exhibits for a sample.

**Courses with Diversity Emphasis**

EDUC 100

In the introductory course, EDUC 100, all teacher candidates are placed in regional parochial schools. These schools provide the springboard for discussion of public school history, public/private/parochial school funding, teacher qualifications and certification, and a multitude of other issues.

EDUC 207

During the course Foundations of Education, taken by every initial candidate in the Education Program, all candidates complete 30 hours working in a diverse after-school program. West Liberty’s Teacher Preparation Program has a long-standing partnership with the Anchor Program at Madison Elementary School on Wheeling Island and with the Laughlin Chapel After-School Program. Candidates can complete all of the required hours at Madison Elementary, or candidates can complete 20 of the required field hours at Madison and complete the other 10 at the Laughlin Chapel, if they so choose. Both after-school centers are in highly diverse areas of the Wheeling area. Madison Elementary, which is required to track student demographics, are over 41% racially diverse (African American population) with 100% representation of low socio-economic status (81% free/reduced lunch) and 31% meeting criteria for special education.

SPED 241

Beginning the fall 2010, all teacher candidates began working with individuals and students with disabilities in a six-hour field experience in a special education classroom.

**Diversity Proficiencies**

Woven throughout the teacher education program are diversity proficiencies. Please see Candidate Preparation for Diverse Population (narrative in section 4 of the IR) for a full reporting of the various instructional strategies, specific texts, and projects that relate to this standard.

Specifically infused in EDUC 207 is an opportunity for teacher candidates to interact with diverse peers through cultural presentations. The Director for International Education, Mia Szabo, will be working with international candidates to make cultural presentations to all teacher candidates in this course by the end of the Spring 2011 semester.
In the graduate program, only one emphasis track leads to initial certification for those candidates who wish to pursue it. Otherwise, the special education track in the graduate program can be completed without the additional courses for initial certification. The field placement coordinator for the undergraduate program also works with Director of the Graduate Program to arrange for the required field and student teaching experiences for those candidates pursuing initial special education certification.

Technology standards for teachers from ISTE are tracked across the program with a program matrix for all professional education core. (ISTE Program Matrix – In ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE under standard 3 in online exhibits).

**Standard 4**

**Diversity**

All candidates in the teacher education program at West Liberty University complete a sequence of diverse field experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 100, Introduction to Education</td>
<td>12 hours in parochial schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 207, Foundations of Education</td>
<td>30 hours in racially diverse after-school centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education 241, Exceptionalities and Diversities</td>
<td>6 hours in a special education classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL FIELD PLACEMENTS**

Additionally, all teacher candidates complete the following sequence of field placements:

- Education 301, Education Psychology                   | 30 hours in general public school       |
- **Elementary Candidates**                              |                                          |
- Curriculum and Methods Block                          | 60 hours in general public school/private school |
- **Secondary Candidates**                              |                                          |
- Education 293, Instructional Design                   | 30 hours in general public school       |

Throughout program, all field experiences are tracked by the Field Placement Coordinator. These are evidenced for Standard 4 and available for review as part of exhibits. The Coordinator assures that all teacher candidates have at least one field placement or student teaching placement in a “high diversity” public school setting. Please see **Additional Exhibit 4 - Field Placement Tracking Form in the online exhibits** for a sample.
Courses with Diversity Emphasis

EDUC 100

In the introductory course, EDUC 100, all teacher candidates are placed in regional parochial schools. These schools provide the springboard for discussion of public school history, public/private/parochial school funding, teacher qualifications and certification, and a multitude of other issues.

EDUC 207

During the course Foundations of Education, taken by every initial candidate in the Education Program, all candidates complete 30 hours working in a diverse after-school program. West Liberty’s Teacher Preparation Program has a long-standing partnership with the Anchor Program at Madison Elementary School on Wheeling Island and with the Laughlin Chapel After-School Program. Candidates can complete all of the required hours at Madison Elementary, or candidates can complete 20 of the required field hours at Madison and complete the other 10 at the Laughlin Chapel, if they so choose. Both after-school centers are in highly diverse areas of the Wheeling area. Madison Elementary, which is required to track student demographics, are over 41% racially diverse (African American population) with 100% representation of low socio-economic status (81% free/reduced lunch) and 31% meeting criteria for special education.

SPED 241

Beginning the fall 2010, all teacher candidates began working with individuals and students with disabilities in a six-hour field experience in a special education classroom.

Diversity Proficiencies

Woven throughout the teacher education program are diversity proficiencies. Please see Candidate Preparation for Diverse Population (narrative in section of the IR) for a full reporting of the various instructional strategies, specific texts, and projects that relate to this standard.

Specifically infused in EDUC 207 is an opportunity for teacher candidates to interact with diverse peers through cultural presentations. The Director for International Education, Mia Szabo, will be working with international candidates to make cultural presentations to all teacher candidates in this course by the end of the Spring 2011 semester.

The Admissions Office has regions for recruitment including urban districts within DC, Maryland, and Virginia. Two of the College Deans have visited schools in the DC area to connect with guidance counselors and promote West Liberty University. The diversity of the candidates in the Education Program, and in the larger University, is captured in Exhibit 6: Candidate Demographics in the online exhibits. This exhibit displays the socioeconomic status of the candidates in the Education program.

While the University uses a limited avenue for advertisement of faculty positions, the Unit has researched various diverse journals and mechanisms for recruitment of diverse and talented faculty members. Please see the list of researched journals/publications in Additional
Exhibits 2 of the online exhibits. The current advertisement for an early childhood special needs faculty member is being placed in two of these journals.

The unit has also been moving toward the inclusion of additional assessments to validate student diversity proficiencies. The initial assignments are represented in the chart below and the descriptions of several are included in the file, Diversity Assignment Descriptions included with the online exhibits.

Diversity Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 207</td>
<td>Foundations of Education</td>
<td>Diversity Debate, Ruby Payne Project, Contextual Factors Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 241</td>
<td>Introduction to Exceptionalities</td>
<td>American Sign Language Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 320/412</td>
<td>Collaborative Special Education for Secondary/Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>Mock IEP Assignment (Key Assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 302/312</td>
<td>Reading in the Content Area/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>ESL Reading Lesson Assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 5

Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

There are ten full-time faculty in the Department of Professional Education; these faculty teach the specialized courses in specific certification areas and courses in the professional common core sequence (required for all certification candidates). A complete set of vitae for all full-time and adjunct faculty within the Teacher Education Program is maintained in the Dean’s Office. The Dean is the current NCATE Director and Director of Teacher Education. Vitae are maintained for all full-time faculty within the College of Education; the College of Education includes the departments of Professional Education and Health and Human Performance.

Additionally, all adjunct faculty used by the department of Professional Education, including all individuals used to supervise student teachers, have files with vitae in the Dean’s Office as well as do all adjuncts and faculty who teach Curriculum and Methods courses for the Teacher Education Unit.

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are used to supplement specific courses within the Teacher Education Unit and in the supervision of student teachers. Typically, adjuncts are used to instruct the Curriculum and Method (C&M) courses. These adjuncts are hand-selected by the Director of Teacher Education and the Assistant Director of Teacher Education and are approached about teaching for the Unit. Minimum qualifications for adjuncts include a master’s degree and at least five years of recent teaching experience in the subject matter taught in the C&M course(s). The Director and Assistant Director typically have first-hand knowledge of the effectiveness of the teaching, have personally observed the teaching, and know the dedication of the selected adjuncts. All current adjuncts for
C&M course are current practicing teachers or administrators who come highly recommended by their administrators/supervisors. For example, our current instructor for the C&M course in mathematics has over 13 years of public high school math experience; she is a department chair for mathematics at her high school and a National Board Certified Teacher. The adjunct instructor for our special education course, Autism II, is a Ph.D. candidate in special education with a specialization in Applied Behavior Analysis.

Adjuncts for the supervision of student teachers are typically retired educators. The selection for these adjuncts is typically the same as for the C&M courses. All adjuncts are interviewed by the Department Chair for the Professional Education and/or the Director of Teacher Education before a semester contract is issued. When adjuncts are utilized for a course within the program, the adjuncts are typically assigned all sections of the course to ensure continuity between and among the classes. Additionally, this past year, the Director of Teacher Education and Chair for Professional Education designated specific key faculty as leading specific courses. For instance, Dr. Judy Stechly is the lead instructor for the course EDUC 301, Educational Psychology. A highly qualified adjunct, Patti Coon, teaches an on-line section of the course. Instructor Coon coordinates the course logistics, book selection, etc, directly with Dr. Stechly to ensure the connective tissue of course content and design.

Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in EPPAC (Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Council) meetings held at least once a semester. Additionally, adjunct faculty participate in various aspects of the Unit and are included in on e-mail listserv for Program information dissemination. Unit adjuncts have a shared office in Main Hall of campus, and meet routinely with the department chair for Professional Education and/or the Director of Teacher Education.

Adjunct faculty who teach courses are evaluated with the same instruments as full-time faculty. Teacher candidates complete an evaluation of teaching at the end of the semester. The assigned department chair per the respective content area conducts at least one evaluation of teaching throughout the semester. **Samples of student evaluations of faculty, portfolio examples and department chair evaluations are included in the IR online exhibit 5 under standard 5 and Additional exhibit 5.3.**

**Standard 6**

**Faculty Unit Governance and Resources**

The Dean for the College of Education was hired in July 2009, and, at the time of hire, assumed the titles of Director of the Education Graduate Program, NCATE Coordinator, Certification Officer, and Director of Teacher Education. In January 2010, the Dean named Dr. Kay Clawson, full professor, as director of the graduate program. In August 2010, Instructor JoJo Ullom was named Assistant Director of Teacher Education and Instructor Traci Tuttle was named Assistant Coordinator of Assessment and Accreditation. In the 2011-2012 school year, both women will assume the full director title of each respective area. The Dean will maintain status as certification officer.
Adjuncts

A complete set of vitae for all full-time and adjunct faculty within the Teacher Education Program is maintained in the Dean's Office. The Dean is the current NCATE Director and Director of Teacher Education. Vitae are maintained for all full-time faculty within the College of Education; the College of Education includes the departments of Professional Education and Health and Human Performance.

Additionally, all adjunct faculty used by the department of Professional Education, including all individuals used to supervise student teachers, have files with vitae in the Dean's Office as well as do all adjuncts and faculty who teach Curriculum and Methods courses for the Teacher Education Unit.

Adjunct faculty are used to supplement specific courses within the Teacher Education Unit and in the supervision of student teachers. Typically, adjuncts are used to instruct the Curriculum and Method (C&M) courses. These adjuncts are hand-selected by the Director of Teacher Education and the Assistant Director of Teacher Education and are approached about teaching for the Unit. Minimum qualifications for adjuncts include a master's degree and at least five years of recent teaching experience in the subject matter taught in the C&M course(s). The Director and Assistant Director typically have first-hand knowledge of the effectiveness of the teaching, have personally observed the teaching, and know the dedication of the selected adjuncts. All current adjuncts for C&M course are current practicing teachers or administrators who come highly recommended by their administrators/supervisors. For example, our current instructor for the C&M course in mathematics has over 13 years of public high school math experience; she is a department chair for mathematics at her high school and a National Board Certified Teacher. The adjunct instructor for our special education course, Autism II, is a Ph.D. candidate in special education with a specialization in Applied Behavior Analysis.

Adjuncts for the supervision of student teachers are typically retired educators. The selection for these adjuncts is typically the same as for the C&M courses. All adjuncts are interviewed by the Department Chair for the Professional Education and/or the Director of Teacher Education before a semester contract is issued. When adjuncts are utilized for a course within the program, the adjuncts are typically assigned all sections of the course to ensure continuity between and among the classes. Additionally, this past year, the Director of Teacher Education and Chair for Professional Education designated specific key faculty as leading specific courses. For instance, Dr. Judy Stechly is the lead instructor for the course EDUC 301, Educational Psychology. A highly qualified adjunct, Patti Coon, teaches an on-line section of the course. Instructor Coon coordinates the course logistics, book selection, etc, directly with Dr. Stechly to ensure the connective tissue of course content and design.

Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in EPPAC (Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Council) meetings held at least once a semester. Additionally, adjunct faculty participate in various aspects of the Unit and are included in on e-mail listserv for Program information dissemination. Unit adjuncts have a shared office in Main Hall of campus, and meet routinely with the department chair for Professional Education and/or the Director of Teacher Education.
All full-time University faculty advise students. Nine of the ten full-time faculty in the Professional Education Program advise undergraduate teacher education candidates. The Director of the Education Graduate Program, Dr. Kay Clawson, advises all graduate students. Typically, faculty advise between 30-35 students in any given semester. **Please see Faculty Advising Loads in the online exhibits for assigned advising loads for each faculty member.** Secondary and comprehensive majors who are teacher candidates are advised in their respective content areas. These teacher candidates work with Education faculty informally in the advising of Education courses. In the introductory course, EDUC 100, all teacher candidates create programs of study, and they receive suggested outlines of course sequence.

**Overload**

Very few faculty assume course or supervision overload. **Please see the Teaching Loads exhibit in the online exhibits for the assignment of course-loads and student teaching supervision.**

**Key Transitions**

The Assistant Director of Teacher Education (the same person as the Professional Education Department Chair) monitors the key transition points in the program. The Assistant Director reviews all applications for program admission, program continuation, and student teaching admission; this person also collects and reviews all negative dispositions and contacts teacher candidates regarding admission acceptance or denial.

**Budget**

Finally, the cumulative budget for the College of Education is included under **ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE for standard 6 in the online exhibits** and the comparable budgets of other colleges at the institution are available under **EXHIBIT 7 for standard in the online exhibits.**