



# College of Education Self Study Report

Eastern Oregon University

2014

---

## Table of Contents

Institutional Context and Overview .....	1
Regional Priorities .....	2
Conceptual Framework.....	3
College of Education Mission.....	3
Conceptual Framework.....	3
The geographical/cultural environment: Place, culture, and conditions of our mission.....	3
Assessment .....	4
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions .....	6
1a. Content Knowledge.....	6
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge .....	8
1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills .....	11
1d. Student Learning.....	15
1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals.....	18
1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals.....	18
1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates.....	18
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation .....	22
Element 2a. Assessment System.....	22
Element 2b. Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation .....	25
Element 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement .....	28
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.....	30
3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners .....	30
3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice .....	32
3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn .....	38
Standard 4: Diversity.....	42
4a. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences .....	42
4b. Working with diverse faculty .....	46
4c. Working with diverse candidates .....	47
4d. Working with diverse p-12 students.....	49
Standard 5: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions .....	51
5a. Qualified Faculty .....	51
5b. Modeling Best Practices in Teaching .....	52
5c. Modeling Best Practices in Scholarship.....	55

5d. Modeling Best Practices in Services.....	57
5e. Unit Evaluation of Faculty Performance .....	58
5f. Professional Development.....	59
Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources .....	62
6a. Unit Leadership and Authority:.....	62
6b. Unit Budget .....	64
6c. Personnel.....	64
6d. Unit Facilities.....	65
6e Element Resources including Technology.....	66
State specific standards (response to OAR).....	68
584-017-1010 Request for Waiver of Rules.....	68
584-017-1012 Waivers of Academic Requirements and Appeals on Academic Decisions.....	68
584-017-1020 Knowledge of School Law for Licensed Educators .....	68
584-017-1025 Consortium .....	69
584-017-1030 Evidence of Effectiveness for Initial I Teaching License Preparation .....	69
584-017-1032 Evidence of Effectiveness for Continuing Teaching License.....	70
584-017-1035 Verification of Program Completion for All Licensure Programs .....	70
584-017-1040 Partial Waivers for Field or Clinical Requirements in the Event of School District Closures.....	71
584-017-1042 Field or Clinical Experiences .....	71
584-017-1045 Student Teaching.....	71
584-017-1048 Internship Agreements.....	72

## List of Tables

Table 1. The Characteristics of our Teacher Graduates .....	4
Table 2. Electronic Artifacts in Support of the Conceptual Framework .....	5
Table 3. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1a .....	7
Table 4. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1b: Initial Preparation Programs .....	9
Table 5. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1b: Advanced Programs .....	10
Table 6. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1c: Initial Preparation Programs .....	13
Table 7. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1c: Advanced Programs .....	14
Table 8. CUESTE Scores for Data Analysis and Reflections Rubrics in the Work Sample .....	15
Table 9. MAT Scores for Data Analysis and Reflections Rubrics in the Work Sample .....	16
Table 10. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1d .....	17
Table 11. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1g .....	20
Table 12. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2a .....	24
Table 13. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2b .....	27
Table 14. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2c .....	29
Table 15. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3a .....	32
Table 16. CUESTE Field Experiences and Clinical Practice .....	34
Table 17. MAT ECE/ELEM and MAT MID/HS Field Experience Table .....	35
Table 18. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3b .....	37
Table 19. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3c .....	40
Table 20. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4a .....	45
Table 21. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4b .....	47
Table 22. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4c .....	49
Table 23. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4d .....	50
Table 24. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5a .....	52
Table 25. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5b .....	54
Table 26. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5c .....	56
Table 27. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5d .....	57
Table 28. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5e .....	59
Table 29. Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5f .....	60
Table 30. Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1010 .....	68
Table 31. Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1020 .....	68
Table 32. Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1025 .....	69
Table 33. Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1030 .....	70

Table 34. Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1035 .....	71
Table 35. ....	72

**List of Figures**

Figure 1. Flow chart of transition assessment points within College of Education programs ..... 23

## **Institutional Context and Overview**

Eastern Oregon University's (EOU's) mission is to guide student inquiry through integrated, high-quality liberal arts and professional programs that lead to responsible and reflective action in a diverse and interconnected world. As an educational, a cultural, and a scholarly center, the University connects the rural regions of Oregon to a wider world. Our beautiful setting and small size enhance the personal attention our students receive, while partnerships with worldwide colleges, universities, agencies, and communities contribute to the educational possibilities of our region and state.

Since its inception in 1929 as Eastern Oregon Normal School, a vital part of the University mission includes preparing teachers for public and private schools in the region. Initial Teacher Preparation programs at EOU have taken the form of an undergraduate degree program in Elementary Education (CUESTE) and a Master of Arts (MAT) graduate degree, offering both Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School programs.

Advanced programs are also offered at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Reading and ESOL programs are available at the baccalaureate and post baccalaureate levels. Both programs are in high demand to meet the growing state need for teachers who can meet the needs of diverse students. As standards and assessment for learners become more stringent with the adoption of the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment, the demand for teachers with specialized knowledge in reading is growing. Likewise, the growing population of English Language Learners requires teachers who are knowledgeable about effective strategies for creating equitable learning experiences for these diverse learners.

The Special Education Endorsement program is offered at the graduate level for teachers who wish to add this endorsement to their license. The demand for qualified special education teachers is much higher than the supply, and EOU's preparation program helps fill a significant need for the P-12 schools in Eastern Oregon. The two-year cohort program has produced many of the teachers now filling the special education classrooms across the Eastern portion of the state.

EOU serves a large portion of the state of Oregon. The service area includes 46,000 square miles (approximately the size of the state of Pennsylvania) of sparsely populated territory. Five of the ten most eastern counties are termed "frontier" indicating an extremely low population density. EOU's primary service region extends from the Idaho border to the east and southeast, Washington to the north, Nevada to the south, and generally, the Cascades to the west. Because EOU's mission is to connect rural students with educational opportunities, distance education strategies have been foremost in our plans to provide access to those in under-served communities such as Pendleton, Burns, John Day, Ontario, Enterprise, the Columbia Gorge, and rural eastern Multnomah County.

EOU currently employs residential programs, distance education, and quasi-distance learning strategies to serve the growing number of place- and time-bound students in rural Oregon. There are approximately 1,900 public school teachers serving the 29,000 public school students in the region. Most of the schools are small, rural, and often isolated. This type of school environment requires a special kind of teacher. Rural schools require teachers who are prepared to instruct broadly, who possess several specialty skills and who can adapt and work with few resources.

EOU has traditionally provided the region with such a cadre of teachers. Rural and frontier public schools demand high quality teachers prepared to meet multiple needs of students. EOU's undergraduate teacher education program (CUESTE) meets the needs of both traditional students who move, typically, from high school to college in a smooth transition, and late comers to teacher education delimited by geography and resources. In contrast, the post

baccalaureate Master of Arts in Teaching program (MAT) often attracts candidates who make later career decisions to become a teacher. Both of these programs are based on the same core values and beliefs about learning and education.

### **Regional Priorities**

Oregon's future economic vitality relies on an educated population. The current 40/40/20 Initiative requires access high quality education for all of Oregon's residents, which can be a particular hardship for people in rural or isolated communities. EOU has made a commitment to serve rural communities. EOU programs established in Ontario, Pendleton, and Gresham have resulted directly from the desire to fulfill this mission-based strategy. In each of these undergraduate teacher education programs, students efficiently transition from the community college courses to the College of Education program. Students who are admitted to these programs are not required to come to the La Grande campus.

As a priority, EOU directs its resources to address the following targets:

Make higher education more accessible by a) bringing education closer to home, b) making education more career relevant, c) offering more flexibility relative to course scheduling and curriculum needs, and d) becoming more sensitive to customers

Make higher education more affordable by a) allowing students to utilize lower tuition rates of community colleges for the first half of their college program, b) allowing the option for students to live at home, thereby reducing their room and board costs, and c) providing students with streamlined programs and concomitant advising that assures efficiency of time and money in acquiring a college degree.

## Conceptual Framework

*Please see the table near or at the end of each narrative for links to evidence noted within the narrative. Evidence to be found in the table is denoted by italics.*

The College of Education at Eastern Oregon University spans undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs and advanced programs of study. Initial teacher preparation for elementary multiple subjects is available at the undergraduate (CUESTE) and graduate (MAT) levels, and secondary teacher preparation is available through the graduate level secondary MAT program. Advanced programs in ESOL and reading are available at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, while special education can only be done through the graduate program. The professional educational programs are aligned with University's mission, vision, core themes, and objectives.

Key decisions and strategic plans at the university and within the College of Education are guided by the university mission, vision, core themes, and objectives as well as by the mission statement of the Colleges of Business and Education (COBE) and the Conceptual Framework of the College of Education.

### College of Education Mission

The University Mission and Core Themes (adopted in 2004 and revised in 2013, respectively) focus on responsible and reflective action, providing access to education for students in rural areas, providing personal attention in high quality programs, and encouraging community engagement. Under the guidance of new leadership in the joint Colleges of Business and Education (COBE), a new mission statement was developed in 2013. The new mission statement was created in a process with collaboration from all faculty members across both colleges. The Conceptual Framework of the College of Education was adopted in 2010, and it reflects both the University Mission and Core Themes and the updated COBE mission statement.

#### Unit mission statement.

The Colleges of Business and Education create a community oriented environment conducive to professional development and life-long learning.

### Conceptual Framework

The current conceptual framework for the College of Education was developed during the 2010-2011 academic year with extensive input from the faculty and the Consortium. After revisions based on faculty and Consortium feedback, the final conceptual framework was developed.

### The geographical/cultural environment: Place, culture, and conditions of our mission

Within the Eastern Oregon University College of Education, rural culture is embraced for the unique traits of the local community and natural environment while connectedness to the wider world is essential.

#### The personal environment.

Eastern Oregon University College of Education offers programs in which faculty value an environment of learning that honors a reflective stance on the profession; a curriculum responsive to sameness, difference, and individuality of rural students; and an attentiveness to information leading to continuous improvement.

#### The professional environment.

In the College of Education, field placement and mentoring play critical roles in shaping the professional schema. The constant flow between practice, belief, and theory over time develop a mature classroom leader.

Table 1

*The Characteristics of our Teacher Graduates\**

Major Tenets	Expectations
1. Teachers must be academically competent: They must be proficient in their content and the tools needed to teach that content.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Know the content matter in the subjects they teach –4</li> <li>ii. Be able to think critically –5</li> <li>iii. Have communication skills in multiple modalities –3, 4, 8</li> <li>iv. Know the standards for the subject area they teach –5, 7</li> <li>v. Use appropriate educational technology to optimize learning 3, 8</li> <li>vi. Know the foundations of pedagogy including development, learning theory, and psychology - 1</li> </ul>
2. Teachers must be volitional: They must know why they are doing what they are doing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Be reflective practitioners—articulate a problem, consider possible solutions, employ strategies, and evaluate results - 2, 3, 9</li> <li>ii. Have initial skills of classroom management- 3</li> <li>iii. Have the skills for creating an environment for learning - 2, 8</li> <li>iv. Know developmentally appropriate practices - 1</li> <li>v. Possess the knowledge of most effective practices - 2, 8, 9</li> <li>vi. Understand and apply the features of good lesson design and curriculum planning - 2, 5, 7, 8</li> <li>vii. Able to help all students achieve - 1, 2, 8</li> <li>viii. Able to aggregate and synthesize data for decision-making –6</li> <li>ix. Able to respond to that data with a willingness to change practice –6, 9</li> <li>x. Able to practice action research –6, 9</li> <li>xi. Know what current research says about this generation of learners and the social settings of contemporary learners – 7, 9</li> </ul>
3. Teachers must be professional: They must demonstrate the dispositions of the profession.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Have confidence as an instructional leader –5</li> <li>ii. Have empathy for students - 1, 2</li> <li>iii. Have a willingness to contribute beyond the school day – 9</li> <li>iv. Have a passion and commitment to the students and profession –9</li> <li>v. Work collaboratively with a diverse group of professionals and peers - 1, 7, 8</li> <li>vi. Be flexible to the environment and willing to adapt –7</li> <li>vii. Be able to take constructive feedback and make appropriate changes to practice,</li> <li>viii. Be a lifelong learner –5, 9</li> <li>ix. Have an ethical/moral character –9</li> </ul>
4. Teachers must be culturally responsive: They must be conscious of their environment and culture, know the students that they teach, and act consciously to accommodate equity in learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Have cultural awareness and competency –2 , 3, 4, 9</li> <li>ii. See oneself as a member of the educational and wider community and willing to invest emotionally, culturally, and intellectually - 1, 10</li> <li>iii. Know how to respond to the dynamics of the family life of the students and to adjust to the effects of poverty and cultural diversity - 1, 2, 5</li> </ul>

\*Numbers listed in expectations column refer to In TASC standards from Model Core Teaching Standards, July 2010

**Assessment**

Program requirements are extensions of the Conceptual Framework and institutional requirements. The institutional general education requirements are completed through the Multidisciplinary Studies major required of all

CUESTE candidates. Institutional program learning outcomes required for undergraduates are completed through the CUESTE program coursework and assignments. Program matrices demonstrate how the Conceptual Framework translates into the categories of assessment for each program (content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy/professional knowledge, student learning, technology, and cultural competence) as indexed by the InTASC standards or other professional standards salient to reading, ESOL and special education.

Data are collected from program faculty each term and put into a database system where all program data are stored. Data are analyzed regularly by the Assessment and Accreditation Manager and shared with program faculty following a timeline developed by program leaders. Faculty members then use the data analysis for program evaluation and improvement. Further detail regarding the assessment system can be found in Standard 2.

As the College of Education has worked on the assessment process over the last three years, program reflections and conversations have indicated a need for revised preparation programs as well as a revised conceptual framework. The unit fully expects to submit major program modifications for TSPC approval for the initial teacher preparation programs and possibly advanced programs within the next two years. This will be guided by a revised conceptual framework developed with representatives from all groups of stakeholders in the teacher preparation programs at EOU.

Table 2

*Electronic artifacts in Support of the Conceptual Framework*

Conceptual Framework	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Vision and Mission of the Institution and unit	<a href="#">University Mission</a> <a href="#">Core Themes</a>	
Philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit	<a href="#">COBE mission</a>	Mission statement for Colleges of Business and Education (COBE) can be found on Conceptual Framework document.
Knowledge bases, theories, research, wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit	<a href="#">general education requirements</a> <a href="#">Multidisciplinary Studies major program learning outcomes</a>	
Candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards	<a href="#">InTASC standards</a> <a href="#">Initial teacher preparation program alignment</a> <a href="#">Reading alignment</a> <a href="#">ESOL alignment</a> <a href="#">Special Education alignment</a>	Alignment documents show alignment of conceptual framework with national standards
Summarized description of the unit's assessment system	<a href="#">timeline</a>  <a href="#">Standard 2</a>	Assessment timeline for each program  Link to standard 2: Unit Assessment

## Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

### 1a. Content Knowledge

Content knowledge requirements for teaching licensure are aligned with the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) governing knowledge and skills required for Initial I Teaching Licensure approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC). Content knowledge is also directed by the Oregon Content Standards and Common Core State Standards mandated by the Oregon Department of Education. Content standards may be met in content methods courses and content courses offered through the College of Arts and Sciences and/or College of Education content courses such as ESOL or reading. Content standards may also be met at other institutions, as determined by a review of candidate transcripts. Education faculty work with content faculty to align prerequisite content coursework with state educator assessments.

#### **Candidates know the subject matter to be taught.**

Candidates for initial teacher preparation programs must demonstrate content knowledge at the time of admission. Undergraduate elementary candidates must have the majority of their required *multidisciplinary studies degree* completed. The multidisciplinary studies degree insures that candidates have a breadth and depth of content knowledge to support teaching multiple subjects. At the graduate level, candidates for the elementary MAT program must also provide *transcript evidence of coursework in language arts, science, social science, math, art, and music*. Candidates seeking secondary authorization must complete *a major or its equivalent* in the endorsement content preparation, determined through a transcript evaluation process by content faculty and/or College of Education faculty.

All candidates admitted to initial teacher preparation programs must pass a basic skills exam prior to matriculation. The state approved and preferred basic skills test is the Essential Academic Skills exam (EAS). *The Year to Date EAS results* show that EOU applicants exceed the state average passing rate in math, meet the state average passing rate in reading, and are within four percentage points of the state passing rate in writing. In addition to competency in reading, writing, and mathematics as evidenced through the basic skills exam, entrance into program also requires a minimum GPA (2.75 at the undergraduate level and 3.00 at the graduate level).

Once admitted to program, application of content knowledge is monitored through methods coursework and in fieldwork components of each program. *Observations* and *midterm and final evaluations* address the candidate's knowledge of content and ability to explain concepts. Observation forms and evaluation forms are based on the InTASC standards. Standard 4 of the InTASC standards focuses on candidate content knowledge. Content knowledge in the field is assessed through the lens of the Oregon Content Standards and the Common Core State Standards. By the end of student teaching, all candidates must demonstrate proficiency on the final evaluation by achieving a minimum score of 3 on a four-point scale for each of the InTASC standards.

#### **Candidates can explain concepts in professional, state, and institutional standards.**

In addition to knowing content, candidates must also show an ability to explain content. This is also evaluated through the observations and evaluations, with a focus on InTASC standards 5, 7, and 8.

#### **Candidates pass state licensure exams.**

All completers from initial teacher preparation programs and from advanced programs pass the state-approved content exam(s) for their program. For the undergraduate CUESTE initial preparation program, the content exams are a requirement for program completion, but not for admission. At the graduate level, the ECE-ELEM program requires candidates to pass subtest II of the National Evaluation Series (NES) *Elementary Education* exam. Subtest I is required



for program completion. However, the secondary MAT program requires candidates to pass the *secondary content exam(s)* for their selected endorsement(s) at the time of admission.

Although all candidates must pass their content exams in order to be considered program completers, not all scores shown in the NES data analyzer database represent candidates currently within EOU programs. Some test takers submit scores to EOU without matriculating to program, and some test scores are for those who have not yet completed the program. Test scores for applying and active students are entered in the College of Education database by CUESTE and MAT support specialists, and all program completers have passed the appropriate content exam(s) prior to recommendation for licensure.

**Advanced candidates have in-depth knowledge of content they teach.**

Advanced program candidates demonstrate in-depth knowledge of content by passing the *advanced program content exam* related to their subject areas as an exit requirement for program completion. In all advanced programs, the national standards for the discipline are incorporated into class assessments used for program improvement. These standards are integrated into scoring rubrics for assessments. *Example rubrics* for each program are included in the table of evidence. In the ESOL program, a class-based linguistics exam is part of the program assessment for content knowledge. The Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) standards are embedded in program assessments. In the reading program, International Reading Association standards for reading professionals are integrated into syllabi and assessment rubrics. The special education program incorporates the standards from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC).

**1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

**Understand the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy.**

Candidates have many opportunities to develop and demonstrate their pedagogical content knowledge. Throughout their programs of study, candidates participate in methods coursework and field experiences that provide practical experiences in content pedagogy. Assessments such as *observation forms* and *work samples* are designed to evaluate pedagogical knowledge and give candidates many opportunities to practice putting that knowledge to use in real classroom settings. Candidates have multiple occasions to connect content material with methods for teaching that content.

**Candidates know instructional strategies.**

As part of those experiences, the use of instructional strategies is assessed regularly through observations and *midterm and final evaluations* for student.

**Draw upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills.**

The key assessment used for pedagogical content knowledge is the observation form. The observation form is aligned with the 10 InTASC standards. Standards 4, 5, 7 and 8 correspond with content pedagogy. By the end of the student teaching experience, candidates are expected to reach a score of 3 on a four-point scale for each of the content pedagogy standards on the observation form, demonstrating their proficiency in content pedagogy. The data collected and analyzed indicate that the mean score for each of these standards for all initial licensure programs is greater than the benchmark score of 3 by the end of student teaching.

All field work experiences, culminating in student teaching are within the candidate's content area and level of authorization. All cooperating teachers are authorized and endorsed in the subject areas in which they teach. All

university supervisors are authorized at the level that they are supervising. University supervisors were trained on forms and procedures in a group session in November 2011. All new supervisors meet one-on-one with the placement coordinator for training prior to their first supervision assignment. Supervisors meet with their assigned cooperating teachers and student teachers at the beginning of the term for an orientation. Supervisors and cooperating teachers provide evaluation and feedback to the candidates about content pedagogy through the formal observations and also through informal observation experiences. Cooperating teachers demonstrate and guide candidates in the use of multiple instructional strategies and clear presentation of content material.

Table 4

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1b: Initial Preparation Programs*

Standard 1b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<b>Initial Preparation Programs</b>		
Understand the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy	<a href="#">observation form</a> <a href="#">CUESTE observation data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT obs data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">elem MAT obs data '13-'14</a> <a href="#">sec MAT obs data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT obs data '13-'14</a>	Refer to InTASC standards 4, 5, 7, 8 on the observation form and data
Candidates know instructional strategies	<a href="#">midterm</a> and <a href="#">final</a> evaluations <a href="#">CUESTE mid and final eval data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT mid &amp; final eval data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">elem MAT mid eval data '13-'14</a> <a href="#">sec MAT mid and final eval data</a>	Refer to InTASC standard 8 on evaluations
Draw upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills	see observation data	
Candidates can present in clear and meaningful ways	see mid and final eval data	Refer to InTASC standards 5, 7, and 8
Candidates integrate technology	<a href="#">work sample rubric</a>  <a href="#">technology rubric</a>  <a href="#">CUESTE technology data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT technology data</a> <a href="#">sec MAT technology data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT technology data '13-'14</a>  <a href="#">Data analysis and summaries</a>	See technology integration rubric in work sample  Current technology assessment  Program data for technology integration competency  Link to data analysis summaries for each program

Table 5

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1b: Advanced Programs*

Standard 1b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Advanced Programs		
<p>Advanced candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning</p>	<p><a href="#">work sample rubric</a>  <a href="#">ESOL work sample data S13-F13</a></p> <p><a href="#">mini-unit and rubric</a>  <a href="#">ESOL mini unit data S13-F13</a>  <a href="#">ESOL mini unit data F12-W13</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rdg graduate synthesis paper</a>  <a href="#">Rdg grad synthesis paper data</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rdg undergrad synthesis paper</a>  <a href="#">Rdg undergrad synthesis paper data</a></p> <p><a href="#">SPED comprehensive instructional plan</a>  <a href="#">SPED comp. instr. plan data 13</a>  <a href="#">ESOL data tables</a></p> <p><a href="#">observation form (see #4)</a>  <a href="#">ESOL SIOP observation data S13-F13</a></p> <p><a href="#">end of experience evaluation</a>                      (see domain 3c)  <a href="#">ESOL end of experience eval data S13-F13</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rdg graduate synthesis paper</a>  <a href="#">Rdg grad technology assessment data</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rdg undergrad synthesis paper</a>  <a href="#">Rdg undergrad synthesis paper data</a></p> <p><a href="#">Assistive Technology Life Skills/Transition Plan</a>  <a href="#">SPED Assistive Tech data</a></p>	<p>ESOL graduate assessment and data</p> <p>ESOL undergraduate assessment and data</p> <p>Reading graduate assessment and data</p> <p>Reading undergrad assessment and data</p> <p>Special education assessment and data for 2010-2012. Data not yet available for the 2012-2014 cohort</p> <p>ESOL technology assessments and data</p> <p>Reading graduate technology assessment and data</p> <p>Reading undergraduate technology assessment and data</p> <p>Special education technology assessment and data</p>

## **Candidates can present in clear and meaningful ways.**

Presentation of content material is assessed within the midterm and final evaluations for student teachers. The midterm and final evaluations are indexed to the InTASC standards. Data from standards 5, 7, and 8 on the midterm and final evaluations provide evidence on candidates' skills at presenting content clearly using multiple teaching strategies.

## **Candidates integrate technology.**

Candidates across all initial teacher preparation programs integrate technology as appropriate within their teaching. Technology integration is built into the lesson plan template used within the initial teacher preparation programs. Beginning with the 2014 winter term (for MAT) and 2014 spring term (for CUESTE), the work sample had an added rubric to assess the use of technology. These work sample data for technology will be used for program evaluation moving forward. In addition, all initial licensure candidates take an educational technology class within their program with a *technology assessment* that evaluates the candidates' abilities to use various technologies in the categories of organizational, presentation, collaborative, and content technologies. At the undergraduate level, candidates take LIB 490, Educational Technology. Elementary MAT candidates take ED 642, Technology in the Elementary Classroom, and secondary MAT candidates take ED 643, Technology in the Secondary Classroom.

## **Advanced candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning.**

Candidates in advanced programs participate in similar experiences through methods coursework and practica within their programs. These experiences present the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their in-depth understanding of content pedagogy. The advanced program candidates are assessed in a variety of ways, depending on the program. The ESOL program assesses their candidates using the *work sample* at the graduate level and a *mini SIOP unit* at the undergraduate level. In the reading program, a *synthesis paper* is used at both graduate and undergraduate levels. A *comprehensive assessment plan* is used to assess content pedagogy in the special education program. Assessments have been adjusted and revised to better capture informative data or to provide more support for candidates as decisions based on the data were made for continuous improvement within the programs. The strengths and needs of the program and/or the assessment are identified in the *data analysis summaries* for each program.

As with the initial teacher preparation programs, attention is given to the integration of educational technology in the advanced programs. In the advanced programs, integration of technology is found in an *ESOL observation form* (see #4) and *end of experience evaluation* (see Domain 3c) for the ESOL program. For the reading program, technology integration is evaluated through the *synthesis paper* (graduate rubric and undergraduate rubric) completed within the practicum course. The special education program monitors technology integration through the *Assistive Technology Life Skills/Transition Plan*.

## **1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**

### **Candidates apply professional and pedagogical knowledge.**

The programs in the College of Education use a variety of measures to insure that candidates have a strong foundation in professional and pedagogical knowledge. Candidates have opportunities to develop and demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills throughout the sequence of coursework and into their field experiences. For example, candidates learn about and reflect on their understanding of children and adolescents and how they learn in their development and classroom dynamics courses. They learn to apply those understandings in classroom settings in later courses such as their core curriculum courses.

**Candidates know major schools of thought about teaching and learning and can analyze research and incorporate new information into their practice.**

Professional and pedagogical knowledge is first assessed early in the program for both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In the CUESTE elementary teacher preparation program, candidates complete an assessment called the *Kidwatching kit*. This assessment requires candidates to synthesize their learning about an individual student's learning based on various developmental perspectives (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical). Results of this assessment indicate that CUESTE candidates have an emerging understanding of the influence of development on learning, but will continue to grow in their abilities as they continue through the rest of their fieldwork and student teaching. The summative assessment in student teaching, the *final evaluation*, assesses exit competence in professional and pedagogical knowledge when InTASC standards 1 and 2 are evaluated. All candidates must earn a score of 3 on a four-point scale on all standards at the final evaluation. Analysis of the fall 2012 through fall 2013 final evaluation data for InTASC standard 1 shows a mean score range from 3.91 to 4.00. Similarly, the mean score for InTASC standard 2 final evaluations range from 3.89 to 4.00.

Graduate candidates complete a *Learning Theories and Application paper* in the second term of their program during their first field experience. This assessment requires candidates to apply the learning theories they have researched to observations they complete in multiple settings within their field experience placement. The data indicate that most candidates, both elementary and secondary, meet the benchmark score of 3 on a four-point scale for each of the criteria assessed. Just as with the undergraduate candidates, the MAT candidates are assessed on a final evaluation at the end of their student teaching experience. Professional and pedagogical knowledge can be assessed on InTASC standards 1 and 2 on that evaluation. All candidates must earn a score of 3 on a four-point scale on all standards on the final evaluation.

**Candidates consider school, family, and community contexts and consider prior experiences of students.**

Field work experiences and student teaching provide time for practice and reflection. For all candidates in the initial teacher preparation programs, these reflections are integrated into the *work sample* process that is started in their first term with a guided mini work sample and culminates in two full work samples in the student teaching term. Through the work sample, candidates show their skill with considering the school, family, and community contexts as well as considering the prior learning and experience of the students in the class.

**Candidates reflect on their practice.**

The lesson plans and end of unit reflection provide ample opportunity to reflect on practice and apply professional and pedagogical knowledge to improve on the instruction throughout the unit.

**Advanced program candidates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.**

Advanced program candidates demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge in their *content exams* and in a variety of ways throughout their programs. Each content exam for advanced programs includes a section on professional and pedagogical knowledge (see Table 7 for details). All program completers must pass the content exam prior to recommendation for licensure. Professional and pedagogical knowledge is shown in the integration of theory and practice that is addressed throughout coursework and field experiences. The culminating experience of a professional practicum offers a formal opportunity to assess professional and pedagogical knowledge in each of the advanced programs. Opportunities to focus on family, school and community contexts occur in experiences such as the *leadership project* or the *synthesis papers* written in the reading program. The ESOL program assesses professional and

pedagogical knowledge with *mini unit* at the undergraduate level and a *work sample* at the graduate level. ESOL candidates demonstrate the ability to reflect on practice to identify strengths and areas for improvement as well as an ability to explain implications of research on their practice through these teaching units. Collaboration with other professionals to create meaningful learning experiences for all students is a focus of the *comprehensive consultation/collaboration plan* required within the special education program.

Table 6

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1c: Initial Preparation Programs*

Standard 1c	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Initial Preparation Programs		
Candidates apply professional and pedagogical knowledge	<a href="#">Kidwatching kit</a> and <a href="#">rubric</a> <a href="#">CUESTE kidwatching data</a>  <a href="#">Learning theories and application paper</a> <a href="#">elem MAT Learning Theories &amp; app data</a> <a href="#">sec MAT Learning Theories and app data</a>  <a href="#">final evaluation</a> <a href="#">CUESTE mid and final eval data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT mid &amp; final eval data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT mid and final eval data</a>	Final evaluation data for the 13-14 cohort was not available at the time of this report.
Candidates consider school, family, and community contexts	<a href="#">work sample rubric</a> <a href="#">CUESTE work sample data</a>	Contexts, prior experiences, and reflection on practice are included within the lesson plan and work sample
Candidates consider prior experiences of students	<a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '13-'14</a>	
Candidates reflect on their practice	<a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '13-'14</a>	
Candidates know major schools of thought about teaching and learning	See Kidwatching kit data (linked above) See Learning Theories and Application data (linked above)	Each of these assessments requires candidates to research about and apply major concepts of teaching and learning
Candidates can analyze research and incorporate new information into their practice	See Kidwatching kit data (linked above) See Learning Theories and Application data (linked above)	

Table 7

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1c: Advanced Programs*

Standard 1c	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Advanced Programs		
<p>Reflect on practice and can identify strengths and areas of improvement</p>	<p><a href="#">end of experience evaluation</a>  <a href="#">ESOL end of experience eval data S13-F13</a></p>	<p>ESOL assessment</p>
<p>Advanced candidates are engaged in professional activities</p>	<p><a href="#">professional development presentation</a>  <a href="#">Rdg undergrad prof dev presentation data</a></p>	<p>Undergrad reading assessment</p>
<p>Have a thorough understanding of the school, family and community contexts</p>	<p><a href="#">leadership project</a>  <a href="#">Rdg grad leadership proj data (old)</a></p>	<p>Graduate reading assessment</p>
<p>Collaborate with the professional community to create meaningful learning experiences for all students</p>	<p><a href="#">Rdg grad leadership proj data (current)</a></p>	<p>Special education assessment</p>
<p>Advanced candidates are aware of current research and policies</p>	<p><a href="#">comprehensive consultation/collaboration plan</a>  <a href="#">SPED comp. instr. plan data 13</a></p>	<p>Contexts, prior experiences, and reflection on practice are included within the work sample and mini unit</p>
<p>Able to analyze educational research and policies and can explain implications for their own practice</p>	<p><a href="#">SIOP mini unit</a> and <a href="#">rubric</a>  <a href="#">ESOL mini unit data S13-F13</a>  <a href="#">ESOL mini unit data F12-W13</a></p>	<p>Advanced program content exams include a section on professional and pedagogical content knowledge which includes information on research, policies and implications for practice.</p>
	<p><a href="#">work sample rubric</a>  <a href="#">ESOL work sample data S13-F13</a></p>	
	<p><a href="#">ESOL Test Framework</a> (see domain II)</p>	
	<p><a href="#">Reading Test Framework</a> (see domains III and IV)</p>	
	<p><a href="#">Special Education Test Framework</a> (See domain IV)</p>	
	<p><a href="#">ESOL content score data S13-F13</a>  <a href="#">Rdg content score data</a>  <a href="#">SPED content score data</a></p>	

## 1d. Student Learning

Student learning is the focus of all preparation programs in the College of Education. All programs are dedicated to developing reflective practice based on the context for learning, including the students' prior experiences and developmental levels.

### Candidates assess and analyze student learning.

Candidates for initial licensure at both the undergraduate and graduate levels demonstrate their impact on student learning in the work sample completed by the candidates. Through the end of 2013, student learning was only measured indirectly through the *work sample rubrics*, specifically through the "data analysis and interpretation" and "reflections" sections. These rubrics assess the candidate's ability to analyze student achievement data and reflect on implications for practice.

In the CUESTE program, all candidates complete two "mini work samples," one in their first term and one in their second term prior to their full time student teaching term in which they complete the two full work samples required by TSPC. The mini work sample is an abbreviated work sample that is one week in length. It is used as a formative assessment to provide guided practice and extensive feedback in all elements of the work sample. Table 8 shows scores on the data analysis and interpretation and the reflections sections of the work sample for CUESTE students. All scores are based on a four-point scale.

### Candidates develop meaningful learning experiences based on developmental levels and prior experience.

The culminating work sample demonstrated CUESTE candidates' ability to analyze and interpret student learning as well as reflect on the data and its implications for teaching and learning. The candidates showed proficiency in data analysis and interpretation. Score details can be found by clicking on the links in the table.

Table 8

*CUESTE Scores for Data Analysis and Reflections Rubrics in the Work Sample*

CUESTE Work Sample Scores				
	Data analysis and interpretation		Reflections	
	First term "mini" Mean for all candidates	Last term "final" Mean for all candidates	First term "mini" Mean for all candidates	Last term "final" Mean for all candidates
<a href="#">Fall 2012 Student teachers</a>	2.71	3.50	3.07	3.71
<a href="#">Spring 2013 Student teachers</a>	3.37	3.77	3.30	3.81
<a href="#">Fall 2013 Student teachers</a>	3.50	3.29	3.67	3.71

Just like the CUESTE program, both the elementary and secondary MAT programs were assessed on student learning through the work sample. All candidates complete one mini work sample in the fall term. As with the CUESTE mini work sample, it is an abbreviated work sample that is one week in length. The mini work sample is used as a formative assessment to provide guided practice and extensive feedback in all elements of the work sample. Table 9 shows the scores for both MAT elementary and MAT secondary candidates for 2011-2014 cohorts. Score details can be

found by clicking on the links within the table MAT Work Sample Scores. Growth in ability to analyze data and reflect on implications for practice is show for all MAT cohorts where complete data is available.

Table 9

*MAT Scores for Data Analysis and Reflections Rubrics in the Work Sample*

MAT Work Sample Scores				
	Data analysis and interpretation		Reflections	
	First term “mini” Mean for all candidates	Last term “final” Mean for all candidates	First term “mini” Mean for all candidates	Last term “final” Mean for all candidates
<a href="#">2011-2012 Elementary cohort</a>	1.81	3.87	2.06	4.00
<a href="#">2011-2012 Secondary cohort</a>	3.04	3.83	3.24	3.78
<a href="#">2012-2013 Elementary cohort</a>	3.00	4.00	3.33	3.94
<a href="#">2012-2013 Secondary cohort</a>	2.47	4.00	3.18	3.71
<a href="#">2013-2014 Elementary cohort</a>	1.45	*	1.82	*
<a href="#">2013-2014 Secondary cohort</a>	1.89	*	3.17	*

\*data not available at the time of the report

Beginning in spring 2014, raw data on students’ pre/post assessments has been collected and submitted to the College of Education as part of the work sample process. Data analysis at the program and unit level will be possible using the student data achievement data submitted by all candidates. This will provide a more direct assessment of student learning. This data has yet to be included within the unit assessment system, but it will be included as part of the 2014-2015 program data analysis schedule.

**Candidates develop meaningful learning experiences based on developmental levels and prior experience.**

The ability to develop meaningful learning experiences based on developmental levels and prior experience is also assessed through the work sample. The Unit Planning rubric focuses on planning developmentally appropriate learning experiences within the context of the students’ prior learning.

**Advanced candidates: Student learning concepts and theories, assessments and analyses, and school and community resources.**

Advanced programs assess student learning through various instruments. ESOL candidates at the undergraduate and graduate level demonstrate their impact on student learning through the *end of experience evaluation* that is done at the culmination of the final practicum experience. On the three-point scale used for this assessment, a score of 2 was considered proficient. At the graduate level, 100% of the candidates received 2 or 3 on each section of the evaluation. At the undergraduate level, approximately 50% of the students earned scores of 2 or 3 on all sections scored. Mean scores for each section of the evaluation at the undergraduate level ranged from 1.95 to 2.39. The graduate level candidates are also assessed on student learning through the *work*. Data collected for the work sample from winter 2013 through fall 2013 yielded information on five candidates. All five candidates received a 2 or better in data analysis and interpretation.

Table 10

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 1d*

Standard 1d	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<b>Initial Preparation Programs</b>		
<p>Candidates assess and analyze student learning</p> <p>Candidates use these assessments in instruction by making appropriate adjustments to instruction and monitoring student progress</p> <p>Candidates develop meaningful learning experiences based on developmental levels and prior experience</p>	<p><a href="#">work sample rubric</a>  <a href="#">CUESTE work sample data elem MAT work sample data '12-'13</a>  <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '13-'14</a>  <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '12-'13</a>  <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '13-'14</a></p> <p><a href="#">student scores and statistical analysis</a></p>	<p>Data Analysis and Interpretations and Reflections rubrics are used to assess student learning. Unit Planning rubric is used to assess development of meaningful learning experiences</p> <p>Beginning with 2014-2015, students' raw score data will be part of the analysis for student learning</p>
<b>Advanced Programs</b>		
<p>Advanced candidates understand major concepts and theories of student learning</p> <p>Advanced candidates analyze student assessment data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning</p> <p>Advanced candidates use school and community resources to support learning</p>	<p><a href="#">ESOL end of experience eval S13-F13</a>  <a href="#">ESOL end of experience eval data S13-F13</a>  <a href="#">work sample rubric</a>  <a href="#">ESOL work sample data S13-F13</a></p> <p><a href="#">Rdg undergrad Literacy Profile</a>  <a href="#">Rdg undergrad literacy profile data</a>  <a href="#">Rdg graduate literacy profile</a>  <a href="#">Rdg grad literacy profile data</a></p> <p><a href="#">comprehensive assessment plan</a>  <a href="#">SPED comprehensive assess plan data</a></p>	<p>ESOL assessments for student learning</p> <p>Data Analysis and Interpretations rubric is used to assess student learning.</p> <p>Reading assessments for student learning</p> <p>Special education assessment for student learning</p>

Reading candidates focus on student learning throughout coursework and practicum experiences, but focus specifically on this in the assessment course at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. A *literacy profile* assessment demonstrates the reading candidates' ability to impact students learning and make decisions regarding teaching and learning decisions based on data. At the undergraduate level, the assessment has been revised to provide more detailed information on each candidate and for program assessment. The first time the assessment was used, the scores were reported as a total percent. The mean score was reported as 96%. The second time the assessment was used, each element was scored on a three-point scale, and all students who completed the course scored a 2 or 3 for every element. The rubric has since been revised and more detail has been added to the language to make it clearer for instructors and candidates. The course where this assessment is used is taught infrequently (once in a two-year period for each cohort). New data, when available, will help the program continue to revise this assessment. At the graduate

level, the assessment and reporting of scores is also evolving to refine data collection and utility. For fall 2011 through spring 2013, data were reported as class composites. Beginning with fall 2013, data were reported by individual candidate. Data comparisons are difficult to make because data were reported differently. However, the data reveal that the majority of candidates are scoring 3 or 4 in each element.

In the special education program, the *Comprehensive Assessment Plan* is the instrument used to assess student learning. The special education program candidates demonstrate impact on student learning through the comprehensive assessment plan project. Scores for the 2012-2014 cohort on this assessment range from 3.03 for assessment results to 3.78 for evaluation. Scores are reported on a four-point scale. Scores are not available for the 2010-2012 cohort because of a change in assessments between the two cohorts.

### **1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

At this time EOU does not offer programs for other school professionals. 1e is not addressed in this report.

### **1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

At this time EOU does not offer programs for other school professionals. 1e is not addressed in this report.

### **1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates**

Professional dispositions are emphasized within preparation programs from admission through student teaching. A focus on professional dispositions begins with the application process. All applicants (CUESTE and MAT) are asked to sign the *Statement of Professionalism* approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. The statement is included within the CUESTE application and is sent to applicants as part of the fingerprinting process for MAT candidates.

Orientation meetings for all CUESTE cohorts are held in the spring prior to matriculation and then again in the first meeting of the cohort in the first term of coursework. Sample *orientation agendas* show that dispositions are included within the orientation. In the MAT program ED 601 (Teaching as a Profession) is a course completed in the first term of the program. This class focuses on professional dispositions and responsibilities. The *syllabus* for this class is linked in Table 11.

Prior to spring term of 2013, a *self-report survey* of professional dispositions was administered to all initial teacher preparation candidates. Unfortunately, the self-report data was not useful as a program assessment due to the subjective nature of the instrument. Report data for that survey was collected, but it is no longer being used for program improvement (see Table 11 for data).

The Conceptual Framework for the EOU College of Education is indexed to the InTASC Standards, and professional dispositions are currently assessed with the *final evaluations* in the student teaching experience through InTASC standards 9 and 10. InTASC standard 9 focuses on professionalism and ethical practice, while standard 10 focuses on collaboration and leadership, two characteristics of professional dispositions that align with the expectations of a professional teacher as defined within the *College of Education Conceptual Framework* (see Tenet 3). For CUESTE student teachers in the spring and fall of 2013, all candidates reached or exceeded the benchmark of 3 (on a four-point scale) for professional dispositions (InTASC standards 9 and 10) by the final evaluation. All MAT candidates in the 2012-2013 cohorts met or exceeded the benchmark of 3 by the final evaluation. Final evaluation information is not yet available for the 2013-2014 MAT cohorts, but midterm evaluation data show that only one elementary candidate scored less than 3 on professional dispositions and all secondary candidates scored a 3 or higher for professional dispositions.

To document that candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors consistent with fairness and belief that all students can learn, the final evaluations are also used, but this time with a focus on InTASC standard 2 (Learning Differences) and InTASC standard 3 (Learning Environments). A review of data for the final evaluation scores on these standards indicates that all candidates met or exceeded the benchmark score of 3 on a four-point scale for both standards.

The *work sample proposal* submitted by each candidate prior to teaching each work sample requires candidates to describe the context of the school and community as well as how families will be invited to participate in the learning during the unit. Although numerical data are not collected from this proposal process, the proposal insures that professional dispositions are reflected in the candidates' plans for working with students, families, and the community.

For advanced programs, professional dispositions are assessed through the *end of experience evaluation* in ESOL, *reflection papers* in reading, and a *special educator competency evaluation* in the special education program.

The end of experience evaluation form is used to assess professional dispositions at both the graduate and undergraduate levels for the ESOL program (see domain V). A score of 2 on the three-point scale is considered acceptable. The graduate mean scores for all elements of domain V exceeded the benchmark. The undergraduate mean scores ranged from 1.67 to 2.04 across the elements of domain V. The ESOL program faculty have created a plan of action to provide further support for candidates and mentor teachers at the undergraduate level which can be found in the *data analysis and summary for ESOL*.

Professional dispositions are assessed in reading with an *I Care, I Share paper* at the undergraduate level and a *reflection paper* at the graduate level. A previous assessment for the graduate level was a *self-report survey*. Please see the *assessment summary* for details on the evolution of this assessment at the graduate level. Data from the undergraduate assessment indicate that scores for the different elements of the paper ranged from 3.16 to 3.71, showing that the candidates demonstrated competence in professional dispositions, including the elements related to diversity. Analysis of data at the graduate level is confounded by the fact that the assessment changed from a self-report survey to a reflection paper and that a small number of candidates (n=3) opted not to complete the assessment because it did not have a significant effect on the final grade for the course in which the assessment was given. The instructors for the course are considering ways to increase candidate participation in order to have more robust data for analysis. The 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years used the self-report survey, with data reported as a composite for each class. Data reported for the first reflection paper (scored on a three-point scale) indicate that 13 of the 15 candidates who completed the assessment scored at the acceptable or target level on all elements of the reflection paper. Data for the assessment given in summer of 2013 were collected as a class composite. Future data on this assessment will be reported on a revised four-point rubric and disaggregated by individual candidate.

In the special education program, assessment of professional dispositions is measured by the special educator competency evaluation (see standard 7.0). Results for this assessment are not available. Changes in key assessments and key assessment categories between the 2010-2012 cohort and the 2012-2014 cohort left the program without data on this particular standard prior to the writing of the self-study report. Professional disposition assessment occurred at the end of the spring 2014 term, and data analysis is in progress at the writing of this report.

The opportunity to complete program reports and a self-study for the unit have provided faculty with multiple occasions to consider how our candidates and programs are evaluated. As with several of the standards addressed within the program reports and self-study, opportunities for improvement and change have become apparent when looking at professional dispositions. During the next two academic years, the unit anticipates making major



modifications to programs, beginning with a revised conceptual framework that will guide the modifications. One issue to consider as the unit moves forward with programmatic changes is when and how professional dispositions are assessed for candidates. This is one standard that has not been as closely influenced by the conceptual framework as is necessary for a cohesive set of programs. The unit sees opportunity for continuous improvement with better alignment between a revised conceptual framework and assessment of professional dispositions.

## Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

### Element 2a. Assessment System

#### **Assessment system reflects conceptual framework and professional and state standards.**

The assessment system at the unit level is organized around the conceptual framework and the candidate data collected at *key transition points* (see link to Transition Assessment Points in Table 12). The assessment system is driven by, and designed to measure, assess, demonstrate and ensure that the institutional mission, the mission of the Colleges of Businesses and Education, the conceptual framework of the College of Education, and *state and professional standards for educators* are all reflected within the College's programs. To ensure that the College assessment system and processes provide program faculty needed data and evidence for continuous improvements, the College hired an Assessment and Accreditation Manager Fall 2013.

#### **System is regularly evaluated by professional community.**

The College of Education assessment system is reviewed and evaluated regularly by *program faculty* and community stakeholders during *program and consortium meetings*, and there is a constant flow of communication between the Field Coordinator, Assessment and Accreditation Manager, program faculty and key College of Education staff members in order to refine the assessment system further.

#### **System is based on professional, state, and institutional standards.**

Programs ensure that *professional, state and institutional standards align* in several cohesive evaluation measures. Each program has developed matrices of for each level of standards, their alignment, and relevant assessments. These matrices and assessment plans are followed consistently throughout the academic year.

#### **System includes comprehensive & integrated set of evaluation measures.**

College of Education programs have developed analyses for multiple and varying measures of candidate performance, including exams (both standardized state exams and within courses), surveys, written passages, work samples, and student teaching observations. Both the initial preparation and advanced programs have ensured that measures are cohesive and comprehensive by *aligning them with with professional, state, and institutional standards* at *key transition points* throughout programs.

#### **Assessments are conducted at transition points throughout programs.**

The College of Education recognizes the importance of identifying, and assessing candidates at key transition points throughout their programs. Each program has identified *key transition points*, identified appropriate assessments, and ensured, in conjunction with the Field Coordinator, Education personnel, and the Assessment and Accreditation Manager that these assessments are consistently conducted and data are *systematically collected and analyzed*.

Assessments of candidates are organized around the transition points that naturally occur in each program: when candidates enter the program (program entry), while candidates are in the program (program), and student teaching/program completion (program completion). Data collected at these transition points provide various data and evidence about candidates' proficiencies, competencies, and progress toward meeting the goals of the conceptual framework, individual programs, and state and national standards. For comprehensive details on the undergraduate and graduate initial preparation and advanced programs, see the *key transition points* (Table 12).

### College of Education Assessment System: Transition Assessment Points



Figure 1. Flow chart of transition assessment points within College of Education programs.

#### Evaluation measures assess candidate performance and unit operations.

Data is analyzed quantitatively by the Assessment and Accreditation Manager according to *program assessment and analyses schedules and the assessment timeline*. Data is analyzed as an aggregated whole, and when data yields an “n” of 10 or more scores per site and/or scorer, data is disaggregated (given our program sizes, this typically requires several terms of data to acquire the necessary “n”) so that faculty may discuss issues such as inter-rater reliability (the degree of consistency and agreement in scoring and interpreting rubrics) and possible reasons for differences between sites. The *qualitative* and *quantitative* information paired provide context and enable the program faculty to determine when exams are consistent, and when they require refinements in order to ensure that they are assessing candidate learning and performance in fair and consistent manners.

Candidate performance is examined in formal processes (e.g. analyses and summaries of data), and also through less formal processes, such as examination of student performance scores by Education personnel and the Field Coordinator as they are turned in to ensure students are proceeding effectively, and there are no concerns or issues where candidates may need prompt interventions.

#### Candidate performance is determined through multiple assessments.

College of Education programs have developed analyses for multiple and varying measures of candidate performance, including exams (both standardized state exams and within courses), surveys, written passages, work samples, and student teaching observations. Rubrics and have been developed and are regularly adjusted to ensure measurements of candidate performance are consistent and valuable. For full listings of program assessments, see *Assessment of Candidate Performance* (Table 12) and the *College of Education Data Matrix* (Table 12).

Table 12

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2a*

Standard 2a	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>Assessment system reflects conceptual framework and professional &amp; state standards.</p> <p>System is regularly evaluated by professional community.</p> <p>System is based on professional, state, &amp; institutional standards.</p> <p>System includes comprehensive &amp; integrated set of evaluation measures.</p> <p>Evaluation measures assess candidate performance &amp; unit operations.</p> <p>Assessments are conducted at transition points throughout programs.</p> <p>Candidate performance is determined through multiple assessments.</p> <p>Unit eliminates bias &amp; tests for fairness, accuracy, &amp; consistency.</p>	<p><a href="#">Alignment of professional, state and institutional standards</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program and consortium meetings</a></p> <p><a href="#">Qualitative narratives</a></p> <p><a href="#">Alignment of professional, state and institutional standards</a></p> <p><a href="#">Analyses and summaries of data</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program assessments</a></p> <p><a href="#">Assessment timeline</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program assessment and analyses schedules</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Assessment of candidate performance</a></p> <p><a href="#">Biannual consortium gatherings</a></p> <p><a href="#">Qualitative narratives</a></p> <p><a href="#">Key transition points</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program assessment and analyses schedules</a></p> <p><a href="#">Assessment timeline</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Assessment of candidate performance</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Biannual consortium gatherings</a></p> <p><a href="#">Qualitative narratives</a></p>	

**Unit eliminates bias and tests for fairness, accuracy, and consistency.**

The College of Education recognizes the need to eliminate bias and ensure that testing is fair, equitable and consistent through both qualitative and quantitative measures. When program faculty submit assessment data at the end of each term, they also submit *qualitative narratives* of their experiences with program assessments, often including positive experiences with the assessments, their concerns with the assessments, feedback from students, issues with implementation of assessments, and possible approaches moving forward. The qualitative and quantitative information paired provide context and enable the program faculty to determine when exams are consistent, and when they require refinements in order to ensure that they are assessing candidate learning and performance in fair and consistent manners.

The College of Education is cognizant that additional measures need to be taken in order fully eliminate bias. Moving forward, the College plans to explore routes for review of assessments by diverse educators, potentially through the *biannual consortium gatherings* with program faculty and staff and community stakeholders.

**Element 2b. Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

**System is maintained & provides regular, comprehensive information on candidates, programs, & the unit.**

The College of Education has established a regular and consistent *process of candidate assessment data collection* in order to ensure that data are *methodically collected, aggregated, and analyzed*. The College maintains a database system where information for applicants, candidates, university supervisors and cooperating teachers and assessment data are stored and accessed as needed. Graduate hire data is informally maintained within a Google spreadsheet that is updated by program faculty and staff when information is provided. Moving forward, the College of Education is anticipating state data on graduates from OACTE and seeks to improve the graduate hire collection process.

**Data are collected from applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty, & others.**

*Curricula vitae* for all College of Education faculty are stored on the cloud and available for program use as needed, the Colleges of Business and Education Operation Manager collects and stores professional development, service, and scholarship information for program faculty, and the Colleges have implemented a *Faculty Activity Form* to help measure faculty scholarship and service to the university and community. Additionally, the institution as a whole is working on a more refined measurement system for faculty professional development, and during the 13-14 Academic Year, the College of Education began participating in the Professional Education Data System (PEDS) report through the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), which has been an excellent impetus for collection of data including program faculty information and some broad aspects of student performance and student demographics, including diversity of candidates.

There are specific qualifications for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors and guidelines for the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers within the *undergraduate student handbook and the graduate student handbook*. The Associate Dean of Education ensures that all University Supervisors are qualified per their *curricula vitae*, and the Field Coordinator stores all licensure information for Cooperating Teachers and monitors qualifications.

Currently, candidate data are entered on forms that are *available electronically* and e-mailed to the Field Coordinator and/or Assessment and Accreditation Manager for entry. The database system has been regularly reviewed and refined by the Field Coordinator, and the Field Coordinator and Assessment and Accreditation Manager will continue to work to evaluate and refine the system in order to ensure that data collection processes continue to improve. New systems and approaches are being explored.

**Candidate assessment data are systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, & analyzed.**

Candidate performance data are *regularly collected, summarized, and analyzed* in aggregate and disaggregate data by modality (e.g. on-campus, onsite, and online), specific sites, and scorers when the “n” of scores is greater than 10. Currently, candidate data are entered on forms that are available electronically and e-mailed to the Field Coordinator and/or Assessment and Accreditation Manager for entry in the College of Education database. Data is analyzed quantitatively by the Assessment and Accreditation Manager according to program assessment and analyses schedules and the assessment timeline.

**Candidate assessment data are disaggregated for alternate routes, off-campus programs, & distance learning programs.**

*Data is analyzed* as an aggregated whole, and when data yields an “n” of 10 or more scores per site and/or scorer, data is disaggregated (given our program sizes, this typically requires several terms of data to acquire the necessary “n”) so that faculty may discuss issues such as inter-rater reliability (the degree of consistency and agreement in scoring and interpreting rubrics) and possible reasons for differences between sites.

**Records of formal complaints are maintained; resolutions are documented.**

Student issues, concerns and formal complaints are filtered to the Associate Dean of Education. The Associate Dean maintains an electronic record of all issues, concerns and complaints and the steps taken for resolution.

**Data are regularly compiled, summarized, & analyzed.**

Data are collected from candidate and course assessments in the undergraduate and graduate initial teacher preparation programs and advanced programs. As candidate data is received, it is entered into the College of Education database system (the goal is to have it entered within 24 hours). The database system is a relational system, and the Field Coordinator and Assessment and Accreditation Manager work with the tables within the system to ensure that data is compiled properly and accessible for queries and searches. Class data is sent directly to the Assessment and Accreditation Manager, and all data is analyzed quantitatively according to *program assessment and analyses schedules* and the *assessment timeline*. Once analyses are completed the Assessment and Accreditation Manager writes brief summaries of the trends observed in the data, and shares the analyses and narratives with program leaders. Program leaders then share the analyses with program faculty during program meetings, and they discuss the data, ask questions, make recommendations for adjustments and discuss the trends observed in order to inform their programs.

Table 13

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2b*

Standard 2b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>System is maintained &amp; provides regular, comprehensive information on candidates, programs, &amp; the unit.</p> <p>Data are collected from applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty, &amp; others.</p> <p>Candidate assessment data are systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, &amp; analyzed.</p> <p>Candidate assessment data are disaggregated for alternate routes, off-campus programs, &amp; distance learning programs.</p> <p>Records of formal complaints are maintained; resolutions are documented.</p> <p>Data are regularly compiled, summarized, &amp; analyzed.</p> <p>System is maintained using information technology.</p>	<p><a href="#">Process of candidate assessment data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Data analyses schedules</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Student resources for data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor resources for data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Curricula vitae</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Activity Form</a></p> <p><a href="#">Undergraduate student handbook</a></p> <p><a href="#">Graduate student handbook</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Data analyses schedules</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Data tables</a></p> <p><a href="#">Analyses and summaries of data</a></p> <p>Viewable in Associate Dean’s office.</p> <p><a href="#">Process of candidate assessment data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p>Database system viewable program personnel’s offices.</p> <p><a href="#">Student resources for data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor resources for data collection</a></p>	<p>Program data are disaggregated when “n” is 10 or above for sites.</p> <p>Electronic records are maintained locally by the Associate Dean of the College of Education.</p>

### **System is maintained using information technology.**

The College of Education currently utilizes a Microsoft Access database system for candidate performance data (course data, at this time, is stored locally by the Assessment and Accreditation Manager). The database is stored on a network with support from the Information Technology department. The database system has been regularly reviewed and refined by the Field Coordinator, and the Field Coordinator and Assessment and Accreditation Manager will continue to work to evaluate and refine the system in order to ensure that data collection processes continue to improve. New systems and approaches are being explored.

### **Element 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

#### **Data are regularly & systematically used to evaluate courses, programs, & clinical experiences.**

The College of Education utilizes available data to help drive decisions regarding *course content*, program design, and student teaching experiences in a variety of ways. For example, data is analyzed as an aggregated whole, and when data yields an “n” of 10 or more scores per site and/or scorer, data is disaggregated so that faculty may discuss possible reasons for differences between sites and adjust accordingly. Program leaders share analyses with program faculty during *program meetings*, and they discuss the data, ask questions, make recommendations for adjustments and discuss the trends observed in order to inform and improve their programs.

Faculty reflects on course content through feedback such as course evaluations and student communications and adjust their coursework, teaching and materials accordingly. Candidate performance is examined in formal processes (e.g. analyses and summaries of data), and also through less formal processes, such as examination of student performance scores by Education personnel and the Field Coordinator as they are turned in to ensure students are proceeding effectively, and there are no concerns or issues where candidates may need prompt interventions.

#### **Unit initiates changes based on data.**

Changes such as *evolution of assessments* (see Table 14) occur as a result of reviews of the candidate assessment data, faculty reflect on student feedback, performance, and classroom environments to drive changes in content delivery, data analyses drive program discussions of redesigns/improvements of assessments, and *biannual consortium meetings*, where key program and community stakeholders provide thoughts and concerns regarding programs and discuss candidate assessments (and potential improvements) help to determine assessment and overall program adjustments.

#### **Faculty has access to data.**

Faculty are exposed to data analyses and information in *program meetings*, there is a shared College of Education Resources folder where faculty may access cloud data that is on a schedule of *updates, additions, and improvements*, and the College of Education accreditation site is available to all College of Education faculty and staff. Faculty may also *request data* from the Assessment and Accreditation Manager or program leaders.

#### **Data are shared with faculty & candidates to help them reflect/improve.**

Candidate *mid-term clinical experience evaluations* are shared with students so that they may reflect on strengths and areas for improvement and candidates *self-evaluate* their clinical experiences. The Associate Dean reviews

institutional course evaluations and discusses them when warranted, providing opportunities for both the candidates and program faculty to reflect on possible improvements.

Table 14

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 2c*

Standard 2c	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>Data are regularly &amp; systematically used to evaluate courses, programs, &amp; clinical experiences.</p> <p>Unit initiates changes based on data.</p> <p>Faculty has access to data.</p> <p>Data are shared with faculty &amp; candidates to help them reflect/improve.</p>	<p><a href="#">Faculty reflection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Regular evaluation and changes</a></p> <p><a href="#">Changes in content delivery</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE Assessment Data Matrix</a></p> <p><a href="#">Process of candidate assessment data collection</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program and consortium meetings</a></p> <p><a href="#">Evolution of assessments</a></p> <p><a href="#">Regular evaluation and changes</a></p> <p><a href="#">Program meetings</a></p> <p><a href="#">Schedule of updates, additions, and improvements</a></p> <p><a href="#">Data request form</a></p> <p><a href="#">Mid Term clinical experience evaluations</a></p> <p><a href="#">Self-evaluation</a></p>	

## Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

### 3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

**Field experiences and clinical practices are designed, delivered, and evaluated with school partners and others.**

Partnerships between the College of Education and P-12 partners have varying levels of formality, depending on the relationship that has been built with the school or district. At the most basic level, the partners have no formal agreement, but candidates may work within the partner schools to obtain their initial 30 hours of required experience in a classroom prior to application to a teacher preparation program. In this case, the partner school hosts candidates for volunteer hours or a practicum course prior to entrance into one of the teacher preparation programs. These informal experiences in schools can lead to candidates returning to that school to complete field experiences or student teaching once admitted to one of the teacher preparation programs.

The next level of partnership is with schools that place candidates with cooperating teachers for field experiences prior to student teaching. In the CUESTE program, there are three field experiences (practica) prior to the full time student teaching term, each with increasing responsibility for teaching and classroom management. In the MAT program, there is a field experience that begins with the first contracted teacher day in the fall and continues through the fall term until winter break. Candidates have some teaching responsibilities during the field experience, but are not expected to fully take over the classroom.

The final level of partnership is with schools that have placed student teachers within their schools. Contracts with each school district are required prior to placing student teachers within the district. These contracts explicitly identify the rights and responsibilities of the school and the university.

Different models of partnerships between the University and P-12 schools are developed based on the needs of the local schools. In some cases, the school and the program leaders have developed a partnership where candidates are placed within the same school with the same university supervisor for most or all of the field experiences and clinical practice, allowing the candidate, supervisor, and cooperating teachers to develop a consistent and collaborative relationship to support the candidate's learning. Examples of this type of partnership can be found across both the undergraduate CUESTE program and the MAT initial teacher preparation programs.

Sometimes the relationships are developed informally, and sometimes they are based on more formal agreements, such as the Portland Metro Education Partnership (*PMEP partnership*) developed between the Gresham site and Gresham-Barlow school district. The goals of this agreement include yearlong residency placements, use of the co-teaching model, and provide strategic literacy and language support through reading and ESOL practicum placements.

Another example of a more informal partnership is the practicum agreement developed during the 2009-2010 school year between University faculty and the La Grande school district to redesign the scheduling of the CUESTE practicum experiences. Meetings were held between the University faculty and the elementary schools within the district to get feedback on how to better align the schedule for the practicum experiences to fit the schedules at the schools. The need for a consistent, daily practicum schedule was clear when the teachers indicated that they wanted candidates who would be at the school daily to be part of the morning literacy block. The practicum schedule was adjusted according to the needs of the schools, and that practicum schedule remains in place at the La Grande CUESTE site where it was developed. Documents created as a result of the meetings with teachers (*CUESTE practicum options, practicum model based on teacher feedback*) show the result of partner collaboration in designing the practicum.

Field experiences and clinical practice are regular topics of discussion and work groups within the Education Consortium. *Meeting minutes* from the Consortium are evidence of the discussions that are had and the decisions that are made in collaboration with Consortium partners. Issues related to initial teacher preparation programs and advanced programs are included within the Consortium meetings.

**Together, units and school partners jointly determine placement of student teachers and interns.**

The placement coordinator located on the La Grande campus is responsible for all field experience and clinical practice placements (at EOU these are generally referred to as practicum experiences and student teaching) for initial teacher preparation programs. The placement coordinator communicates regularly with site-based administrators to secure all placements and to proactively seek new connections with current or future partner schools. A collaborative process between the placement coordinator, candidates, and P-12 school personnel (administrators and teachers) determines field and clinical placements. Once the candidates complete a *placement form* indicating their geographical and school district preferences, the placement coordinator makes contacts with the potential schools, following the protocol identified by each district for seeking placements. Depending on the district, the placement coordinator may work with an administrator at the district level or the building level to discuss placement needs. When an appropriate match is identified between the candidate and a cooperating teacher, the placement coordinator collaborates with the school to secure a placement. Before placements can be finalized, each school district where student teachers are placed must have a signed *student teacher contract* on file with the College of Education. The CUESTE undergraduate teacher preparation program site leaders at Gresham, Pendleton, and Ontario take responsibility for coordinating local placements for CUESTE students because of their familiarity with the local candidates and school needs. Undergraduate advanced program practicum placements are generally coordinated as part of the CUESTE program. At the La Grande campus, the ESOL instructor places candidates in their practicum placements in coordination with district ESOL coordinators. The instructor works directly with the district and school partners to determine practicum placements. An *information sheet* providing information for cooperating teachers is shared on the *ESOL website* to provide school personnel with information about practicum placement expectations so that the university instructor along with the school partner can jointly determine the best placements.

Advanced program practicum placements at the graduate level are usually made by the candidate in consultation with his or her employing school district (if applicable) or with a local school if the candidate is not already employed. The instructor for the practicum coordinates with the school administrator and mentor teacher to be sure the placement meets all requirements for practicum requirements and supervision needs.

**Together, units and school partners share expertise to support candidates' learning.**

Evaluation of candidates in practicum experiences and student teaching is done collaboratively between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. In practicum experiences, university faculty confer with school partners informally when in the field supervising candidates. University supervisors and instructors invite feedback from cooperating teachers regarding candidate performance during practica related to university coursework. One example of how feedback is requested from cooperating teachers is a *Google Form* sent to cooperating teachers at the end of practicum experiences. This form was piloted by one CUESTE site during the 2013-2014 school year and will be expanded to other sites beginning in fall 2014. *Observation forms* are completed by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor during student teaching, giving the candidate feedback from both mentors. In addition, the *midterm* and *final evaluations* completed in student teaching are completed collaboratively between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor with input by the candidate during a three-way meeting with the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and the candidate.

A team from EOU attended the Quality Teaching and Learning summer institute in June 2014. This interdisciplinary team included representatives from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and school district personnel attended a week-long pedagogy institute focused on developing plans for strengthening the teaching of core practices within the teacher preparation programs.

Table 15

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3a*

Standard 3a	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Field experiences and clinical practices are designed, delivered, and evaluated with school partners and others	<a href="#">PMEP Partnership MOU</a> <a href="#">CUESTE practicum options</a> <a href="#">Practicum model based on teacher feedback</a> <a href="#">Consortium Minutes</a>	Specifically, minutes from the Nov. 2011, Nov. 2013, and April 2014 meetings address field experience and clinical practice issues.
Together, units and school partners jointly determine placement of student teachers and interns	<a href="#">Student teacher contract</a> <a href="#">Placement form</a> <a href="#">ESOL undergrad practicum information</a> <a href="#">ESOL grad practicum information</a>	
Together, units and school partners share expertise to support candidates' learning	<a href="#">Google form for practicum feedback</a> <a href="#">observation form</a> <a href="#">midterm evaluation</a> <a href="#">final evaluation</a> <a href="#">Report of Quality Teaching and Learning Institute team</a>	

**3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

**Candidates meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice.**

Entry requirements for clinical practice (student teaching) include passing the *Civil Rights* exam and successful completion of prerequisite field experience and coursework. At the MAT level, candidates must also have passed the *content exam* for their subject area(s). For elementary candidates, the content test that must be passed prior to student teaching is subtest II of the Elementary Education exam.

Exit criteria includes successful completion of two full *work samples*, at least 6 observation forms from university supervisors and from cooperating teachers, and a *final evaluation* completed collaboratively by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher with scores of at least 3 on a four-point scale for all InTASC standards. The final evaluation form asks supervisors and cooperating teachers to indicate whether the candidate is or is not recommended for initial licensure. To be considered a program completer and earn recommendation for licensure, the candidate must have all content testing successfully completed.

**Candidates participate in a variety of field experiences before clinical practice.**

The CUESTE program requires a total of 18 weeks of field experience placement, which includes observation, part-time student teaching, and full-time student teaching. CUESTE candidates participate in three field experiences prior to their student teaching term. The first practicum experience is ED 309: Structured Practicum. This experience is a 15-day practicum at the beginning of the school year, beginning with the teachers' first contracted day. The candidate works with the cooperating teacher to set up the classroom for the beginning of the year and remains through the first several days of school. The purpose of the experience is to provide candidates with knowledge about how to set up a classroom, create curriculum plans, foster a positive classroom environment, and develop rapport with students and families. The second practicum is ED 480L: Primary Core Lab. This practicum is integrated into the primary level core coursework and provides candidates with the opportunity to apply methods and knowledge they are gaining in their core coursework in curriculum, development, and content methods. Planning and implementation of a mini work sample (one week in length) is a requirement of the practicum. The third practicum is ED 380L: Elementary Core Lab. This practicum is integrated into the elementary level core coursework and provides candidates with the opportunity to apply methods and knowledge they are gaining in their core coursework in curriculum, exceptionalities, and content methods. ED 380L also requires a mini work sample and increasing responsibility within the K-6 classroom. Across the three practica, CUESTE candidates have experience in two authorization levels (early childhood and elementary) in at least two grade levels. Please see Table 16 for an overview of CUESTE field experiences.

The MAT program requires a total of 31 weeks of full time field experience placement, which includes observation, part time student teaching and full time student teaching. MAT candidates participate in a field experience (previously known as "A" Placement) that begins in the fall term with the teachers' first contracted day. This field experience continues until winter break. During this field experience, candidates begin with observation and work toward increasing responsibility within the placement. A suggested schedule for increasing responsibility is included within the *MAT handbook* to guide candidates and cooperating teachers. Within the field experience, MAT candidates observe different teachers, teach lesson in one or more content areas or class sections, and plan and implement a mini work sample (one week in length). The field experience allows candidates to participate in a variety of experiences prior to student teaching (previously known as "B" Placement). With both the field experience and student teaching, MAT candidates have experiences with their authorization and endorsement areas. Please see Table 17 for an overview of MAT field experiences.

**The conceptual framework is reflected in field experiences and clinical practice.**

The *conceptual framework* is indexed to the InTASC standards and is aligned with the work sample. The InTASC standards are the basis for *observations* and *evaluations* within the field experience and student teaching. *Work samples* are required in field experience and student teaching.

Table 16

*CUESTE Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*

	ED 309 (Prior to fall term)	Core 1 (Primary)	Core 2 (Upper Elementary)	Core 3 (Student Teaching)
Full-time observation placement	3 weeks			
Minimum of two-week placement in primary grades, including one full-time week with a mini work sample		2 weeks-spread across the term		
Minimum of two-week placement in upper elementary grades, including one full-time week with a mini work sample			2 weeks-spread across the term	
Full-time teaching responsibilities with two full work samples required				11 weeks

*Note.* Field experience is listed vertically. Term in which field experience occurs is listed horizontally.

**Field experiences and clinical practice help candidates develop knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in standards.**

Feedback from observation forms and evaluations (aligned to InTASC) help candidates develop knowledge and skills in professional standards. *Work samples* are required to be aligned with Oregon Content Standards and Common Core State Standards for students. In advanced programs, *practicum requirements* are aligned with the national standards associated with their content. The standards addressed in the practicum experiences are outlined in the *syllabi* for practicum courses or practicum assessments.

**Clinical practice allows candidates to use information technology.**

The use of educational technology is assessed within the *work sample*. The work sample is a requirement in student teaching for all initial teacher preparation programs. It is also used in the graduate ESOL practicum. Technology is assessed in the *synthesis paper* required in the reading practicum at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In the

special education program, the use of educational technology is assessed in the *assistive technology plan* developed in the field-based SPED 545/546 courses.

Table 18

*MAT ECE/ELEM and MAT MID/HS Field Experience Table*

	Summer	Fall Term	Winter Term	Spring Term
<b>Full time Placement for observation and initial teaching experiences</b>	<b>4 weeks (placement begins prior to the beginning of fall term at EOU)</b>			
<b>Full time placement with part time teaching responsibilities and practice work sample</b>		<b>8 weeks</b>		
<b>Full time placement with part time teaching responsibilities and work sample (2-week minimum)</b>			<b>8 weeks</b>	
<b>Full time teaching responsibilities and work sample (3-week minimum)</b>				<b>11 weeks</b>

**Clinical practice is sufficiently extensive and intensive.**

The CUESTE program requires 18 weeks of field experience/clinical practice over three full terms. The MAT program requires 31 weeks of field experience/clinical practice over a full year. Please see Tables 16 and 17 for an overview of field experience and clinical practice.

The fieldwork experiences provide candidates with increasingly more responsibility as they gain experience. They set the foundation for the full time student teaching that culminates the teacher preparation program. CUESTE candidates are ready to take full responsibility within the student teaching classroom generally within the first three weeks of the student teaching term. Guidelines for phasing the student teacher into the classroom can be found in the

*Student Teaching Handbook*. The expectation is that the CUESTE student teacher will have full responsibility for planning and teaching for a minimum of six weeks during the term. This responsibility can be within a co-teaching model where the student teacher takes the lead role in planning and instruction. Two full work samples are completed during the student teaching term.

MAT candidates have a full academic year of field work/clinical practice. The initial field experience begins with observation and gradually adds instructional responsibility to the candidate to provide a strong pedagogical foundation prior to full time student teaching. The student teaching placement begins with winter term. During the winter term, the student teacher has part time responsibility for instruction. A two-week work sample must be completed during winter term. Full time teaching responsibilities begin in spring term, and the student teacher has full responsibility for planning and teaching. This responsibility can be within a co-teaching model where the student teacher takes the lead role in planning and instruction. During spring term, a three-week work sample is required.

**Criteria for school faculty are clear and known.**

All cooperating teachers are authorized and endorsed in the areas they teach. The placement coordinator uses the *Educator Lookup* function of the TSPC website to verify licensing information. A copy of the licensure information is kept by the placement coordinator for all cooperating teachers. The respective program handbooks identify expectations in the section of the handbook dedicated to cooperating teachers.

**School faculty members are accomplished school professionals.**

Many factors are considered when making placements with cooperating teachers in addition to making sure they are licensed for the subjects and grade level(s) they teach. As described in Standard 3a, a collaborative process between the placement coordinator, school district, and candidate is used to make final placements. School administrators consider the experience and expertise of the cooperating teacher before making a placement. Some cooperating teachers have a long history of working with candidates and have demonstrated their mentoring skills over time, making placements in their classrooms a priority.

**Clinical faculty uses multiple assessments for candidate performance.**

Candidate performance is assessed formally through the observation forms and evaluation forms. Work samples are another formal assessment of candidate performance. A brief assessment at the beginning of the term, *Form A*, is submitted by the cooperating teacher. This gives the university supervisor and program leaders a preliminary sense of how the student teaching experience is going in the beginning.

**Clinical faculty gives regular support to candidates.**

Regular supervision visits are required throughout the student teaching experience. For the CUESTE program, a minimum of eight visits are required of the university supervisor during the full time student teaching term. A beginning of the term meeting that involves the supervisor, cooperating teacher, and candidate provides orientation to expectations and paperwork requirements. At least six observation visits are required, including a midterm evaluation meeting with the candidate and cooperating teacher. A final evaluation meeting is held at the end of the term. Candidates requiring more support may have more than the six required observation visits.

The schedule of supervision visits for the MAT program is similar to the CUESTE program; however the visits are spread across the full academic year. In the fall term, a beginning of the term orientation meeting is held with the supervisor, cooperating teacher, and candidate. Three observation visits are required during the fall term. A midterm

evaluation is completed at the end of fall, which coincides with the end of the field experience placement. In winter term, the student teacher begins a new placement, and the supervisor once again completes an orientation visit, this time with the new cooperating teacher and the candidate. Two observation visits and a midterm evaluation are required during winter term. During the spring term of full time student teaching, two more observation visits plus a final evaluation meeting are required. Candidate requiring more support may have more visits from the supervisor than the minimum required by the program.

Any candidate who is struggling with academic or placement issues may be placed on a *Plan for Success*, a plan that provides clear guidelines for successful continuation in the program and extra support from clinical and university faculty.

**Advanced teaching candidates apply coursework in classrooms.**

The practicum experiences for the ESOL and Reading programs are culminating experiences, requiring prerequisite coursework. The practicum experience is intended for candidates to synthesize and apply coursework learning in the practicum setting. As evidence by the *end of experience evaluation* and the *synthesis paper* required at the end of the practicum for ESOL and reading respectively, the candidate is expected to apply previous learning to the classroom.

The special education program integrates field experiences throughout the program. Coursework content is applied through a field based experience multiple times throughout the program. Two examples of application assignments in the special education program are provided in Table 18.

Table 18

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3b*

Standard 3b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Candidates meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice	<a href="#">Civil Rights Exam data</a> <a href="#">CUESTE work sample data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '13-'14</a> <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '13-'14</a> <a href="#">final evaluation</a> <a href="#">CUESTE content score data-NES</a> <a href="#">CUESTE content score data-MS</a> <a href="#">elem MAT content score data</a> <a href="#">sec MAT content score data</a>	
Candidates participate in a variety of field experiences before clinical practice	<a href="#">MAT handbook</a>	See page 16 for schedule
The conceptual framework is reflected in field experiences and clinical practice	<a href="#">Conceptual framework</a> <a href="#">observation form</a> <a href="#">midterm evaluation</a> <a href="#">final evaluation</a> <a href="#">work sample rubric</a>	Conceptual framework is aligned with and indexed to the InTASC standards found on the observation and evaluation forms

Table 18 (cont.)

Standard 3b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Field experiences and clinical practice help candidates develop knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in standards	<a href="#">ESOL ED 479 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ESOL ED 547 syllabus</a> <a href="#">Reading ED 439 syllabus</a> <a href="#">Reading ED 583 syllabus</a> <a href="#">SPED comprehensive instructional plan</a>	Advanced program syllabi and assessment evidence of standards addressed in field experiences.
Clinical practice allows candidates to use information technology	<a href="#">Rdg undergraduate synthesis paper</a> <a href="#">Rdg graduate synthesis paper</a> <a href="#">Assistive Technology Life Skills/Transition Plan</a>	See also work sample, observation form, and evaluations listed previously.
Clinical practice is sufficiently extensive and intensive	<a href="#">CUESTE Student Teaching Handbook</a> Also see MAT handbook p. 16-17 listed above	See p. 22
Criteria for school faculty are clear and known.	<a href="#">Educator Lookup</a> See cooperating teacher sections of CUESTE student teaching handbook and MAT handbook listed above	
School faculty are accomplished school professionals	See observation forms and evaluation forms listed above	
Clinical faculty uses multiple assessments for candidate performance	<a href="#">Form A</a>	
Clinical faculty gives regular support to candidates	<a href="#">Plan for Success</a>	
Advanced teaching candidates apply coursework in classrooms	<a href="#">ESOL end of experience eval</a> See undergraduate and graduate reading synthesis papers listed above See Assistive Technology Plan listed above	
	<a href="#">SPED comprehensive instructional plan</a>	

### 3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

**Assessments are linked to proficiencies in the conceptual framework and standards.**

The major assessments in the field experience and clinical practice are *work samples*, *observations*, and *midterm and final evaluations*. These assessments are aligned with the *conceptual framework*. Conceptual framework tenets are

noted on the rubrics for the work sample, and the observation and evaluation forms are based on the InTASC standards. The conceptual framework has been indexed to the InTASC standards. *Assessments in the advanced programs* are aligned to the standards for their respective national professional organizations.

**Multiple assessments evaluate candidate performance and student learning.**

Candidate performance is assessed formally through the observation forms and evaluation forms. Work samples are another formal assessment of candidate performance. A brief assessment at the beginning of the term, *Form A*, is submitted by the cooperating teacher. This gives the university supervisor and program leaders a preliminary sense of how the student teaching experience is going in the beginning. Student learning is assessed through the work sample. Student learning and implications for practice are assessed using the “data analysis and interpretation” and “reflections” rubrics from the work sample. This is an indirect way of assessing student learning. Since spring 2014, raw data on students’ pre/post assessments has been collected and submitted to the College of Education as part of the work sample process. Data analysis at the program and unit level will be possible using the student data achievement data submitted by all candidates. This will provide a more direct assessment of student learning. This data has yet to be included within the unit assessment system, but it will be included as part of the 2014-2015 program data analysis schedule.

**Assessments are conducted by candidates, school, and unit faculty.**

Candidates assess student learning with every *lesson* that is taught and through the work sample, which is an entire learning unit with multiple lesson plans. Assessment of student learning is a requirement for lesson planning. The work sample requires formal data analysis of student learning. Candidates also self-assess their clinical experience with *Form B-1*.

Candidates’ knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn are assessed by school faculty and University faculty through individual formal observations. Collaboratively, the school and University faculty along with the candidate complete midterm and final evaluations based on the InTASC standards.

**Field Experiences and clinical practice include time for reflection/feedback from peers and faculty.**

Each observation visit from a university supervisor provides an opportunity for the candidate to receive feedback regarding instruction, classroom management, and professional dispositions. Feedback is also provided through the work sample process with opportunity for candidate reflection after each lesson and at the end of the unit. Peer and instructor feedback is emphasized during the student teaching seminar class (*ED 412*). This course is held concurrently with student teaching and is an opportunity for candidates to interact with peers and the instructor to discuss classroom issues and give/receive feedback on issues within their placements.

**Field experiences and clinical practice include assessment of student learning.**

Student learning is assessed through the work sample. Work samples are completed in both field experiences and in clinical practice. During field experiences, a “mini” work sample (one week in length) is used as a formative assessment and opportunity for candidates to receive feedback on their ability to plan and assess a learning unit. Student learning and implications for practice are assessed using the “data analysis and interpretation” and “reflections” rubrics from the work sample. This is an indirect way of assessing student learning. Since spring 2014, raw data on students’ pre/post assessments has been collected and submitted to the College of Education as part of the work sample process. Data analysis at the program and unit level will be possible using the student data achievement data submitted by all candidates. This will provide a more direct assessment of student learning. This data has yet to be

included within the unit assessment system, but it will be included as part of the 2014-2015 program data analysis schedule.

Table 19

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 3c*

Standard 3c	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Assessments are linked to proficiencies in the conceptual framework and standards	<a href="#">Conceptual framework</a> <a href="#">observation form</a> <a href="#">midterm evaluation</a> <a href="#">final evaluation</a> <a href="#">work sample rubric</a>	
Multiple assessments evaluate candidate performance and student learning	<a href="#">ESOL assessments</a> <a href="#">Reading assessments</a> <a href="#">Special education assessments</a>	
Assessments are conducted by candidates, school, and unit faculty	See observation form, evaluation forms and work sample listed above <a href="#">Form A</a>	
Assessments are conducted by candidates, school, and unit faculty	See work sample listed above <a href="#">Lesson plan template</a> <a href="#">Form B-1</a>	
Field Experiences and clinical practice include time for reflection/feedback from peers and faculty	See observation form, midterm evaluation, and final evaluation listed above	
Field Experiences and clinical practice include time for reflection/feedback from peers and faculty	See observation form listed above <a href="#">ED 412 syllabus</a>	
Field experiences and clinical practice include assessment of student learning	See work sample listed above	
Field experiences and clinical practice include opportunities to work with students from diverse populations	<a href="#">Placement school demographics</a>	See school demographics tab

**Field experiences and clinical practice include opportunities to work with students from diverse populations.**

Field experiences and clinical practice for candidates across all programs provide experiences with students from diverse populations. Fall 2013 placement data show that candidates are placed in schools with high numbers of language learners, economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities. Please see the link to *school demographics* found in Table 19. Candidates have the opportunity to work with English Language Learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences. Because some placements for field experiences are

geographically limited, it is not possible to ensure that all candidates will have substantive experiences with diverse students from all identified groups. However, the programs strive to provide all candidates with opportunities for working with diverse students as much as possible. In the CUESTE program, many of the candidates are working on an ESOL course of study, so they have multiple experiences with linguistically and culturally diverse students. Reading course of study candidates also work with diverse students who are struggling readers. Many of the struggling readers are English Language Learners or students with disabilities. In all Initial Teacher Preparation programs, the Exceptionalities class requires students to be participant observers working with students with special needs. At the graduate level, all MAT candidates are required to participate in a service learning project with a focus on diversity. These projects provide candidates experience within a context of diversity. This project provides engagement with diverse community organizations for all MAT candidates. However, no data are currently available, as data were not routinely collected for program assessment. This project was not considered one of the key assessments, so data were not analyzed. Because data are required for this standard, each program will need to reconsider which data are collected (or not currently collected) that will provide evidence of engagement with diverse community and school organizations.

## Standard 4: Diversity

### 4a. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

Eastern Oregon University has a Difference, Power, and Diversity (DPD) graduation requirement for all undergraduate students, which means that students must take at least 5 credits in courses on diversity. In addition, the College of Education is committed to providing candidates with learning experiences and field experiences that will provide a foundation for understanding diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process. Coursework and field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education. As a result of the emphasis on issues of diversity within the undergraduate teacher preparation program, CUESTE is the only program within the university to gain approval by the Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPCC) for meeting the DPD requirement. Instead of asking approval for individual courses within the program as meeting the DPD requirement, CUESTE demonstrated a commitment to diversity throughout the program. For this reason, the *CUESTE program as a whole meets the University DPD requirement*.

The evaluations of candidates' work related to diversity is embedded at all levels of the unit and is addressed in course assessments, InTasc standards, state competencies, student teacher work samples, and reflections.

From INTASC standards, initial and additional licensure program faculty has identified standard 2 as the standard that directly relates to evaluating candidate's competency in diversity. Further, from standard 2, faculty demonstrates reflecting diversity knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be required of all candidates. While InTasc standard 2 aligns with courses throughout each program and provides a means to assess the curriculum and candidate attainment of this standard, the diversity proficiencies add a layer of richness and depth that demonstrates how candidates benefit from the design, implementation, and evaluation of standard 2.

#### **Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are articulated by the unit.**

The College of Education is committed to providing candidates with learning experiences and field experiences that will provide a foundation for understanding diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process. Coursework and field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education. As a unit committed to a community-oriented environment, our programs focus on knowledge and skills the candidates will need to have to work successfully with the students in their placements, as noted in the *Conceptual Framework* tenet 4: "Teachers must be culturally responsive: They must be conscious of their environment and culture, know the students that they teach, and act consciously to accommodate equity in learning."

Prerequisite coursework and coursework within the teacher preparation programs build an understanding of diversity and expectations regarding equity in education. Prior to program admission for CUESTE, all candidates have a prerequisite course, *ED 130* or an equivalent, which focuses on diversity and cultural competency. A diversity course, *ED 640*, is included within the MAT program because not all candidates have preparation in diversity prior to program admission. InTASC standard 2, with its focus on diversity, is assessed using observations and student teaching evaluations.

#### **Candidates understand diversity, including English language learners (ELL) and students with exceptionalities .**

Each program includes a course that introduces candidates to exceptionalities, inclusion, and special education law. At the undergraduate level this class is *ED 384/484*, and at the graduate level the class is *ED 641*. Reading and discussion around the topics of language acquisition, linguistic differences, and English Language Learners are

incorporated into the Language Arts course series for CUESTE (ED 354 and ED 355), elementary MAT (ED 620, ED 621, ED 622), and secondary MAT (ED 656, 657, 658). However, making that content overt within the syllabi for these classes is something that requires revision. The master syllabi for these courses have not kept up with the changing content of the courses. Students in the CUESTE program at three of the four sites all complete an ESOL course of study. At two of the sites, a reading course of study is integrated with the CUESTE program. All of these candidates have in-depth *coursework on emergent literacy, linguistics, and/or cultural diversity* that enhances their understanding and ability to apply their knowledge in the classroom. Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, a new course focusing on meeting competencies in working with English Language Learners will be added to the initial teacher preparation program. It will be piloted with the undergraduates and then added to the MAT program the following year. Assessment of candidate proficiency in meeting the needs of diverse learners is assessed with InTASC standard 2 through observations and student teaching evaluations. This is another measure for checking candidate understanding of diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities.

### **Candidates develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity.**

Within the field work and clinical practice settings, candidates are assessed on their ability to incorporate their knowledge into their practice. They do this through *lesson plans* and *work samples* that demonstrate differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners and data analysis that shows growth in all learners. They are *observed* as they teach and evaluated on InTASC standard 2 which focuses on the candidates' ability to meet all learner needs. Within the ESOL course of study, the *mini unit* has an emphasis on incorporating diversity.

### **Candidates connect instruction and services to students' experiences and cultures.**

In the planning process for the work sample, candidates are expected to incorporate the students' prior learning and the community context into new learning. The *work sample proposal process* requires students to reflect on individual learners and on the community, school, and classroom contexts. The ESOL mini unit requires candidates to explicitly connect instruction to students' experiences and cultures.

### **Candidates demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences .**

In all programs, candidates learn to recognize that gender, ethnicity, and class are factors that continue to the inequalities in education. Topics related to gender and or matters of diversity are explored in ED 130 on the undergraduate level and ED 640 on the graduate level.

### **Candidates develop classroom/school climates that value diversity.**

Candidates are evaluated on their ability to create positive learning environments and meet the needs of all learners through the lesson *observations* and *midterm* and *final evaluations* of student teaching. The observations and evaluations are based on the InTASC standards. Standard 2: Learning Differences (The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards) is an appropriate measure of the candidates' competency to incorporate equitable practices within the classroom. Standard 3: Learning Environments (The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation) also addresses the issues of cultural sensitivity, multiple perspectives, and classroom climates. These standards are assessed regularly throughout the clinical practice, thus providing clinical faculty with evidence on candidate competency in valuing diversity within the classroom.

### **Candidates understand teaching and learning styles and can adapt instruction.**

The ability to use multiple teaching strategies to adapt to student learning styles is found in InTASC standard 8, Instructional Strategies. Candidates consider multiple modes of instruction as they plan instruction, and they reflect on their practice after each lesson they teach in their work sample. This ability to reflect and adapt can be seen through *work sample* scores on the “meeting learner needs” and “reflections” rubrics. This information can also be assessed through the lesson *observations* and *midterm and final evaluation* scores for standard 8.

### **Candidates demonstrate dispositions valuing fairness and learning by all.**

As noted repeatedly throughout this standard, the lesson observations, work sample, and student teaching evaluations provide evidence of candidate competence in meeting learner needs, valuing diversity, and creating positive classroom environments. In addition to the standard assessments, one example of a class that puts an emphasis on diversity and equity issues is the children’s literature sequence of courses: *LIB 387* and *LIB 388*. Units on multicultural literature and its place in literacy learning are part of the coursework for these classes.

### **Assessments provide data on candidate ability to help student from diverse populations learn.**

Data from InTASC standard 2 on the midterm and final student teaching evaluations allows the college to assess candidates’ ability to help students from diverse populations learn. Data shows that the CUESTE candidates’ average midterm score is 3.57 and average final exam score is 3.86. The secondary MAT midterm average score is 3.33 with a final of 3.89. The elementary MAT average midterm score is 2.94 and final score is 3.77.

### **Assessment data are used for feedback to candidates.**

Candidates for initial licensure at both the undergraduate and graduate levels demonstrate their impact on student learning in the work sample completed by the candidates. Through the end of 2013, student learning was only measured indirectly through the *work sample rubrics*, specifically through the “data analysis and interpretation” and “reflections” sections. These rubrics assess the candidate’s ability to analyze student achievement data and reflect on implications for practice.

In the CUESTE program, all candidates complete two “mini work samples,” one in their first term and one in their second term prior to their full time student teaching term in which they complete the two full work samples required by TSPC. The mini work sample is an abbreviated work sample that is one week in length. It is used as a formative assessment to provide guided practice and extensive feedback in all elements of the work sample.

Just like the CUESTE program, both the elementary and secondary MAT programs were assessed on student learning through the work sample. All candidates complete one mini work sample in the fall term. As with the CUESTE mini work sample, it is an abbreviated work sample that is one week in length. The mini work sample is used as a formative assessment to provide guided practice and extensive feedback in all elements of the work sample.

Beginning in spring 2014, *raw data on students’ pre/post assessments* has been collected and submitted to the College of Education as part of the work sample process. This will provide a more direct assessment of student learning. In addition to using student learning data for analysis at the program and unit level, it will be used to provide feedback to candidates on their ability to help all students learn. This data has yet to be included within the unit assessment system, but it will be included as part of the 2014-2015 program data analysis schedule.

Table 20

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4a*

Standard 4a	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are articulated by the unit	<a href="#">CUESTE DPD approval application</a> <a href="#">Conceptual framework</a> <a href="#">ED 130 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ED 640 syllabus</a>	See tenet 4
Candidates understand diversity, including English language learners (ELL) and students with exceptionalities	<a href="#">ED 384/484 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ED 641 syllabus</a> <a href="#">Reading course of study check sheet (undergrad)</a> <a href="#">ESOL course of study check sheet</a>	Coursework lists for reading and ESOL courses of study
Candidates develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity	<a href="#">Lesson plan template</a> <a href="#">work sample rubric</a> <a href="#">observation form</a>	
Candidates connect instruction and services to students' experiences and cultures	<a href="#">work sample proposal</a>	
Candidates demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences	<a href="#">observation form</a> <a href="#">midterm evaluation</a> <a href="#">final evaluation</a>	
Candidates incorporate multiple perspectives in their instruction Candidates develop classroom/school climates that value diversity		
Candidates understand teaching and learning styles and can adapt instruction	see work sample, midterm evaluation, final evaluation links listed above	
Candidates demonstrate dispositions valuing fairness and learning by all	<a href="#">LIB 387 syllabus</a> <a href="#">LIB 388 syllabus</a>	
Assessments provide data on candidate ability to help student from diverse populations learn	<a href="#">elem MAT mid &amp; final eval data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT mid and final eval data</a> <a href="#">CUESTE mid and final eval data</a>	See work sample listed above
Assessment data are used for feedback to candidates	<a href="#">Form for student score data and analysis</a>	

#### **4b. Working with diverse faculty**

**Candidates interact with school, unit, and other faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups, faculty has knowledge and experiences to help candidates work with students from diverse groups, including ELL and students with exceptionalities and faculty diversity is increased or maintained through good faith efforts of the unit.**

Eastern Oregon University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer and educator, committed to building a diverse and inclusive community and learning environment. This commitment is best evidenced by a diverse population of students, faculty, staff, and alumni. To that end, the University encourages applications from women and members of historically underrepresented minority groups, as well as others who would bring additional dimensions to the University's culture, teaching and outreach missions. This philosophy is followed in every position description for openings in the College of Education. The College strives to have a diverse candidate pool for every faculty position that is hired. Two College of Education faculty members have recently been representatives to key university committees that focus on diversity and equity issues: the President's Commission on the Status of Women and the University Diversity Committee. As representatives of these important groups, the faculty members were part of the interview process as a new Human Resources Director was hired. The issue that both faculty members prioritized was the question of how to recruit and retain diverse faculty. This has been a challenge at EOU as a whole and within the College of Education specifically. Good faith efforts are made to attract and hire qualified faculty with diverse backgrounds, but it is a challenge not yet fully resolved. Some progress has been made with the hire of a new Dean of the Colleges of Business and Education 2013. He has brought a wealth of experience, scholarship and perspective on issues of diversity. Additionally, he is one of the only, if not the only, dean of color in an education unit in the state.

Although there is little racial diversity among College faculty, diversity is represented in a multitude of other ways. There are currently four bilingual faculty. Several faculty members have international teaching and/or travel experience to bring to the university classroom. We have faculty who have taught in special education classrooms. The p-12 teaching experiences of our faculty are broad, with classroom teaching experience ranging from 3-20+ years. Faculty have taught in rural, suburban, and urban schools, some with experience across all three contexts.

One faculty member has experience as a Peace Corps volunteer, and recently completed a sabbatical experience teaching ESOL in Costa Rica. A second faculty member spent her 2012-2013 sabbatical year in Costa Rica working and researching in a school. Another faculty member makes annual trips to Mexico to work with the same local community each year. Another faculty member has worked in Eastern Europe doing literacy training with teachers. A science faculty member spent a week at a research site in Ecuador.

Since 2012, three new faculty members with expertise in exceptionality have been added to the College of Education. These faculty members are located at two sites across the state, giving candidates opportunity to work with qualified full time special education faculty. A fourth faculty member with special education expertise is joining the tenure track faculty in fall of 2014.

Faculty members are cognizant of the need for bringing the larger diverse community into the classroom at EOU, and they share their diverse experiences within their courses to enrich the learning and broaden the perspective of the candidates whom they teach. A link to the *Faculty Qualifications* information is given in Table 21.

The College of Education was awarded two significant grants in the 2013-2014 school year that will provide further opportunity for candidates to interact with diverse scholars and mentors. The directors for both grants are faculty members within the College of Education. The *Oregon Teacher Pathway (OTP)* grant focuses on recruiting,

fostering and retaining diverse teacher candidates who are identified while in high school. The effort is to increase the number of diverse teachers in eastern Oregon public schools and to provide an opportunity for non-students of color to engage in culturally responsive practice. College mentors (candidates in current teacher preparation programs at EOU) who will be working with the high school students have opportunities to interact with renowned scholars of color in their training as mentors. These candidates have also had an opportunity to engage with Dr. Rich Milner and Dr. Geneva Gay on culturally responsive teaching.

The *Center for Culturally Responsive Practices (CCRP)* grant focuses on bringing prominent scholars of color to the University to provide professional development for candidates, school partners, and the community. Each scholarly presentation features an interactive keynote address open to all and a workshop available for teacher professional development. In the summer of 2014, the EOU community, the College of Education, and the eastern Oregon education community had an opportunity to attend a two-day workshop led by Dr. Geneva Gay.

Table 21

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4b*

Standard 4b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>Candidates interact with school, unit, and other faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups</p> <p>Faculty has knowledge and experiences to help candidates work with students from diverse groups, including ELL and students with exceptionalities</p> <p>Faculty diversity is increased or maintained through good faith efforts of the unit</p>	<p><a href="#">Faculty Qualifications</a></p> <p><a href="#">Oregon Teacher Pathway</a></p> <p><a href="#">Center for Culturally Responsive Practices</a></p>	

**4c. Working with diverse candidates**

**Candidates interact with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups.**

The student body at EOU is made up of students of various ethnic and international backgrounds; students with disabilities, gay and lesbians, first generation college students; and students from a variety of religious, socio-economic and language backgrounds. Because the college focuses on developing a community of learners, our students interact with each other during each of their courses. Our faculty facilitate learning and inclusion in their courses. They work with great care to assist each student in feeling comfortable sharing his or her perspectives and to connect each student with the other students in their course. In small group and large group discussions, candidates are involved in conversations that provide them opportunities to share in the perspectives of others. Further, candidates in the college are asked to work together in groups outside of class time to prepare for teaching experiences, create lessons or units, or complete a service project.

The College of Education strives to recruit and retain diverse candidates within the programs. The first opportunity for candidates to reflect on and communicate about their own diversity is in the admissions process. For the CUESTE and MAT programs, the admission application includes an essay reflecting on diversity. With the addition of the Oregon Teacher Pathways programs, the college looks to increase its diverse candidate pool by 20% over the next 3 years.

Socioeconomic diversity and gender diversity are richly represented within the candidate pool across all programs. Our programs also have a mix of traditional and non-traditional students, allowing candidates to gain valuable insights from working with other generations. Ethnic diversity can be seen within programs, particularly in the more urban Gresham center, and the more diverse Umatilla and Malheur County Centers. Ethnic diversity, though always a goal, is a challenge for most of rural Eastern Oregon.

#### **Candidates from diverse groups work together on committees and projects.**

As the unit continues to find ways to diversify the candidate pool (i.e. Oregon Teacher Pathway), we are exploring technology as a way to expose candidates to diversity at a distance. Collaborative efforts and projects are part of the philosophy of the College of Education, as seen in the *Conceptual Framework* Tenet 3 on professionalism. Working collaboratively with peers is a significant part of the coursework throughout preparation programs, and the value that is put on working together in diverse groups is apparent in the structure of classroom time.

#### **Candidate diversity is increased or maintained through the good faith efforts of the unit.**

Recruiting efforts include regular work with community college partners and meeting with students who may be interested in continuing their education with EOU. Our on campus content courses, particularly in math and science, are also visited by a faculty member for recruitment into the secondary MAT program. Our graduate advisor works with faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences to identify classes and/or students for recruitment. Campus visits with presentations by College of Education faculty have been arranged with Four Rivers Charter School (dual language immersion school) from Ontario and the Nixyaawii Community School (Native American Community). Faculty make multiple connections with potential students through community service activities and faculty presence in the schools. Good faith efforts are made to recruit diverse candidates.

The new OTP program is one tool for increasing candidate diversity. Now in its first year of implementation, two classrooms of high school students representing two school districts currently enroll a total of 50 potential teacher candidates in the Oregon Teacher Pathway class. This is a course designed to introduce students of color to the teaching profession, inclusion, critical pedagogy, and educational justice while supporting them in their college readiness knowledge and skills. Students who complete the course successfully will receive four college credits.

In addition, the dean of the College of Education has appeared on radio programs, one being the Spanish radio station in Hermiston, promoting opportunities for diverse candidates for our education program. Over 50% of Hermiston and Umatilla schools are from Latino communities. However, only 6% of the population in these districts has 4-year degrees. In an effort to engage candidates from these communities, the dean and the VP of student services has met with the Hermiston Hispanic Advisory Group and other stakeholders in the districts to develop stronger partnerships with these districts. Further, the dean and VP of academic affairs have met with and developed partnerships with the Nixyaawii Community School. The challenge facing the school is that there are no state licensed teachers on staff. Therefore, we cannot allow candidates to engage in field experiences with the school. We are working on efforts to help the school get at least one licensed teacher on staff. We have also met with the ESD in Malheur and

schools in that area to develop stronger partnerships with their schools with high ethnically and linguistically diverse populations.

Table 22

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4c*

Standard 4b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Candidates interact with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups	<a href="#">CUESTE application</a> <a href="#">MAT application</a>	Diversity essay included within application
Candidates from diverse groups work together on committees and projects	<a href="#">Conceptual framework</a>	
Candidate diversity is increased or maintained through the good faith efforts of the unit	<a href="#">Oregon Teacher Pathway</a>	

**4d. Working with diverse p-12 students**

**Field experiences or clinical practice occur in settings with students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and exceptional groups.**

Field experiences and clinical practice for candidates across all programs provide experiences with male and female p-12 students from different socioeconomic groups and different learning styles and abilities. Most candidates also have the opportunity to work with students from ethnically or racially diverse groups and English Language Learners some of their field experiences. Because some placements for field experiences are geographically limited, it is not possible to ensure that all candidates will have substantive experiences with diverse students from all identified groups. However, the programs strive to provide all candidates with opportunities for working with diverse students as much as possible. In the CUESTE program, many of the candidates are working on an ESOL course of study, so those candidates have multiple experiences with linguistically and culturally diverse students. Reading course of study candidates also work with diverse students who are struggling readers. Many of them are English Language Learners or students with disabilities. In all Initial Teacher Preparation programs, the Exceptionalities class requires students to be participant observers working with students with special needs. At the graduate level, all MAT candidates are required to participate in a service learning project with a focus on diversity. These projects provide candidates experience within a context of diversity.

The CUESTE program is offered at multiple sites across the state. Programs currently operate in Gresham, Pendleton, La Grande, and Ontario. (Coos Bay completed its last cohort of CUESTE students in spring of 2014 and no longer offers the program.) Ethnic diversity in p-12 students can be seen in the more urban Gresham center, and the more diverse Umatilla and Malheur County Centers. The MAT program offers placements across the state of Oregon. The geographic diversity of candidate placements is representative of the diverse p-12 students with whom program candidates interact. The *school demographics* sheet in the Consortium report linked below in Table 23 displays data regarding English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities in all Oregon school districts where our candidates were placed for field experiences and clinical practice in the fall of 2013. Of the

Oregon school districts where candidates are placed, more than 1/3 of them have an English learner population exceeding 20%. Greater than half of the school districts have a population of economically disadvantaged students that exceeds 50%.

**Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students.**

The data collected so far for programs provide evidence of equitable learning for students in clinical practice, but not for all students. The data collected are indirect evidence through work sample scores on meeting learner needs, data analysis and interpretation, and reflections. Each of these has been addressed in earlier sections of this report, and data have shown candidate growth and competence with each of these areas of the work sample (see Standard 1). These data indicate an awareness of the need for equity in learning, an ability to analyze and interpret data related to student learning, and the professional disposition for reflection on practice with an emphasis on improvement of instruction. While these data may not adequately show a direct connection to equitable learning experiences, it is clear that the programs have made learning equity a priority. Beginning with spring2014, candidates were required to submit *raw scores and data analysis* focused on equitable learning for all students along with their work samples. These data have not yet been included within data analyses, but will be part of the 2014-2015 data analysis cycle for all programs.

A specific assessment process for feedback from peers and supervisors to help candidates reflect on their ability to help all students is not currently in place within the programs. It is a topic addressed in the *curriculum and assessment courses* where candidates interact with peers, and feedback is provided from supervisors via the *work sample* rubric scoring guide.

Table 23

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 4d*

Standard 4d	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Field experiences or clinical practice occur in settings with students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and exceptional groups	<a href="#">Consortium report</a>	Download the spreadsheet and click on school demographics tab
Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students	<a href="#">Student raw data and analysis work sample rubric</a> <a href="#">ED 480 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ED 485 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ED 380 syllabus</a> <a href="#">ED 385 syllabus</a> ED <a href="#">611</a> , <a href="#">612</a> , <a href="#">613</a> syllabi ED <a href="#">650</a> , <a href="#">651</a> , <a href="#">652</a> syllabi	

## Standard 5: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

### 5a. Qualified Faculty

**Professional education faculty members have earned doctorates or expertise in assigned areas.**

The College of Education faculty members have earned, at minimum, Masters degrees in their assigned areas, and 72% of the faculty have doctorates that are relevant to their assigned areas, while an additional 11% are actively pursuing doctorates and conducting relevant research. As evidenced in the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet, faculty members pursue scholarship activities such as research and conference presentations that increase their knowledge and expertise. For example, faculty members are involved in more than 30 relevant professional organizations and they perform more than 60 education related services in local areas, regionally and statewide (which not only serve the communities but expand the knowledge of the content they teach to candidates).

**School faculty members are licensed in the fields that they supervise.**

The College of Education requires that Cooperating Teachers have at least two years of successful teaching experience immediately prior to supervision, and that they hold valid licenses for current assignments in their schools. These requirements are listed in the definition of key terms within the *undergraduate and graduate student handbooks*, monitored in curricula vitae (monitored and stored by the Field Coordinator).

**Higher education clinical faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in their areas.**

The College of Education ensures that faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in their assigned areas. This is accomplished via collecting and storing of professional development, service and scholarship information in personnel files (maintained by the Operations Manager), *curricula vitae* (see link in Table 24), measurements such as the *Faculty Activity Form* (see link in Table 24) and *general inquiries to all program faculty* (see Table 24 for link to fully maintained spreadsheet of faculty qualifications based on questionnaires and the Faculty Activity Form). Faculty cite examples of contemporary professional experiences such as several years of experience in the classroom, professional awards, continued involvement in local schools and on regional and state boards, trainings for school professionals, professional observations, and presentations at all levels. The *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet and *curricula vitae*, along with the Colleges of Business and Education mailing groups, exhibit the contemporary professional experiences that faculty members have. Faculty cited more than 40 education related services in local areas and over 20 education related services statewide and nationally.

Additionally, opportunities such as *sabbatical leaves* and the Faculty Development Fund (reviewed and distributed by the *Faculty Development Fund Committee*) help to ensure that faculty members are pursuing contemporary professional experiences. The *2013-2014 awardees of summer stipends and sabbatical leave* may be viewed via the link in Table 24.

Table 24

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5a*

Standard 5a	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>Professional education faculty members have earned doctorates or expertise in assigned areas.</p> <p>School faculty members are licensed in fields that they supervise.</p> <p>Higher education clinical faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in their areas.</p>	<p><a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a></p> <p><a href="#">Curricula vitae</a></p> <p><a href="#">Undergraduate student handbook</a></p> <p><a href="#">Graduate student handbook</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE in Action</a></p> <p><a href="#">Curricula vitae</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Activity Form</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a></p> <p><a href="#">Sabbatical leave policy</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Development Fund Committee</a></p> <p><a href="#">Sabbatical and summer stipend awardees 2013-2014</a></p>	<p><i>For quick reference, see the definition of key terms – Cooperating Teacher in each handbook.</i></p> <p><i>Field Coordinator also has relevant information.</i></p> <p><i>Also: see boards announcing services and scholarship by the Colleges of Business and Education office, group mailings with announcements and responses, and personnel files with Operations Manager.</i></p>

**5b. Modeling Best Practices in Teaching**

**Faculty knows the content they teach.**

The College of Education faculty has earned, at minimum, Masters degrees in their assigned areas, and 72% of the faculty have doctorates that are relevant to their assigned areas, while an additional 11% are actively pursuing doctorates and conducting relevant research (see the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet). As evidenced in the Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship spreadsheet, Faculty pursues scholarship activities such as research and conference presentations that increase their knowledge and expertise. For example, faculty is involved in more than 30 relevant professional organizations and they perform more than 60 education related services in local areas, regionally and statewide (which not only serve the communities but expand the knowledge of the content they teach to candidates).

### **Faculty helps candidates develop proficiencies in professional, state, & institutional standards.**

*Course syllabi* are founded on professional, state and institutional standards, and these standards are stated on the syllabi and reflected in the course learning outcomes. Standards are emphasized and used to frame course content and discussions. Program faculty ensure that course assessments are *aligned with professional and state standards* and the development of proficiencies in these standards are measured and analyzed so that course content and instruction can be revised when needed.

### **Faculty helps candidates apply research, theories, & current developments to their fields.**

Pursuing contemporary experiences, collaborating with other program faculty and staying abreast of current methods, research, theories and developments enables faculty to share knowledge and ensure candidates apply research theories and current developments in their fields as practitioners. Faculty models the use of research in understanding theories of learning and their application to the classroom, demonstrates best teaching practices through their own instruction, provides authentic assignments and experiences, discussions and feedback, and teaches classroom action research so that students may learn to directly apply educational research in their own classroom experiences. A comprehensive listing of ways that faculty help candidates apply research, theories and current development to their fields may be viewed on the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet in the column labeled “Best Practices: Faculty Notes”.

### **Faculty values candidate learning & assess candidate performance.**

As true educators, College of Education faculty greatly values candidate learning, and they understand that continuous assessment, feedback, and improvement are essential for producing effective educators. The programs are designed with assessments of candidate performance at *key transition points*, collecting data through observations, assignments, evaluations, reflective activities and exams. Program and course assessments are included in the *syllabi* for each course and program. Program faculty participate in regular discussions of student performances based on assessments and data analyses, and they adjust and revise their coursework as needed to ensure candidates are demonstrating proficiencies in professional, state and institutional standards, applying research, theories and current developments to their fields, and understanding how to integrate diversity and technology into their writing and utilize a variety of instructional methods.

### **Teaching supports candidate reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, & professional dispositions.**

Faculty implements many reflective assessment approaches throughout their courses and they utilize research, class assignments and reflections to provide opportunities for students to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills. As part of *professional and state standards*, professional dispositions are built in and assessed at key points in each program. Collaborative assignments help students to apply and build skills in each of these areas as well. See *Standard 1g* for more information on professional dispositions. For more details, see the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet, and the column labeled “Best Practices: Faculty Notes”.

### **Faculty uses a variety of instructional methods.**

Faculty demonstrates best teaching practices and a variety of instructional methods through their own instruction. A comprehensive listing of ways that faculty model and teach instructional methods may be viewed on the

Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship spreadsheet in the column labeled “Best Practices: Faculty Notes.”.

Table 25

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5b*

Standard 5b	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Faculty knows the content they teach.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a>	
	<a href="#">Curricula vitae</a>	
Faculty helps candidates develop proficiencies in professional, state, & institutional standards.	<a href="#">Course syllabi</a>	
	<a href="#">Program Alignments</a>	
Faculty helps candidates apply research, theories, & current developments to their fields.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a>	
Faculty values candidate learning & assess candidate performance.	<a href="#">Transition point assessments</a>	
	<a href="#">Course syllabi</a>	
Teaching supports candidate reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, & professional dispositions.	<a href="#">Program Alignments</a>	
	<a href="#">Standard 1g</a>	
Faculty uses a variety of instructional methods.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a>	
Faculty integrates diversity & technology into their teaching.	<a href="#">Summer Institute for Instructional Technology</a>	
Faculty assesses their effectiveness as teachers, including their effects on candidate learning.	<a href="#">Faculty reflection</a>	
	<a href="#">Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment</a>	
	<a href="#">Program assessment and analyses schedules</a>	

### **Faculty integrates diversity & technology into their teaching.**

Faculty incorporate multicultural experiences and the importance of cultural diversity within curriculum and in instruction, and candidates focus on diversity during their practicums while working with diverse learners. Courses in curriculum and instruction focus on meeting the needs of all learners. The children's literature courses focus on multicultural literature and strategies for working with English language learners is addressed within language arts methods.

Faculty models technology integration by including several technological mediums in their own instruction. In the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet, and the column labeled "Best Practices: Faculty Notes", faculty share that they use a variety of technological tools, such as smart boards (which were recently installed, through grants, in some of our education classrooms), online collaboration through a learning management system, video analyses of teaching, wikis, and digital storytelling. The institution offers the *Summer Institute for Instructional Technology (SIIT)*, where faculty develop new ideas to integrate technology effectively, and specific technology classes are taught within the College of Education programs.

### **Faculty assesses their effectiveness as teachers, including their effects on candidate learning.**

College of Education faculty demonstrates a desire to constantly learn, improve and grow. *Faculty reflects on course content through feedback* such as course evaluations and student communications and adjust their coursework, teaching and materials accordingly. In response to questionnaires regarding faculty evaluations and course evaluations (see *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* in Table 25), faculty members commented on utilizing faculty evaluation processes, course evaluations and student reflections and feedback as foundations for growth and improvements for student learning. The Associate Dean reviews institutional course evaluations and discusses them when warranted, providing opportunities for both the candidates and program faculty to reflect on possible improvements, and faculty

Many faculty participates in the college and institutional faculty evaluation processes, which not only ensures colleagues are receiving effective feedback and support, but it helps participating faculty to understand evaluation processes, develop evaluation goals, and critically think about their own approaches teaching and student learning.

College of Education faculty participates in the *Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment*, focusing on advancing student achievement of university learning outcomes and delivering high-impact practices to add value to all students' learning experiences, and they are in a constant state of review and assessment of candidate learning through the *assessment and analyses processes* discussed, developed and revised at the programmatic and college levels.

## **5c. Modeling Best Practices in Scholarship**

### **Faculty demonstrates scholarly work in their fields.**

The College of Education faculty actively pursues scholarly work in their fields through methods such as research, pursuing and achieving publications, submitting and giving presentations and finding, writing and earning grants. Faculty scholarship may be viewed in the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet (see link in Table 26). Faculty cited more than 40 education related services in local areas, over 20 education related services statewide and nationally, and almost 50 university services during the questionnaires and faculty activity form.

### **The type of scholarly work is based on the mission of the institution.**

Eastern Oregon University is an institution that focuses on liberal arts and professional programs. Part of the *university mission* states that “As an educational, cultural and scholarly center, EOU connects the rural regions of Oregon to a wider world. Our beautiful setting and small size enhance the personal attention our students receive, while partnerships with colleges, universities, agencies and communities add to the educational possibilities of our state”.

Faculty scholarly activities clearly demonstrate a focus on the institutional mission through practitioner-related and professional publications, presentations, grants, and committees that are focused on developing and furthering partnerships in local communities, academic communities and local, regional and state agencies. Faculty notes collected within the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet demonstrate the institutional mission of personal attention to students. The *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet and *curricula vitae*, along with the Colleges of Business and Education mailing groups, exhibit the scholarly work that faculty members participate in.

Additionally, opportunities such as *sabbatical leaves* and the Faculty Development Fund (reviewed and distributed by the *Faculty Development Fund Committee*) help to ensure that faculty members are pursuing scholarly work that is relevant to, and furthers, the mission of the institution. The *2013-2014 awardees of summer stipends and sabbatical leave* may be viewed via the link in Table 26.

Table 26

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5c*

Standard 5c	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<p>Faculty demonstrates scholarly work in their fields.</p> <p>The type of scholarly work is based on the mission of the institution.</p>	<p><a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a></p> <p><a href="#">Curricula vitae</a></p> <p><a href="#">COE in Action</a></p> <p><a href="#">EOU Mission Statement</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a></p> <p><a href="#">Sabbatical leave policy</a></p> <p><a href="#">Faculty Development Fund Committee</a></p> <p><a href="#">Sabbatical and summer stipend awardees 2013-2014</a></p>	<p>Faculty scholarly accomplishments are shared through the Colleges of Business and Education mailing groups as well.</p> <p><i>The announcements of scholarly achievements and the responses from other faculty demonstrate the institutional culture and goals of collaboration, professionalism, and partnership.</i></p>

## 5d. Modeling Best Practices in Services

**Faculty provides service to the university, schools, & community consistent with the mission of the unit & institution.**

College of Education faculty epitomizes the *mission of the institution*, connecting “the rural regions of Oregon to a wider world”, and developing “partnerships with colleges, universities, agencies and communities [to] add to the educational possibilities of our state.” Their high degree of involvement within the College, university, and local schools and communities is demonstrated in the *curricula vitae*, and *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet, where more than 40 local community involvement projects are cited within faculty areas of expertise alone.

Table 27

### *Electronic Artifacts in Support of Standard 5d*

Standard 5d	Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
Faculty provides service to the university, schools, & community consistent with the mission of the unit & institution.	<a href="#">COE in Action</a> <a href="#">EOU Mission Statement</a> <a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a> <a href="#">Curricula vitae</a>	<i>Also: see boards announcing services and scholarship by the Colleges of Business and Education office, group mailings with announcements and responses, and personnel files with Operations Manager.</i>
Faculty collaborates with school faculty & faculty in other units of the institution.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a> <a href="#">Curricula vitae</a>	
Faculty members are actively involved in professional associations.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a> <a href="#">Curricula vitae</a>	
Faculty provides education related services at local, state, national, & international levels.	<a href="#">Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship</a> <a href="#">Curricula vitae</a>	

### **Faculty collaborates with school faculty & faculty in other units of the institution.**

Faculty serve on College committees and institutional committees as service to the College and to the wider University community as part of the shared governance model at EOU. Faculty listed almost 50 university activities that involve collaboration with their College colleagues and other institutional colleagues. Faculty also frequently

collaborates with faculty from the other college within the institution (College of Arts and Sciences) on advisory committees, in research and presentations, and providing professional development opportunities. The Quality Teaching and Learning grant and the GO STEM grant awarded to the College of Education in spring 2014 were collaborative efforts with faculty partners from the College of Arts and Sciences. The *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet display the highly collaborative culture that the College of Education cultivates.

**Faculty members are actively involved in professional associations.**

Faculty members serve on advisory boards within professional associations, serve as officers and reviewers, and work with publishers for professional associations. College faculty are active, highly involved members, working towards ensuring that education is constantly growing and improving, serving students in the best possible manner. Faculty participate in their areas of expertise – on the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet, 36 organizations are represented in multiple disciplines in education.

**Faculty provides education related services at local, state, national, & international levels.**

Faculty volunteers in local school systems provide instruction assistance within school districts, serve on local educational boards, serve on state boards that directly impact delivery of educational services and utilize their skill sets on national and international boards. Faculty also present and collaborate at all levels in greatly varying and expansive manners. The *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet and *curricula vitae*, along with the Colleges of Business and Education mailing groups, exhibit the services College of Education faculty provide. Faculty cited more than 40 education related services in local areas, over 20 education related services statewide and nationally, and almost 50 university services during the questionnaires and faculty activity form.

## **5e. Unit Evaluation of Faculty Performance**

**Systematic & comprehensive evaluation of faculty teaching performance is conducted by the unit.**

During the 2012-2013 academic year, Eastern Oregon University revised faculty evaluation processes, criteria and timelines. Faculty is evaluated using course evaluations, peer evaluations, commitment to subject discipline, institutional service and outreach to the community (relevant to faculty discipline and assigned areas). All faculty members within the institution are evaluated at least once every five year period. The Dean of each unit conducts a post-tenure review every two years with tenured faculty. Tenure-track faculty have informal reviews within the first two years of employment and formal portfolio reviews during years three and five of employment in order to achieve tenure. Fixed-term faculty have teaching evaluations each year for their first three years of employment and every third year after if there is a record of positive evaluations. Details may be viewed in the *Personnel Process and Procedure Handbook* and *Academic Personnel Processes Calendar*.

The institution is highly focused on shared governance; the *Faculty Personnel Committee* (with at least 2 tenured teaching faculty from the College of Education serving as members at all times) reviews and recommends policies regarding evaluation, procedures, tenure and promotion and receives and reviews all recommendations for tenure, promotion, merit, post-tenure review and continuing review. Additionally, faculty members observe colleagues and make recommendations as part of evaluation processes.

**Faculty evaluations are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service.**

College of Education faculty demonstrates a desire to constantly learn, improve and grow. During questionnaires regarding faculty evaluations and course evaluations (see *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service*





Within the College of Education, the conceptual framework incorporates proficiencies with diversity and technology, understanding and utilization of learning theories, research, and emerging practices, and ensures that all candidate proficiencies are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. *Program and College meetings* focus on performance assessments that appropriate fit with the conceptual framework – in turn, developing faculty professionally. Additionally, the *Center for Culturally Responsive Practices (CCRP)*, which is focused on cultural competency in teaching has been established within the College of Education. The CCRP offers professional development sessions to all faculty by nationally and internationally renowned scholars of color. Faculty attend and present at conferences, participate in local, state, regional, national and international associations that are focused on emerging practices, diversity, technology, and performance assessment, as evidenced in the *Faculty Qualifications, Professionalism, Service and Scholarship* spreadsheet data.

## Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

### 6a. Unit Leadership and Authority:

**Unit has leadership & authority to plan, deliver, & operate coherent programs.**

The College of Education reports to the dean of the Colleges of Business and Education. There is a 1.0 FTE Associate Dean assigned to the College of Education and a 1.0 FTE Operational Management as assist in the operations of the college. The [Gresham campus](#) (located on the Mount Hood Community College campus), [Ontario campus](#) (located on the Treasure Valley Community College campus) both have a faculty program led. The programs on [Pendleton campus](#) (located on the Blue Mountain Community College campus) are coordinated by the Associate Dean. [See Organizational chart for more details.](#)

**Unit manages/coordinates all programs for the preparation of education professionals.**

The College is comprised of undergraduate and graduate programs. The programs are Undergraduate Teacher Preparation (CUESTE), Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT), and Masters of Science in Education. Within these programs we have several endorsement areas: English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Reading, and Special Education. The programs are located in La Grande, Gresham, Pendleton, and Ontario. In our MAT program students obtain an initial Oregon license in either primary/elementary or middle/high level. In each of area, faculty members have regularly scheduled meetings to address curriculum and operational related issues.

In addition, the College of Education have monthly meetings, led by the Associate Dean, to discuss overall program to ensure that programs are in alignments with TSPC, accreditation standards, the university mission and college mission. In these meetings the faculty also vote and make decisions of program changes/adjustments and when necessary make recommendations to the Dean regarding proposals for new programs, degrees, licenses, certificates; significant changes or additions to existing programs; recommendations for policy and procedures related to the curriculum (such as course approval and program changes); and procedures for using data from the assessment committee as a basis for improving program offerings.

**Unit's recruiting & admissions policies are clear & consistent in publications & catalogs.**

Recruiting efforts vary by program, and may include education fair exhibits, online advertising, and print advertising. Key program personnel and admissions personnel who have been trained in program specific information as well as application and admissions criteria staff exhibits. Application and admission requirements are clearly posted on our [website](#), as well as listed on program [undergraduate handbook](#) and [graduate handbook](#), which is updated each year. Prior to any changes being made, either online or in print format, these materials are reviewed by College of Education program personnel, marketing staff, and the university admissions office to ensure clarity and consistency. Completed application files are reviewed by at least one admissions staff person before being checked out to the admissions committee to ensure that these standards are being met for each applicant.

For [MAT admissions](#) all applications must include an official bachelor's level degree transcript granted from an accredited university (or equivalent in the case of international degrees), letters of recommendation, a personal statement, and in some cases, teaching license, official master's degree transcript from a regionally accredited university, and resume.

**Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, & advertisements are accurate & current.**

The university, through the registrar's office, maintains an [academic catalog](#) that includes an academic calendar, grading policies, and is maintained as an online document that is up-to-date. The registrar's office works with the dean's office/program staff to ensure that correct and adequate information is about the programs in the College of Education. Program offices and the dean's office of the respective programs review the information contained in Bulletin, including grading policies.

The president's staff on a yearly basis approves the academic calendar. The academic calendars currently exist in "planning form" through Summer 2015. The academic calendar is also included in Bulletin, and, thus, reviewed at that time.

**Unit ensures candidate access to counseling & advising.**

There are two professional advisors who work with students throughout their program, one advisor for undergraduates and one for graduate programs. Each student in the college is assigned an [advisor](#) when they enter one of the programs in the college.

In addition, the [Office of Student Success and Engagement](#) houses all student services for the university. [Counseling services](#) are available through the [Student Health Center](#). Counseling is a free and confidential resource available to all EOU students. This office provides individual, couples, crisis intervention, and group counseling. Students come to the Counseling Center for a variety of reasons. Some are looking for help in coping with the pressures associated with a challenging academic environment or adjustment to college life. Others want to learn how to be more effective in developing, negotiating, or maintaining relationships with others. Counseling can be beneficial for students who are feeling depressed or anxious, as well as those who want to examine their beliefs or explore their current life situation.

**Faculty participates in program design, implementation, & evaluation.**

The College of Education have month meetings, led by the Associate Dean, to discuss overall program design, implementation, and evaluation to ensure that programs are in alignments with TSPC, accreditation standards, the university mission and college mission. Program area faculty also meet at least once per term to evaluate program data, implementation, and enhance program design.

**Collaboration between unit faculty & other faculty members is facilitated by the unit.**

The College of Education maintains a strong relationship with the [College of Arts and Sciences](#) (CAS). Course offerings in the College of Arts and Sciences support the College of Education programs in Multidisciplinary Studies, CUESTE, and the MAT. The faculty in the college consults with faculty in the CAS on content area related to the multidisciplinary studies degree. Before making changes to content area courses related to the education major, faculty in CAS who teach content area course contact faculty in the COE to discuss changes to CAS programs that impact our

multidisciplinary studies degree. CAS faculty are also consulted to review content areas on transcripts of applicants applying to get into the MAT. The Associate Dean plans meetings with each of the relevant discipline CAS chairs to discuss the updated content tests and see how COE can better align recommended prerequisite coursework with the content test frameworks.

The College of Education regularly contributes to professional development activities centered on effective teaching within the university. Faculty participates in and leads [Colloquia](#), the [Center for Teaching and Learning](#), and the [Summer Institute for Instructional Technology](#).

## **6b. Unit Budget**

### **6b.1. Unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations at least proportionate to other units on campus with clinical components.**

The [College Budget](#) supports the activities of teaching, scholarship, and service. The total budget for the unit for 2013-2014 is \$3,281,317. The percentage of total unrestricted academic expenditures allocated to the college unit is 21.32%. Curricular support comes through the unit's service and supplies budget - \$141,850. All other costs are associated with personnel.

### **6b.2. Budget adequately supports on campus & clinical work essential for preparation of education professionals.**

Adjunct Faculty who supervise students' clinical experience are paid \$703 per student. As part of faculty teaching load, they are given 1 credit per student for student teacher experiences. If supervising student teaching is part of their overload, faculty are paid \$1036 per student. These amounts are based on the Faculty Bargaining Agreement.

## **6c. Personnel**

### **6c.1. Workload policies, including class size & online delivery, allow faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in schools, & service.**

Faculty work load is regulated by the collective bargaining contract [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#), and specifically determined by the Dean. Faculty professional work is based upon fall, winter, and spring terms. Faculty load is calculated in terms of load hours. The number of load hours credited for courses is equal to the credit hours assigned to the course. Faculty Tenured or Tenure track teaching load consists of 36 quarter hours per academic year. An additional 9 credits is expected of faculty for scholarship/creative endeavors, community outreach, and service to the University. These specific requirements are detailed in the Promotion and Tenure Handbook.

Fixed-Term Faculty Instructor/Senior Instructor teaching load consists of 45 quarter hours per academic year with no service or outreach. Fixed-Term Faculty Assistant Professor teaching load consists of 36 instructional hours and 9 hours assigned as scholarship, service, and outreach computed on a 1.0 FTE load.

### **6c.2. Faculty loads generally don't exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching & 9 hours for graduate teaching.**

Faculty load credits are considered equal whether undergraduate or graduate teaching. Generally faculty will not exceed more than 12 credits per term.

**6c.3. Supervision of clinical practice does not generally exceed 18 candidates for each full time equivalent faculty supervisor.**

For the 2013-14 academic year we had 46 undergraduate candidates supervised with an average of 5.1 candidates for each faculty supervisor and 22 graduate candidates with an average of 5.5 candidates for each faculty supervisor.

**6c.4 Appropriate use of full-time, part-time, & clinical faculty, as well as graduate assistants, ensures program coherence & integrity.**

Part time faculty are employed by the college and utilized by the programs when their expertise or where geography or logistics are favorable. Although there is a preference for full time faculty, there are situations where part time faculty are ideal. Full time faculty contribute approximately 500 credit hours to program instruction, while part time faculty teach about 60 credit hours total per year.

**6.c.5 An adequate number of support personnel exist.**

There are six support personnel assigned the college: 1) Field Placement/Community Engagement/License Personnel; 2) Undergraduate Advisor; 3) Graduate Advisor; 4) CUESTE Program Coordinator; 5) MAT Program Coordinator; and 6) College Operations Manager.

**6c.6 Adequate resources & opportunities for professional development exist.**

Faculty Development is supported through the [Faculty Development Fund Committee](#). These funds provide faculty with an opportunity to apply for support for necessary travel to conduct scholarly work, to attain increased knowledge or skills to improve teaching, or to acquire necessary materials, skills, and/or information necessary for curriculum development or University program development. The Fund is open to all faculty regardless of rank, tenure or appointment. The maximum amount of the award is \$2000. All faculty in the bargaining unit are eligible for these funds. In addition, the College supports faculty for an additional amount up to \$1200.

Funding for summer Faculty Scholars is also available in a competitive process, with the availability of a full stipend (\$11,000) or a partial stipend (\$5,500). Summer Faculty Scholars submit research proposals through the College Dean during the fall term, and winners are announced in early spring.

**6d. Unit Facilities**

**6d.1. Adequate campus & school facilities support candidates learning**

Eastern Oregon University offers general purpose student computer labs that are available to students at no cost. Printers are also available to students to use however students must provide their paper. Student Lab Aides are on duty to assist users with any hardware or software issues that occur in the labs so our student users can have a quiet area to study or research their work.

General use labs are located in several places around campus and are for EOU student use only with the locations listed below. Hours for the labs change throughout the term due to holidays, breaks and special occasions. Contact the EOU IT Help Desk if you have any questions

Website: <http://www.eou.edu/it/student-computer-labs/>

## **6d.2 Facilities support faculty & candidate use of information technology in instruction.**

Below is a list of each smart classroom that instructors can use technology for their lessons. Click on the room number for information on how to work the equipment provided in each room. For more information on equipment found in classrooms, please contact the EOU IT Help Desk at (541) 962-3111 or [helpdesk@eou.edu](mailto:helpdesk@eou.edu). Website: <http://www.eou.edu/it/smart-classrooms/>

With two grants through OEIB, we were able to purchase two smart boards and hire instructional technology personnel. The college added an additional smart board, iPads, and Android tablets through funding from an outside donor. These additional will allow us to provide additional technological support to our students, faculty, and educational partners.

## **6e Element Resources including Technology**

### **6e.1 Unit allocates resources across programs.**

The institution offers the following software options: learning management system (in 2014 moving from Blackboard to Canvas), g-mail as the email system, and Banner software for student record management. Eastern Oregon University provides Google Email accounts for admitted licensure and degree seeking students, powered by the full Google Apps Education Suite.

Faculty development in technology is handled by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The purpose of the Center for Teaching and Learning is to promote engagement and effective teaching that cultivates significant student learning using technology and other technics for enhancing student learning.

### **6e.2 Unit provides adequate resources to develop & implement an assessment system.**

In the fall of 2014, the college hired an Assessment Coordinator to assist with the development and implement of assessment. The coordinator works with faculty on collecting and analyzing data for program improving purposes. The assessment system utilizes various data collection software which runs through the Assessment Coordinator.

### **6e.3 Unit has adequate information technology resources to support faculty & candidates.**

There is an Information Technology Services department, which also provides students and faculty helpline. Webster is Eastern Oregon University's information system that provides updated personal, confidential information through a secure online interface. It provides students with information about class schedules, grades, class registration, account information, meetings, events, and more. It also provides faculty with information about employee records and allows them to submit grades, view class rosters, and contact students.

The department is responsible for the proper functioning of the following software:

Accounts: email, network, Canvas (formally Blackboard)

Webster: assessment data, candidate records, log-ins & passwords, course and registration information

Canvas (formally Blackboard): audio and video materials, games, syllabi, reading materials, group work, lectures

Degreeworks: Advising and degree planning program that maps out students academic path.

Regarding hardware, the Information Technology Department oversees the following facilities:

computer labs with 10 computers

Pierce Library public access computers

4 Smart boards

14 tablets (androids and ipads)

**6e.4 Faculty & candidates have access to sufficient & current library resources, curricular resources, & electronic information.**

The [Peirce Library](#) serves the entire campus and provides library resources for all education programs in the following ways.

Materials: Peirce Library provides a full range of materials, including books, journals, databases, and audiovisual materials. A library allocation formula has been in place that uses many factors to determine the percentage of library funds a program/department/college should receive for the year.

Instruction and Reference: Peirce Library has a strong instructional mission. A full time instructional and reference librarian focuses on students in College of Education. Librarians also provide direct instruction to college students regarding use of the Peirce Library and its resources. The reference librarians provide direct instruction to students.

The Peirce Library website hosts seven research databases. These web-based databases provide our students with 24/7 support in navigating some of the resources Peirce Library offers both online and /or in person.

Interlibrary Loan: Peirce Library has very liberal interlibrary loan policies, and Education candidates use interlibrary loan frequently. Our interlibrary load services are free to students. We have several methods of electronic delivery of articles to aid distance uses.

## State specific standards (response to OAR)

### 584-017-1010 Request for Waiver of Rules

The College of Education at Eastern Oregon University has requested waivers related only to out-of-state, charter school, and private school placements for clinical experiences. All requests were made using the PR Form from TSPC. Since 2004, a total of 65 waiver requests have been made: Out-of-state placement requests totaled 57; charter school placement requests totaled 3; and private school placement requests totaled 5. Data for our requests is included in correspondence with our licensure officer.

Table 30

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1010*

Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<a href="#">PR Form from TSPC correspondence</a>	

### 584-017-1012 Waivers of Academic Requirements and Appeals on Academic Decisions

EOU has not requested any waivers of academic requirements or appeals on academic decisions, so this standard is not applicable to this unit review.

### 584-017-1020 Knowledge of School Law for Licensed Educators

In the CUESTE program, all candidates have preparation in the knowledge of school law. In the Exceptionalities *ED 384/484* course taken by all candidates, a significant portion of the course is dedicated to school law, with two exams dedicated to special education law. In *ED 242*, a prerequisite to program admission, school law is a part of the required curriculum. In preparation for the Civil Rights Exam, a *PowerPoint* presentation reviewing school law is presented to students. Undergraduate candidates also have training in mandatory reporting laws through one of their Core classes, generally in *ED 380* or *ED 480*. Guest speakers from the Department of Human Services are invited to the classes to provide information regarding the law. A copy of the *material handed out* to the students is linked here. Evidence of candidate competence in school law is shown in the scores for the *Civil Rights Exam*. One hundred percent of candidates successfully passed the Civil Rights exam.

In the MAT ECE/ELEM and MID/HS programs, all candidates have preparation in the knowledge of school law. In the *ED 641 Exceptionality Course* taken by all candidates, a significant portion of the course is dedicated to school law, with two exams dedicated to special education law. In *ED 601, Teaching as a Profession*, candidates are also exposed to school law, including mandatory reporting and requirements for ethical educators. One hundred percent of candidates successfully passed the Civil Rights exam.

Table 31

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1020*

Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<a href="#">ED 384/484</a> <a href="#">ED 242</a> <a href="#">PowerPoint</a> <a href="#">material handed out</a> <a href="#">Civil Rights Exam data</a> <a href="#">ED 641 Exceptionality Course</a> <a href="#">ED 601, Teaching as a Profession</a>	

## 584-017-1025 Consortium

The consortium has been a key player in the development of the Conceptual framework and the field component of the program. One excerpt from Consortium minutes gives an example of how the College employs the Consortium to inform the programs: "The Consortium met 11-19-10 and was apprised of the initial work of the College of Education to re-cast a conceptual framework for teacher licensure programs. The purposes of this work are to refresh the aims of the programs and to address the needs of TSPC accreditation. The EOU Consortium spent most of its deliberations discussing the specific expectations of the teaching professional. The members of the Consortium divided into four groups, each facilitated by a member of the College. The groups were asked to form a list of traits of what they would expect of a beginning teacher."

The bylaws of the Consortium were reviewed at the spring 2012 meeting and revisions were adopted at the fall 2012 meeting. The bylaws of the Consortium clearly indicate that the Consortium is made up of teachers appointed by school district organizations that represent teachers in bargaining matters, public school administrators, students within program, and faculty from the institution. At the Fall 2012 meeting, the bylaws were revised to include the addition of a community member as part of the Consortium. It was discussed that an appropriate community member might be someone who represents Head Start so that would be representation from early childhood education. The EOU Consortium meets biannually, once in the Fall Term and once in the Spring Term.

With the new assessment process in its formative stages, the Consortium has provided specific direction and feedback on assessments included within the assessment plan. Specifically, the Consortium was instrumental in providing feedback on the revised Observation Forms, and Evaluation Forms for our field experiences (Forms C and D). In addition, the Consortium provided valuable feedback and responses to changing the Bylaws and on the new Work Sample as it was in development.

Table 32

### *Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1025*

Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<a href="#">Consortium website</a>	Documents related to Consortium can be found at this link

## 584-017-1030 Evidence of Effectiveness for Initial I Teaching License Preparation

Every candidate in an Initial I Licensure program at EOU completes two full work samples. In addition, each candidate also completes either one or two "mini" work samples that are one week in length prior to the required two- and three-week work samples. Two mini work samples are completed by candidates in the CUESTE undergraduate program. One mini work sample is completed in the MAT graduate program. The mini work samples are developmental learning experiences to help candidates understand the many complex issues that are included in planning, implementing, and assessing a cohesive unit of study.

The Work Sample Student Guide and the *Work Sample Scoring Guide* for the work sample are posted on the College of Education website. Candidates must first complete a work sample proposal and have it approved by the university instructor [in the case of the mini work sample(s)] or the university supervisor (in the case of the full length work samples). The work samples completed by all candidates are required to address each part of OAR 017-584-1030.

In the undergraduate CUESTE program candidates plan, implement, and assess a mini work sample in Core I and Core II. The Core I and Core II work samples are each completed at a different level of authorization so that the candidate has experience teaching a unit at each level of authorization. The mini work sample is a supported process with scaffolding by the university faculty. The mini work sample is scored using the same Work Sample Scoring Guide that will be used for the full work samples required in the full time student teaching (Core III).

In the final term of full time student teaching, CUESTE candidates plan, implement, and assess two work samples, one is a minimum of two weeks and one is a minimum of three weeks. These are the two TSPC-required work samples.

In the MAT program, candidates plan, implement, and assess a mini work sample in their Field Experience Placement (formerly known as “A” Placement) in the fall term at their first authorization level. Just as in the CUESTE program, the mini work sample is a scaffolded learning experience, providing candidates with faculty support and feedback throughout the experience. The mini work samples are scored using the same Work Sample Scoring Guide that will be used for the full work samples required in the student teaching placement (formerly known as “B” placement).

In the student teaching placement candidates plan, implement, and assess two work samples, one is a minimum of two weeks and one is a minimum of three weeks. These are the two TSPC-required work samples.

Students show growth in their ability to successfully provide evidence of effectiveness to foster student learning. When the work sample total scores are compared from the first mini work sample to the second full work sample, the *total mean score* shows growth in all three Initial I Teaching License Preparation Programs.

Table 33

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1030*

Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<a href="#">work sample rubric</a> <a href="#">CUESTE work sample data</a> <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">elem MAT work sample data '13-'14</a> <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '12-'13</a> <a href="#">sec MAT work sample data '13-'14</a>	

**584-017-1032 Evidence of Effectiveness for Continuing Teaching License**

The College of Education at Eastern Oregon University does not currently have a program for Continuing Teaching License Preparation, so this standard is not applicable to this unit review.

**584-017-1035 Verification of Program Completion for All Licensure Programs**

All candidates recommended for licensure, whether for Initial licensure, Advanced Programs, or adding endorsements or authorizations to an existing license, are fully qualified for the requested licensure. Compliance with

all requirements for licensure is assured by *checklists* that are completed by our Licensure Officer prior to submitting a C-2 form for each candidate. All relevant documentation is included within each candidate’s file.

Table 34

*Electronic Artifacts in Support of 584-017-1035*

Evidence in support of standard	Comments or Explanation
<a href="#">CUESTE checklist</a> <a href="#">MAT checklist</a> <a href="#">SPED checklist</a>	Example checklists for program completion
Candidate paper files	Cannot be linked electronically, but reviewers may audit individual hard copy files

**584-017-1040 Partial Waivers for Field or Clinical Requirements in the Event of School District Closures**

EOU has not requested partial waivers for field or clinical requirements in the event of school district closures, so this standard is not applicable to this unit review.

**584-017-1042 Field or Clinical Experiences**

All field experiences are provided in public or private school settings that ensure the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for the educator license. Prior to placement in any classroom, the placement coordinator from EOU looks up the licensure for the selected cooperating teacher to be sure that the teacher is authorized and endorsed in the appropriate areas for which he or she is teaching. A copy of the teacher’s licensure is printed and kept in a binder in the placement coordinator’s office. This information is not currently archived in electronic format, but it is available through the placement coordinator. EOU also works with school personnel to find appropriate placements for all students—making sure EOU students are placed in classrooms that match their intended areas of endorsement and authorization.

Please see [standard 3](#) for further detail.

**584-017-1045 Student Teaching**

The MAT program at both the elementary and secondary levels requires 31 weeks of full time field placement. Candidates begin full time placement at the beginning of the school year for the school in which they are placed. They remain in full time placement in their Field experience placement (formerly known as “A” Placement) until the winter break for their school. With minor variations depending on the public school calendar for the placement, candidates generally have 4 weeks of full time placement prior to the beginning of fall term at the university. During the fall term, candidates return to the EOU campus for three one-week class sessions. The rest of the term is spent in placement, resulting in 8 weeks of full time placement during the fall term. After winter break, candidates begin their B Placement in their second authorization level. During winter term, candidates again return to the EOU campus for three one-week class sessions. The rest of winter term is spent in placement, resulting in 8 weeks of full time placement during the winter term. Candidates remain in their placements for the full 11-week spring term, taking all coursework online during that term.

The CUESTE program requires 18 full weeks of field placement. Candidates begin full time placement at the beginning of the school year with a three-week ED 309 practicum that begins on the first teacher contract day in their placement school. During the Core I term, candidates complete at least two weeks of placement with a combination of part time and full time placement. During the Core II term, candidates again complete at least two weeks of placement with a combination of part time and full time placement. During Core III (Full time student teaching), candidates are in their placements for a full 11-week term.

Please see [standard 3](#) for further detail.

### 584-017-1048 Internship Agreements

The College of Education at Eastern Oregon University occasionally enters agreements with school districts and candidates for candidates to complete internship experiences as part of the MAT program at either the ECE/ELEM or MID/HS authorization levels. These agreements are made when candidates entering or already admitted to the MAT program have been hired by a school district to teach while they are completing the MAT program. The program requirements do not change for the candidate. However, classroom teaching is substituted for the student teaching experience. The candidate may choose to complete the MAT program over a two-year period instead of the usual 13-month period, allowing the candidate to take fewer classes during each term. Agreements between the school district, candidate, and EOU College of Education are kept in the candidates' program files for the duration of the program. The numbers of students with internship agreements is small, each handled on a case-by-case basis. The table indicates the number of internship agreements for each school year since 2009. The links will take you to copies of the agreement for each student. One intern is counted for both the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years because her agreement indicated that she would take two years to complete the program.

Table 35

#### *Internship Agreements*

School Year	Number of Transitional (Intern) Candidates	Links to Agreements
2009-2010	2	<a href="#">1</a> , <a href="#">2</a>
2010-2011	2	<a href="#">1</a> , <a href="#">2</a>
2011-2012	1	<a href="#">1</a>
2012-2013	2	<a href="#">1</a> , <a href="#">2</a>