

The University of Memphis
College of Education Institutional Report



University of Memphis College of Education

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
&
Tennessee State Department of Education

Boards of Examiners Visit
March 28 – April 2, 2008

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE</u>	ii
<u>OVERVIEW</u>	
<u>The University of Memphis</u> 1. <u><i>A Brief History of the University of Memphis</i></u> 2. <u><i>UofM Vision and Strategic Plan</i></u> 3. <u><i>Comparison of University, College, and Service Area Demographics</i></u>	1
<u>The College of Education</u> 1. <u><i>Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty Fall 2007</i></u> 2. <u><i>Programs and their Review Status</i></u> 3. <u><i>http://jackson.memphis.edu/contact.php</i></u> 4. <u><i>http://bf.memphis.edu/millington/</i></u> 5. <u><i>http://academics.memphis.edu/extended/off-campus01.html</i></u> 6. <u><i>Regent’s Online Degree Program Description</i></u> 7. <u><i>Three R’s Project Program Description</i></u> 8. <u><i>College of Education Goals and Vital Signs</i></u> 9. <u><i>Aspiration Statements and Innovation Implementation Teams</i></u> 10. <u><i>http://coefutures.memphis.edu/</i></u> 11. <u><i>http://crede.berkeley.edu/index.html</i></u> 12. <u><i>diversity outcome standards</i></u> 13. <u><i>Summit III – Big Ideas</i></u> 14. <u><i>Urban Partnerships</i></u> 15. <u><i>Research Culture</i></u> 16. <u><i>Technology and Resource Center</i></u>	1
<u>CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</u>	
1. <u><i>conceptual framework graphic</i></u> 2. <u><i>http://www.tennessee.gov/education/lic/doc/acctchlicstds.pdf</i></u> 3. <u><i>http://crede.berkeley.edu/standards/standards.html</i></u> 4. <u><i>Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards</i></u> 5. <u><i>full Conceptual Framework document</i></u> 6. <u><i>Diversity Performance Standards</i></u> 7. <u><i>Dispositions, Policies, and Procedures for Assessment</i></u>	4
<u>STANDARD 1</u>	
<u>CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS</u>	
<u>1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates</u> 1. <u><i>State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area</i></u> 2. <u><i>2003-2006 Praxis II Content Exam Pass Rates by Program Area</i></u> 3. <u><i>Master’s Project Guidelines</i></u> 4. <u><i>Master’s Project Rubric</i></u> 5. <u><i>Physical Education Teacher Education Advanced MS Annual Program Report</i></u> 6. <u><i>Master’s Project Comprehensive Examination Rubric</i></u> 7. <u><i>Master’s Project Enrollment and Completion Rates</i></u>	12

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers</u> 9. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey</u> 10. <u>Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers</u> 11. <u>Follow-up Surveys of Employers</u> 12. <u>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</u> 13. <u>Initial and Advanced Teacher Education Program SPA Reports</u> 14. <u>Advanced Teacher Education Annual Program Reports</u> 15. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u> 16. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 17. <u>2008 Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Instrument</u> 18. <u>Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results</u> 19. <u>Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results</u> 	
<p><u>1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 2. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u> 3. <u>Early Childhood Education Advanced MS SPA Report</u> 4. <u>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</u> 5. <u>Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007</u> 6. <u>Instructional Design and Technology Advanced MS Annual Program report</u> 7. <u>Physical Education Teacher Education Advanced MS Annual Program Report</u> 8. <u>Special Education Advanced MS Annual Program Report</u> 9. <u>Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results</u> 10. <u>Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results</u> 	15
<p><u>1c. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area</u> 2. <u>2007 Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam Performance Scores</u> 3. <u>2007 Praxis II Pedagogy Exam Performance Scores</u> 4. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 5. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u> 6. <u>Early Childhood Education Advanced MS SPA Report</u> 7. <u>annual program reports</u> 8. <u>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</u> 9. <u>Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-07</u> 10. <u>Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results</u> 11. <u>Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results</u> 	17
<p><u>1d. Student learning for teacher candidates</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area</u> 2. <u>Master's Project Guidelines</u> 3. <u>Master's Project Rubric</u> 4. <u>2007 Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam Performance Scores</u> 5. <u>2007 Praxis II Pedagogy Exam Performance Scores</u> 6. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 7. <u>Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards</u> 8. <u>SPA reports</u> 9. <u>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</u> 	19

10. <i>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</i>	
11. <i>Early Childhood Education Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
12. <i>Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-07</i>	
13. <i>Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results</i>	
14. <i>Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results</i>	
<u>1e. Professional knowledge and skills for other school professionals</u>	21
1. <i>Reading Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
2. <i>School Leadership Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
3. <i>Library Media Specialist Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
4. <i>School Psychology Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
5. <i>State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area</i>	
6. <i>Praxis II Scores for Other School Professionals</i>	
7. <i>Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007</i>	
8. <i>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</i>	
9. <i>Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007</i>	
10. <i>Results from School Administration Survey of Program Graduates</i>	
11. <i>Evaluation of School Psychology Program Graduates by Employers</i>	
12. <i>Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers</i>	
<u>1f. Student learning for other school professionals</u>	23
1. <i>Reading Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
2. <i>School Leadership Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
3. <i>Library Media Specialist Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
4. <i>School Psychology Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
5. <i>Results from School Administration Survey of Program Graduates</i>	
6. <i>Evaluation of School Psychology Program Graduates by Employers</i>	
<u>1g. Professional dispositions</u>	24
1. <i>Dispositions, Policies, and Procedures for Assessment</i>	
2. <i>http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4</i>	
3. <i>https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/</i>	
4. <i>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</i>	
5. <i>Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results</i>	
6. <i>Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results</i>	
7. <i>Educational Leadership Advanced MS SPA Report</i>	
8. <i>School Psychology Advanced MA SPA Report</i>	
<u>STANDARD 2</u>	27
<u>ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION</u>	
<u>2a. Assessment system</u>	27
1. <i>2007 Annual Program Report format</i>	
2. <i>COEAS Operations Model</i>	
3. <i>COEAS Essential Assessment Domains</i>	
4. <i>COEAS Assessment Domains and System Characteristics</i>	
5. <i>COEAS Model Transition Points</i>	
6. <i>six pillars of effective practice</i>	
7. <i>Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards</i>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4 9. Overview of Key Assessments and Assessment Points 10. SPA reports 11. Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments 12. https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/ 13. Candidate Admission Data 14. Master's Project guidelines 15. Master's Project Rubric 16. Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers 17. Unit and Program Operations and Quality Assessments 	
<p><u>2b. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COEAS Data Collection, Analysis, and Review Plan 2. OCR Scantron forms 3. How to Post COEAS Key Assessment Scores 4. Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey 5. Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers 6. Follow-up Surveys of Employers 7. Reports in the form of tables 8. survey of alumni 9. National Survey of Student Engagement 10. https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-provost/sirs/all_about_sete.html 11. common instrument in electronic format 12. NCATE Part C Annual Reports 13. http://oir.memphis.edu/program_review/index.html 14. http://academics.memphis.edu/bulletin/ 15. http://academics.memphis.edu/gradcatalog/index.html 16. Communication Form 	31
<p><u>2c. Use of data for program improvement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://coeas-data.memphis.edu 2. Tennessee Regents On-line Degree Program 3. flowchart 4. 2008 Annual Program Report format 5. Annual Program Reports 6. Dean's Updates 7. COE Annual Report 	33
<p><u>STANDARD 3</u> <u>FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aspiration Team #12 Template 2. U.S. DOE Grant Performance Report, Executive Summary 3. Three R's Spring 2007 Report 4. Center for Urban School Leadership Program Description 	36
<p><u>3a. Collaboration between unit and school partners</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jackson Area Collaborative Agreement 2. Center for Urban School Leadership Program Description 	37

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. http://www.campusschool.org/ 4. http://lipman.memphis.edu/about.htm 5. <u>Teacher Education Advisory Council Meeting Minutes</u> 6. <u>Agendas of Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative Meeting</u> 7. <u>University of Memphis Clinical Student Teaching Program Evaluation – Cooperating Teachers</u> 8. <u>A Position on Action Research for Professional Development Conducted by Candidates Enrolled in ICL 7992 Master’s Project</u> 9. <u>Three R’s Program Principal Interview Protocol</u> 10. <u>Three R’s Program Clinical Faculty Interview Protocol</u> 	
<p><u>3b. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program</u> 2. <u>Field and Clinical Experience Description Tables</u> 3. <u>Clinical Student Teaching Handbook</u> 4. <u>Educational Leadership Advanced MS SPA Report</u> 5. <u>Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers</u> 6. <u>ICL 7992-Master’s Project Syllabus</u> 7. <u>Artifact Portfolio Products</u> 8. <u>School Psychology Program Handbook</u> 9. <u>Library Information Specialist State Model for Local Evaluation</u> 10. <u>Syllabus for IDT 3600-Technology in Education</u> 11. <u>Syllabus for IDT 7061-Media and Technology Utilization</u> 13. <u>Cooperating Teacher Data Form</u> 14. <u>Clinical Student Teaching Program Evaluation, Cooperating Teachers</u> 15. <u>University Supervisor Evaluation</u> 16. <u>Cooperating Teacher Informational Session Documentation</u> 17. <u>New Teacher Center Mentor Training Modules</u> 18. <u>Candidate Perceptions of Quality of Student Teaching Experiences</u> 19. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey</u> 	39
<p><u>3c. Candidates’ development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Student Teaching Applicants and Completers</u> 2. <u>Master’s Project Enrollment and Completion Rates</u> 3. <u>School Administration and Supervision Internship Candidates and Completers</u> 4. <u>School Psychology Internship Candidates and Completers</u> 5. <u>Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers</u> 6. <u>Student Teacher Evaluation Summary Form</u> 7. <u>Student Teacher Evaluation Summary Fall 2006</u> 8. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 9. <u>Summative Student Teaching Assessment Results</u> 10. <u>Educational Leadership Advanced MS SPA Report</u> 11. <u>School Psychology Handbook</u> 12. <u>CTL Evaluation Excerpt</u> 	42

<u>STANDARD 4</u> <u>DIVERSITY</u>	43
<u>4a. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences</u>	44
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf 2. <i>Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards</i> 3. <i>Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers</i> 4. <i>conceptual framework</i> 5. <i>COE Diversity Standards</i> 6. <i>ICL 4001</i> 7. <i>ICL 4002</i> 8. <i>SPED 2000</i> 9. <i>SPED 7000</i> 10. <i>SPED 6900</i> 11. <i>ICL 7709</i> 12. <i>LEAD 2010</i> 13. <i>LDPS 7330</i> 14. https://coeas-data.memphis.edu 15. <i>evaluation of student teaching instrument</i> 16. <i>Teacher Education Program Reflections exit survey</i> 17. <i>follow-up surveys of candidates</i> 18. <i>surveys of employers</i> 19. <i>pedagogy Praxis II exams</i> 20. <i>Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers results</i> 21. <i>Teacher Education Program Reflections exit survey results</i> 22. <i>Results from Follow-up Surveys of Candidates</i> 23. <i>Employer Survey Results</i> 24. <i>Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching pedagogy examinations</i> 	
<u>4b. Experiences working with diverse faculty</u>	47
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Candidate Demographics</i> 2. <i>Faculty Demographics</i> 3. <i>Professional Education Faculty Gender & Race – 2007-08</i> 4. <i>Professional Development Activities for 2006</i> 5. http://coe.memphis.edu/CUSL/ 6. <i>Moss Chair of Excellence in Urban Education</i> 	
<u>4c. Experiences working with diverse candidates</u>	48
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Candidate Demographics</i> 2. <i>Comparison of University, College, and Service Area Demographics</i> 3. http://saweb.memphis.edu/Leadership/RSO.html 4. <i>Three R's Project Program Description</i> 	
<u>4d. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools</u>	49
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Demographics of Clinical Sites for Initial and Advanced Programs</i> 3. http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/doc/04-05AnnrptComp.pdf 4. <i>Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers</i> 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <u>Instrument</u> 6. <u>ICL 4001</u> 7. <u>ICL 4002</u> 8. <u>SPED 2000</u> 9. <u>SPED 7000</u> 10. <u>SPED 6900</u> 11. <u>ICL 7709</u> 12. <u>LEAD 2010</u> 13. <u>LDPS 7330</u> 14. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u> 15. <u>Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results</u> 	
<p><u>STANDARD 5</u> <u>FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT</u></p>	51
<p><u>5a. Qualified faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Moss Chair of Excellence in Urban Education</u> 2. <u>Faudree Professorships</u> 3. <u>Faculty Qualifications</u> 4. <u>Academic Qualifications of Professional Education Faculty 2007-2008</u> 5. <u>Professional Education Faculty 2007-2008</u> 6. <u>Faculty Year End Evaluations for 2006</u> 	51
<p><u>5b. Modeling best professional practices in teaching</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/</u> 2. <u>Instruction and the Conceptual Framework</u> 3. <u>Reflection, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Dispositions</u> 4. <u>https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/</u> 5. <u>Instructional Strategies Used by Faculty</u> 7. <u>Assessment Strategies Used by Faculty</u> 9. <u>Practices Used to Address Diversity</u> 10. <u>Practices Used to Integrate Technology</u> 11. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u> 12. <u>SIRS Online Survey</u> 13. <u>2006 and 2007 COE Aggregate SIRS Mean Scores</u> 14. <u>COE Assessments</u> 15. <u>University SIRS Summary Form</u> 16. <u>Faculty Annual Report Form</u> 	53
<p><u>5c. Modeling best professional practices in scholarship</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Modeling Best Practices in Scholarship</u> 2. <u>http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Chapter4.htm</u> 3. <u>Faculty Year End Evaluations for 2006</u> 	56
<p><u>5d. Modeling best professional practices in service</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Teacher Education Advisory Council Meetings</u> 2. <u>Agendas of Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative</u> 3. <u>FDAC Minutes Related to Collaboration with P12 Schools</u> 	57

4. <u>Collaborations and Partnerships</u>	
5. <u>Memberships in Professional Associations</u>	
6. <u>Leadership Institute</u>	
7. <u>Modeling Best Practices in Leadership</u>	
<u>5e. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance</u>	58
1. <u>http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Chapter4.htm</u>	
2. <u>http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Appendices.htm#Form:%20External%20Evaluator%20List</u>	
3. <u>Faculty Annual Report Form</u>	
4. <u>Data Forms for Part-time Faculty</u>	
<u>5f. Unit facilitation of professional development</u>	60
1. <u>Job Description for Assistant Dean</u>	
2. <u>Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007</u>	
3. <u>2005</u>	
4. <u>2004</u>	
5. <u>2003</u>	
6. <u>Collaborations and Partnerships</u>	
7. <u>2006-07 Activities CF Themes</u>	
8. <u>Mentor Checklist</u>	
STANDARD 6	62
UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES	
<u>6a. Unit leadership and authority</u>	63
1. <u>Organizational chart</u>	
2. <u>Aspiration Statements and Innovation Implementation Teams</u>	
3. <u>http://coefutures.memphis.edu/</u>	
4. <u>Summit III – Big Ideas</u>	
5. <u>http://coe.memphis.edu/advising-and-student-services.htm</u>	
6. <u>http://coe.memphis.edu/advising.htm</u>	
7. <u>http://saweb.memphis.edu/health/</u>	
8. <u>http://saweb.memphis.edu/cclt/</u> .	
9. <u>survey of alumni</u>	
10. <u>Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results</u>	
11. <u>http://academics.memphis.edu/bulletin/</u>	
12. <u>http://academics.memphis.edu/gradcatalog/</u>	
13. <u>http://coe.memphis.edu/TEP-admissions.htm</u>	
<u>6b. Unit Budget</u>	64
1. <u>Budget enrollment faculty</u>	
<u>6c. Personnel</u>	65
1. <u>effort table</u>	
2. <u>teaching loads table</u>	
3. <u>handbook</u>	
4. <u>College of Education Support Personnel</u>	

<p><u>6d. Unit facilities</u></p> <p>1. <i><u>Facilities for the College of Education</u></i></p>	<p>66</p>
<p><u>6e. Unit resources including technology</u></p> <p>1. <i><u>technology support doc</u></i></p> <p>2. <i><u>TAF software summary</u></i></p> <p>3. <i><u>http://trl.memphis.edu/smartclassroom.php</u></i></p> <p>4. <i><u>http://trl.memphis.edu/computerlabs.php</u></i></p> <p>5. <i><u>Technology Resources for the College of Education</u></i></p> <p>6. <i><u>Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007</u></i></p> <p>7. <i><u>2005</u></i></p> <p>8. <i><u>2004</u></i></p> <p>9. <i><u>2003</u></i></p> <p>10. <i><u>2002-2007 External funding</u></i></p> <p>11. <i><u>grants by professional education faculty</u></i></p>	<p>67</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>SOURCES OF EVIDENCE ON THE NCATE WEBSITE</u></p>	

Overview

The University of Memphis

The University of Memphis was founded under the auspices of the General Education Bill, enacted by the Tennessee Legislature in 1909. Known originally as West Tennessee State Normal School, the institution opened its doors September 10, 1912. In 1925, the name of the college changed to West Tennessee State Teachers College. In 1950, graduate studies were initiated, and in 1954, the school switched from a quarter to a semester system. In 1957, the state legislature designated Memphis State full university status. In 1959, the university admitted its first black students, and the first doctoral programs began in 1966. In 1983, Memphis State University became the first public university in Tennessee to gain accreditation of its entire curriculum. In 1994, Memphis State University became the University of Memphis. Today, the University of Memphis is one of Tennessee's three comprehensive doctoral-extensive institutions of higher learning and is the flagship of the Tennessee Board of Regents system. It awards more than 3,000 degrees annually. With an enrollment of approximately 21,000 students, the University of Memphis has 24 Chairs of Excellence, more than any other Tennessee university, and five state-approved Centers of Excellence ([A Brief History of the University of Memphis](#)).

The University of Memphis is a learner-centered metropolitan research university providing high quality educational experiences while pursuing new knowledge through research, artistic expression, and interdisciplinary and engaged scholarship. The university's vision is that we will be recognized as one of America's great metropolitan research universities, noted for its comprehensive, innovative academic programs and for capitalizing on its urban setting and region to address the challenges of our global society ([UofM Vision and Strategic Plan](#)).

The University of Memphis is governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents and classified by Carnegie as a Doctoral/Research University-Extensive public institution. Located in a quiet neighborhood setting in the city of Memphis, Shelby County in the extreme southwest corner of Tennessee, the university draws over 85 percent of its enrollment from the city of Memphis and several surrounding counties contiguous to Shelby County including Desoto County, Mississippi and Crittenden County, Arkansas. This service area represents urban, suburban, and rural areas ([Comparison of University, College, and Service Area Demographics](#)).

The College of Education (COE)

How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools?

The table, [Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty Fall 2007](#), shows the unit includes 235 professional education faculty including clinical supervisors, graduate teaching assistants, candidate services staff, and administrators. Of these, 85 are tenured or on tenure track; 28 are full-time university employees but not on tenure track, 113 are adjunct faculty, and 9 are graduate teaching assistants.

The unit enrolls 1,111 candidates distributed across initial and advanced teacher education program and advanced programs for other school professionals. As shown in the table, [Programs and their Review Status](#), the COE offers or coordinates nine baccalaureate teacher education programs; five of these are B.S.Ed. teacher preparation programs offered in the unit: Physical Education Teacher Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Special Education, and Middle Grades Education (recently added). The COE also coordinates four baccalaureate teacher preparation programs in Music Education (vocal and instrumental),

Art Education housed in the College of Communication and Fine Arts, and Dance Education housed in the University College.

Overall, the COE offers 41 graduate degree programs including the Master of Arts in Teaching (5), Master of Education (1), Master of Science (18), Education Specialist (1), Doctor of Education (13), and Doctor of Philosophy (3). However, as shown in the table, [Programs and their Review Status](#), only 14 are initial or advanced programs that prepare P-12 school professionals: five M.A.T. degrees in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education (six licensure programs), Special Education, and newly added Middle Grades Education; one M.Ed. degree in Childhood Literacy Reading—a Tennessee Board of Regents University consortium program; and eight M.S. degrees in School Counseling, Physical Education Teacher Education, Early Childhood Education, Instruction and Curriculum, Instructional Design and Technology, Reading, Special Education, and School Administration and Supervision. In addition, the COE coordinates with initial postbaccalaureate programs in Business Education housed in the College of Business and Economics and Family and Consumer Sciences Education housed in the University College. Further, the COE coordinates advanced M.A. programs in School Psychology housed in the College of Arts and Sciences and the M.A. program in Speech-Language Pathology housed in the School of Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology.

In sum, as the table [Programs and their Review Status](#) illustrates, the COE houses or coordinates nine baccalaureate initial teacher preparation degree programs and 18 postbaccalaureate initial and advanced degree programs for the preparation of P-12 teachers and other school professionals. These degree programs are offered on and off campus or online and reflect 45 different P-12 school professional licensure programs.

Two off-campus centers host the five initial and advanced teacher preparation and other school professional preparation programs offered in their entirety at off-campus locations. The initial Elementary Education (K-6) B.S.Ed., Elementary Education (K-6) M.A.T./Licensure-Only, and Secondary Education (7-12) M.A.T./Licensure-Only programs are offered in their entirety at the Jackson Center located on the campus of Jackson State Community College, Jackson, TN (<http://jackson.memphis.edu/contact.php>). A Master of Science in Instruction and Curriculum advanced teacher preparation program is also offered entirely at the Jackson Center. The COE offers the School Administration and Supervision (K-12) advanced program entirely at the university's new Millington, TN center (<http://bf.memphis.edu/millington/>). The University of Memphis Office of Extended Programs (<http://academics.memphis.edu/extended/off-campus01.html>) offers classes at a number of convenient locations throughout the metropolitan area; however, complete unit programs are offered only at the Jackson and Millington sites.

The unit offers only one online program. Since the institution is a Tennessee Board of Regents institution, the COE collaborates with other Regents institutions in the Tennessee Regent's Online Degree Program (RODP) M.Ed. degree in Advanced Studies in Teaching and Learning with a concentration in Childhood Literacy and Reading. In this consortium, advanced teacher preparation program candidates can select any Tennessee Board of Regents institution as their 'home' and take all courses online ([Regent's Online Degree Program Description](#)). Faculty from each participating institution teach one or two of the courses required for the program. Since the inception of the program, COE faculty have developed and taught two courses in the program: ASTL 7723-Understanding and Implementing Best Practices in Teaching Beginning

Literacy (Literacy II), and ASTL 7709-Action Research. The unit has just begun planning to migrate the K-12 School Library Media Specialist M.S. program to an entirely online format.

One alternate route program is presently offered: the Three R's Project funded through a Teacher Quality Enhancement grant. This pilot program, a partnership between the College of Arts and Sciences, the COE, and Memphis City Schools, places emphasis on recruiting males, particularly African American males, to meet the demographic needs of our metropolitan high-need school district. The Three R's program presently involves two cohorts of candidates for dual licensure in middle school math or science and special education ([*Three R's Project Program Description*](#)). We anticipate this project will provide the model for all teacher preparation programs in the COE as well as college/school partnerships.

Since the spring 2001 NCATE and State BOE teams visit, significant fundamental and positive changes have occurred. Dr. Ric Hovda was appointed as dean of the COE in July 2002 after a year-long national search and following three years of acting and interim deans.

During his first year (2002-03), Dean Hovda reorganized the COE administrative structure to include an associate dean for Administration and Graduate Studies, an assistant dean for Professional Development, and a director of Accreditation. He began a college-wide movement toward programmatic self-study, a more appropriate college-wide conceptual framework that would be responsive to the needs of programs preparing both P-12 and non-P-12 professionals, and similarly, a new college-wide assessment system for all COE programs. He also established the goal of having all COE programs accredited or recognized by national specialized professional associations (SPA) when standards existed. This represented a fundamental change as SPA recognition is optional in Tennessee, and in the history of the COE, very few programs had ever sought SPA recognition. A Faculty Development Advisory Committee was formed to assist the new assistant dean for Faculty Development. Most importantly, Dean Hovda established a three-year overarching goal for the COE to continuously improve all aspects of our work with candidates, colleagues, and community through the application of quality standards and quality design principles to achieve prominence for each program, unit, and department. He enumerated specific strategies for reaching that goal and a series of 'vital signs' of health for the college by which progress is measured ([*College of Education Goals and Vital Signs*](#)).

Changes during 2003-04 included work on developing a new conceptual framework based on analysis of the core commitments of all COE programs. The position and office of assistant dean for Teacher Education and Undergraduate Programs was reorganized into an assistant dean for P-12 Programs. Following national searches, new chairs were appointed in three of the four COE departments. Work was initiated to reinvent the COE's approach to clinical education in urban settings. Major funding was received to initiate the New Teacher Center and the Center for Urban School Leadership.

In 2004-05, three major commitments were identified as the core of the new COE conceptual framework: commitment to effective practice, commitment to diverse communities, and commitment to leadership. A college-wide conceptual framework committee was established. New partnerships focusing on clinical practice sites were planned to replace the existing professional development school model. A director of Teacher Education was added to the dean's staff. A futures planning process was initiated based on the Appreciative Inquiry theoretical model, and a two-day planning summit involving over 250 faculty, staff, students, and community stakeholders was held in May. The outcome of this summit was 16 aspiration

statements, each representing actions and outcomes to which we are committed and each supported by an Innovation Implementation Team ([Aspiration Statements and Innovation Implementation Teams](#); and, <http://coefutures.memphis.edu/>).

In 2005-06, the COE and the College of Arts and Sciences as partners were awarded a \$2.3 million Teacher Quality Enhancement grant ([Three R's Project Program Description](#)) designed to pilot a fundamental reinvention of initial teacher education. Six pillars of practice were adopted and incorporated into the conceptual framework as effective performance outcomes for initial and advanced continuing teacher education programs. Standards for pedagogy and instruction, one of these six pillars of practice, are based primarily on the work of Roland Tharp and others at the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) <http://crede.berkeley.edu/index.html>. A second Appreciative Inquiry futures planning summit was held to clarify the vision framed by the 16 aspiration statements and to extend the work of the Innovation Teams. In May 2006, the new COE conceptual framework embodying the theme, *Preparing Educational Leaders*, was adopted by all departments.

In 2006-07, the College of Education Assessment System (COEAS) was fully functioning with all programs administering key assessments, collecting data, and entering data into the new COEAS electronic database. The first annual assessment retreat was held in May 2007 and programs completed annual program reports. A broad-based committee of faculty and professional and community stakeholders developed [diversity outcome standards](#) for the college and these were adopted and are being incorporated into the conceptual framework. A third Appreciative Inquiry futures planning summit was held in May 2007, during which faculty, staff, administrators, and stakeholders designated three of the College's 16 aspirations as "Big Ideas" to which resources would be committed during the next year. The outcome of this summit was that three foci were selected including a Technology and Resource Center to serve all COE students, staff and faculty; Research Culture Initiative to promote faculty and student research; and an enhanced Urban Partnership focus for all programs in the College of ([Summit III – Big Ideas](#)). Action plans for [Urban Partnerships](#) and [Research Culture](#) were implemented in spring 2008. The action plan for the establishment of a [Technology and Resource Center](#) is approved for implementation contingent on the availability and/or allocation of additional space.

Finally, in May 2007, Dean Hovda left the university to take another deanship. Dr. Michael Hamrick (Chair of the Department of Health and Sport Sciences) was appointed interim dean. A national search for a new COE dean is presently ongoing with the goal of finding a permanent dean for fall 2008.

Conceptual Framework

PREPARING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

What is the vision and mission of the unit? The vision of the COE is to be a national leader in the preparation of urban and metropolitan professionals. We envision a college with faculty who improve the intellectual lives of candidates, conduct innovative research, and create an academic environment recognized nationally and internationally for excellence in teaching, research, and service. The mission of the COE is to provide high-quality undergraduate and graduate instruction, to conduct meaningful research, and to serve our urban and metropolitan communities.

What are the philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit? As represented in our [*conceptual framework graphic*](#), three philosophical commitments undergird the COE's efforts for preparing educators to serve in P-12 schools.

All COE programs are built on the foundation of a *commitment to diverse communities*. We are committed to preparing effective professionals who understand and value diversity, and who act proactively in all relationships.

All programs are designed using principles of *effective practice*. We are committed to preparing candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to begin practice as competent professionals who meet and exceed the requirements for successful work in their chosen fields.

In all programs and practices, we are committed to the notion of leaders as problem solvers who embrace change. We intend to prepare educators to take *leadership* roles in their chosen profession. Our faculty and candidate leaders are disposed to positive change through active engagement with their various professional communities.

Our pursuit of these three commitments is guided by six action principles:

- **Social Justice:** The COE is committed to working towards the good of others. A climate of openness and egalitarianism is embedded in all our actions.
- **Integrity:** We prepare individuals to act in good conscience, to take responsibility for their behavior, and to do the right thing while respecting others.
- **Excellence:** Our college community continuously creates collaborative networks that maximize resources and mobilize the collective efforts of those working together toward the attainment of excellence in all endeavors.
- **Accountability:** The COE holds itself accountable for meeting the educational goals of the community it serves. Key elements of this core value are planning, communication, evaluation, and responsiveness.
- **Respect:** We are a community of scholars who embody professionalism and engage in respectful discourse. This collegial commitment is reflected in our interactions with candidates that are characterized by a variety of teaching and learning approaches, and with the wider community through partnerships characterized by mutual respect.
- **Continuous Learning:** To meet this commitment for candidates, our faculty offers challenging programs that span undergraduate through doctoral degrees. Faculty are supported in modeling ongoing professional development and self-study.

In the same way that actions in support of the three commitments are guided by principles of action, the COE developed norms, or principles of interaction, to guide behaviors and professional interactions among faculty and candidates. They provide benchmarks for continual monitoring and growth and assist the college in navigating change (Gore, 2002).

- **I take 100% responsibility.** I neither make excuses nor cast blame.
- **I seek equity of voice.** I participate, I support, I listen and I perform and contribute in a manner that encourages others to do the same.
- **I am willing to talk about sensitive issues.** I encourage dialogue and am prepared to discuss sensitive issues.
- **I listen for understanding.** I neither interrupt nor participate in secondary conversations. I will go directly to the source for information and problem resolution.
- **I appreciate the strengths and contributions of others.** I need, I want and I value the strengths and contributions of others.

- **I bring positive energy and encouragement to the team.** I contribute positively; I have high expectations of others and I contribute synergy to the team.
- **I commit to the mission of the College.** I support and implement the mission; I actively encourage others to do the same.

What are the knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit? The work of the unit educator preparation programs is guided by an integrated and coherent knowledge base including standards, best practices and research¹. First, approval of all educator preparation programs in Tennessee is based on state standards which are tightly aligned with INTASC and SPA standards (e.g., see page 3-7 among others at <http://www.tennessee.gov/education/lic/doc/accttchlicstds.pdf>). Unit programs have adopted SPA or other professional standards as candidate outcome standards and have aligned these standards with the conceptual framework performance outcomes. The state, INTASC, and SPA standards all have similar foci which are reflected in our conceptual framework outcomes: content and pedagogical content knowledge and skills, knowledge of the learner, knowledge of teaching and learning, assessment of student learning, management of the teaching and learning environments, and professionalism and professional growth and development. These unit outcomes are supported not only by state and professional standards, but are buttressed also by recent reports of best practice. For example, Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden outline a professional and scholarly consensus on what makes a good teacher in their 2005 National Academy of Education report, *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teacher our Children Deserve*. They lay out a clear framework for understanding teaching and learning: to be a professional a new teacher needs to acquire knowledge of learners and their development in social contexts (learning, human development, and language), knowledge of subject matter and curriculum goals (educational goals and purposes for skills and content subject matter), and knowledge of teaching (teaching subject matter, teaching diverse learners, assessment, and classroom management).

Second, given the urban context of the institution and the mission and vision of the unit, our commitments and outcomes standards are influenced strongly by the research and standards of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE), a federally funded research and development program focused on improving the education of students whose ability to reach their potential is challenged by language or cultural barriers, race, geographic location, or poverty. This focus speaks explicitly to the College of Education conceptual framework of effective practice, commitment to diversity and its unique urban focus. Several studies have led to significant advances in understanding basic learning processes, including the social and cultural foundations of cognitive development (e.g. Waxman, H., Tharp, R., & Hilberg, R. (Eds.), 2004; Dalton, S. & Tharp, R., 2002; and, Tharp, R., Estrada, P., Dalton, S., & Yamauchi, L., 2000). Rather than focusing on presumed student deficits, researchers have focused on ways that schools can scaffold learning, build on student characteristics as resources, and mitigate risk factors. The Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) has synthesized this work with five standards for effective teaching: joint productive activity, language and literacy development, contextualizing teaching and learning, complex thinking, and

¹ Please see refer to the [full conceptual framework document](#) for references cited here.

instructional conversation (<http://crede.berkeley.edu/standards/standards.html>). These standards have been incorporated into our conceptual framework outcome standards.

Finally, the recently adopted unit diversity standards are built on a solid knowledge base that effective teachers make connections to their pupils' communities and are able to build upon the cultural and community strengths that students bring to school (Gay, 2000; Irving, 2003, Ladson-Billings, 1994). Prospective teachers need opportunities to interact with parents and students in their communities in order to develop this knowledge base necessary to be effective in the classroom (Chavkin, 2005; Grant & Gillette, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Thus, an important characteristic of a teacher education program is its capacity to help candidates build these connections to the community. In addition to the capacity to build community connections, the new diversity standards aim to provide candidates with a better grounding in the theoretical and conceptual principles of multicultural education (Ladson-Billings, 1999). Finally the new standards strive to help candidates learn to challenge the status quo surrounding teaching in culturally diverse urban classrooms (Cross, 2003; 2005).

What are 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? In pursuit of our three Commitments to Diverse Communities, Effective Practice, and Leadership we have defined the following six performance outcome standards for P-12 teachers and other school professionals.

- **Content Knowledge and Skills:** Successful candidates understand how knowledge in their discipline is organized, connected, and applied, within the discipline as well as across disciplines, and use that understanding to make the content meaningful to their students. They use the content knowledge and skills of the disciplines to help *all* students develop thinking, reasoning, and analytical abilities. Further, candidates use, and help their students learn to use resources to access information and support in the disciplines.
- **Knowledge of the Learner:** Successful candidates address the uniqueness of the learners they encounter through instruction that addresses different and specific learning needs of individual learners, including the use of assistive technology to increase student participation in the total curriculum. They address the unique issues of urban settings, including their economic and socio-cultural experiences and perspectives. Further, candidates communicate effectively with students and with their families.
- **Pedagogy and Instruction:** Successful candidates facilitate learning through joint productive activity between teacher and students and among students. They apply literacy strategies and develop diverse students' language competence in all subject areas. They contextualize teaching and curriculum in terms of their students' existing experiences in home, community, and school. They challenge their students toward cognitive complexity. They instruct through teacher-student dialogue, especially academic, goal-directed, and small-group conversations (known as instructional conversations). Finally, successful candidates use current and emerging technologies to design and facilitate developmentally appropriate, active learning opportunities for all students.
- **Assessment and Responsive Practice:** Successful candidates gather formative and summative evidence of student learning during regular instruction, and use that evidence to monitor and adjust instructional content, strategies, and resources as needed for individuals and groups of students. They design and apply formative assessments that allow diverse

students to demonstrate their learning. They select and administer formal assessment tools, as necessary, and analyze results in order to make appropriate instructional diagnoses and decisions.

- Management of Classrooms and Individuals:** Successful candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to organize the classroom environment so that Pedagogy/Instruction and Assessment/Responsive Practice standards are effectively implemented. They create safe environments where they can address the unique needs of individual learners. They also use resources (e.g., time, materials, technology) effectively to promote positive classroom learning cultures.
- Personal and Professional Growth and Development:** Successful candidates are reflective about their work and their emerging practice, and affirmatively seek out opportunities to participate in, learn from, and contribute to wider communities of professional educators (e.g. joining professional organizations, seeking out mentors, reading in the profession). They promote ethical and equitable practices throughout their work, in the classroom, the larger school/district organization, in the use of technology, and in forming partnerships with families and communities. They demonstrate the ability and willingness to assume leadership for tasks beyond their classroom that contribute to the overall quality of the learning community. Finally, successful candidates use professional and appropriate language in all written and verbal communication.

The primary unit diversity outcomes include: Candidates understand how students differ in their approaches to learning; and, they use their understanding to create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners. These outcomes are aligned with these conceptual framework outcomes:

- Knowledge of the Learner:** Successful candidates address the uniqueness of the students they encounter through instruction that addresses different and specific learning needs of individual learners, including the use of assistive technology to increase student participation in the total curriculum. They address the unique issues of urban settings, including their economic and socio-cultural experiences and perspectives.
- Pedagogy and Instruction:** Successful candidates facilitate learning through joint productive activity between teacher and students and among students. They contextualize teaching and curriculum in terms of their students' existing experiences in home, community, and school.
- Management of Classrooms and Individuals:** Successful candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to organize the classroom environment so that Pedagogy/Instruction and Assessment/Responsive Practice standards are effectively implemented. They create safe environments where they can address the unique needs of individual learners.

As indicated in the table, [*Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards*](#), these unit outcomes are aligned with Tennessee Standard III-Diverse Learners and with appropriate SPA standards. However, to optimize our new conceptual framework's Commitment to Diverse Communities in spring 2007, following two years of work by the faculty, staff, and community stakeholders comprising the Urban Aspiration Team, the COE faculty adopted the following five [*Diversity Performance Standards*](#) as a more focused and tangible expression of our Commitment to Diverse Communities.

The COE Community (including faculty, staff, and partners). . .

- Understands diversity, social justice, and equity in order to promote effective learning in their everyday practice

- Understands linguistic, ethnic, racial and socioeconomic, disability, religious and sexual orientation diversity and demonstrates culturally relevant practices
- Understands the relationships among various historical and present social inequities and uses reflective practice to challenge their work and explicitly confront social inequality
- Understands the larger national and global contexts and demonstrates a clear sense of their own identities in relationship to social justice
- Understands and values the importance of engaging in comprehensive and sustained professional growth to enhance professional practices involving diverse populations

Several assumptions and next steps are essential as the college moves toward learning, practicing, and demonstrating the standards. During the 2007-08 academic year, college programs are evaluating the opportunities provided for candidates through coursework, field, and clinical experiences to learn, practice, and demonstrate these outcomes. This prerequisite step will be followed by insuring that appropriate assessments and accountability procedures are developed.

The unit approach to disposition outcomes is twofold resulting from alignment with state and professional standards. First, candidates are expected to demonstrate unit level dispositions including, professional behavior, reflective practice, and communication and are aligned with these Tennessee professional education and framework standards.

- Candidates perform professional responsibilities efficiently and effectively.
- Candidates reflect on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments. Candidates are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally. Successful candidates are reflective about their work and their emerging practice, and affirmatively seek out opportunities to participate in, learn from, and contribute to wider communities of professional educators (e.g. joining professional organizations, seeking out mentors, reading in the profession).
- Candidates communicate clearly and correctly with student, parents, and other stakeholders. Candidates use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom. Successful candidates use professional and appropriate language in all written and verbal communication.

Second, candidates are expected to demonstrate the disposition outcomes as expressed in SPA standards. As indicated in the table, [*Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards*](#), these unit disposition outcomes are aligned with Tennessee Standard VI-Communication, Standard IX-Reflective Practitioner, and standards from the Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth. Moreover, these unit and state standard are also aligned with related SPA standards. In addition, each program assesses SPA standards and the dispositions represented in those standards.

However, evaluation of our assessment system revealed that aligning dispositions with SPA standards was uneven and did not provide data as useful as we needed. Therefore, in late fall 2007; the Teacher Education Advisory Council adopted new [*Dispositions, Policies, and Procedures for Assessment*](#) for all candidates in place of program-specific outcomes. At the same time, disposition policies and assessment procedures were adopted as well. Programs are now in the process of identifying the points in their program assessment systems when these new

unit-level disposition outcomes will be assessed. Comprehensive and systematic assessment of these new disposition outcomes and implementation of new policies and procedures will begin in fall 2008. These outcomes have emerged from our conceptual framework commitments and principles and will be incorporated into our living conceptual framework document. In the new specific unit-level disposition outcomes, candidates at the University of Memphis are expected to demonstrate behaviors that are indicative of the following dispositions of effective educators.

The candidate shows a disposition toward and a commitment to each of the following:

- Promoting social justice
- Providing equitable learning opportunities for all students
- Promoting achievement of students at all levels
- Recognizing students' unique prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests as part of the context for student learning
- Maintaining his/her position as a positive role model for students and others in regular attendance, grooming, punctuality, and professional demeanor
- Demonstrating positive work habits and interpersonal skills, demonstrating a positive attitude, dependability, honesty and respect for others
- Maintaining the standards of confidentiality regarding student information and communications
- Understanding and involving a wide variety of resources in the school, family, culture, and community to facilitate student learning
- Seeking out, developing, and implementing the most appropriate methods to meet the diverse learning needs of the students
- Developing students' skills as problem-solvers as they progress toward becoming independent, self-directed learners
- Using effective planning and classroom organization as tools in maximizing the time available for instruction and learning
- Collaborating with other professionals to improve the overall learning of students
- Accepting responsibility for what occurs in his/her classroom and for other school-wide responsibilities that contribute to student learning and a safe, orderly environment
- Using sound judgment and thoughtful decision making with consideration of the consequences
- Demonstrating life-long learning and personal growth through reflection, seeking constructive feedback, and being willing to learn from others and past experience
- Participating in professional growth activities within and outside the school

What is a summarized description of the unit's assessment system? The University of Memphis COEAS is an organizing framework and an operations model that delineates how the COE and all its constituent programs—through ongoing self-study—provides regular and comprehensive assessment of four essential domains: applicants and candidate qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates' competence, and unit and program operations and quality. COEAS provides a common framework for assessing the COE as a unit, and all of its constituent programs, including programs preparing teachers and other school professionals—initial B.S.Ed. and M.A.T./Licensure-only teacher education programs, advanced continuing education M.S. programs for teachers, and advanced preparation M.S. programs for other school professionals.

COEAS is a comprehensive, systematic plan for assessment in which all the COE and its programs specify:

- the performance outcomes standards for candidates and questions about operations and quality;
- the major assessments or data sources for candidate outcomes and questions about operations and quality;
- the candidate assessment performance criteria, and operations and quality goals;
- the steps being taken to ensure trustworthy and meaningful assessment data;
- the time when the key candidate assessments occur, and when operations and quality data are collected;
- those responsible for conducting and scoring key candidate assessments or gathering unit operations and quality data;
- the time when assessment data are summarized, analyzed, and used;
- those who participate in summarizing, analyzing, and using assessment results;
- those who file the final assessment data and action report(s);
- the time when this report is made;
- those to whom the report is communicated; and,
- those who monitor planned actions and the effectiveness of the assessment system.

COEAS is designed to ensure systematic assessment of candidate performance and program operations and quality. The three primary purposes of COEAS are to improve candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions, which results in optimal professional practice and efficacy; to improve curriculum and assessment of professional education programs; and to improve COE program operations and quality. To achieve these purposes, COEAS employs a combination of unit-level and program-specific assessments applied over four program transition points, a coordinated system of university and COE databases for candidate performance and unit operations data, and an uncomplicated yet powerful analysis and reporting system.

What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the previous visit? At the time of the last visit, the unit conceptual framework was based on Bronfenbrenner's ecological model. This model seemed to fit well with programs preparing professionals to work in P-12 school settings, but was seen as less appropriate by the many programs in the COE that prepared professionals to work in non-school settings. With Dean Ric Hovda's fall 2002 appointment and his emphasis of on-going self-study by all COE programs, a decision was made to reexamine the utility of the existing conceptual framework. Program-level conceptual frameworks from P-12 school and non-school programs were gathered and a content analysis of these documents revealed three common themes or commitments: diversity and diverse communities, leadership, and effective practice. A broad-based college-wide committee including representatives from all departments and program types was appointed to draft a new conceptual framework document organized around those three core commitments. This representative committee worked for two years and developed drafts of a conceptual framework, which were discussed by faculty in all departments. The present conceptual framework was adopted following approval by all departments. The resulting COE conceptual framework is organized around the theme of Preparing Educational Leaders and includes three core commitments. Our actions to realize these commitments are guided by six principles. Further, these commitments are represented by outcomes for performance of program candidates and unit faculty. Guided by our commitments to diverse communities and effective practice in spring

2007, departmental faculties adopted specific diversity outcomes, and in late fall 2007 the Teacher Education Advisory Council adopted new specific unit-level disposition standards and policies and assessment procedures.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Evidence from assessments is presented for each element below demonstrating that candidates in B.S.Ed. and M.A.T./Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only initial teacher preparation programs, advanced M.S. programs for licensed teachers seeking continuing education, and advanced M.S./M.A. programs preparing other school professionals to meet professional, state, and institutional standards for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The knowledge, skills, and dispositions stated in this standard are reflected in our conceptual framework and are assessed by the College of Education Assessment System (COEAS). The primary sources of evidence used to demonstrate candidate learning of these knowledge, skills, and dispositions include: Praxis II licensure examinations; assessments of capstone experiences such as student teaching, internships, master’s projects/thesis and comprehensive examinations; program-specific COEAS key assessments required for SPA and annual program reports; an exit survey, follow-up surveys of program completers, and surveys of employers and supervisors of program completers. Overall, the evidence is clear—unit initial and advanced program candidates meet NCATE standards for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and program completion? All P-12 school professional educator licenses in Tennessee require initial teacher education and advanced other school professional candidates to pass multiple Praxis II examinations including a content knowledge examination ([State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area](#)). The table below provides the aggregate pass rates from *state Title II reports* for all required content and pedagogical exams; and, [2003-2006 Praxis II Content Exam Pass Rates by Program Area](#) presents a detailed breakdown of data only from content knowledge exams by individual program areas for the most recent three years. As can be seen, all programs demonstrate pass rates above the 80 percent level.

Aggregate Praxis II Pass Rates

State Mandated Praxis II Content and Pedagogy Exams	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006*
Number of candidates tested	396	399	411
Number and Percentage passed	353 (89%)	353 (88%)	375 (91%)
Statewide pass rate	98%	97%	97%

*2006-2007 Tennessee Title II data will not be available until May 2008

In advanced programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license, all candidates are required to complete either an action research study focused on professional development ([Master’s Project Guidelines](#) and [Master’s Project Rubric](#)) or a traditional master’s thesis research study as a capstone requirement in the last semester of the program. Approximately 98

percent of M.S. program candidates in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership (i.e., ECED, SPED, I & C) elect the master's project action research option; whereas in the advanced M.S. Physical Education Teacher Education program in the Department of Health and Sport Sciences, candidates complete a thesis (e.g., [Physical Education Teacher Education Advanced M.S. Annual Program Report](#)). The master's project assessment guidelines and rubric are aligned with conceptual framework outcomes and require, among others, a focus on instructional content. In addition, presentation of the action research study in a professional conference-like poster session is evaluated by two faculty members as a comprehensive examination for the master's degree. One element of the comprehensive examination assessment focuses on subject matter ([Master's Project Comprehensive Examination Rubric](#)). One element of the rubric for the action research study report itself ([Master's Project Rubric](#)) focuses on candidates' ability to use professional knowledge to make and implement a 6-week plan for improving their teaching. The table [Master's Project Enrollment and Completion Rates](#) presents sample data showing that candidates who enrolled in ICL 7992-Master's Project are successful in the research project assessment and the comprehensive examination assessment.

What other key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' content knowledge as expected in professional, state, and institutional standards; and, what do the data indicate about the candidates' knowledge? In addition to Praxis II licensure exams required for initial teacher licensure, all initial and advanced continuing teacher education programs systematically assess aspects of candidates' content knowledge at each of four assessment points by means of teacher education program admission requirements, unit-level capstone experiences such as student teaching ([Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#)) or action research project/thesis ([Master's Project Guidelines](#) and [Master's Project Rubric](#)), exit survey ([Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey](#)), and follow-up surveys of program completers and employers ([Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers](#) and [Follow-up Surveys of Employers](#)). In addition, program-specific key assessments also provide important evidence about candidate content knowledge; for example, go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/>, select a program to view, and then select *Print Program* to view assessment of content standards.

Strong evidence that initial and advanced teacher education candidates meet professional content knowledge standards is found in Section V of each SPA report ([Initial and Advanced Teacher Education Program SPA Reports](#)). Advanced M.S. teacher education programs that did not submit SPA reports (e.g., SPED, IDT, PETE, I & C) also completed Annual Program Reports in which they analyzed key assessments in relation to program standards that are aligned with professional standards ([Advanced Teacher Education Annual Program Reports](#)). More specifically however, results of COEAS key assessments unique to each initial and advanced program and aligned with program and professional standards are easily available to faculty each semester (for example, go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/>, select the desired program to view, and then select *Report by Standards*). These assessments demonstrate that most candidates meet program standards at either a 1=Acceptable or 2=Optimal level. Additional evidence of the COE's candidates' professional content knowledge comes from the Teaching Preparation Program Reflections exit survey completed by candidates in the final semester at the end of their student teaching. In the [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#) for fall 2006/spring 2007 on Item 1-Obtaining sufficient content knowledge in your discipline, mean

scores of 4.32 and 4.21 indicate candidates perceive the quality of their preparation as Strong to Very Strong (1= Weak to 5=Very Strong).

Further evidence of initial candidate's content knowledge is found in the student teaching evaluation ([Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#)). Aligned with conceptual framework, state, and professional outcome standards, this capstone assessment asks supervising faculty and cooperating teachers to rank candidates content knowledge on two items: Item 2-Plans instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content, student needs, curriculum standards, and the community; and, Item 4-Demonstrates a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, structures, and pedagogy of the content area. Using a three point scale of Developing, Acceptable, or Proficient, data reveal that in fall 2006 and spring 2007 over 95 percent of candidates were rated by cooperating teacher and university supervisors as either Acceptable or Proficient ([Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#)).

What do follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? A follow-up survey of program completers ([Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers](#)) was mailed in spring 2007 with a cover letter and postage-paid return envelope to 800 initial and advanced program completers with 39 initial undergraduates, 17 initial postbaccalaureate licensure-only candidates, and 71 graduate degree candidates responding (n=127). Regarding responses from the 71 graduate level candidates, it should be noted here that the survey form used in the spring 2006 administration of the follow-up did not ask candidates to indicate the specific degree they had completed. As a result, for this data set it is not possible to determine which responses for graduate level candidates came from initial master's (M.A.T) and which were from advanced master's (M.S.) degree program candidates. The Center for Research in Educational Policy, which administers, scores, and reports the results of the follow-up survey for the college, has corrected this omission on the instrument to be used for the spring 2008 administration of the survey ([2008 Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers](#)). As shown in [Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results](#), responses indicated candidates are well prepared in terms of content knowledge, on Item 2-Ability to plan instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs, 84 percent stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation. On Item 4-Ability to demonstrate a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, and structure of your content area, 80 percent of program completers reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the quality of their preparation.

The spring 2007 survey of employers ([Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Instrument](#)) provided similar validation regarding candidates' content knowledge. This survey was mailed with a cover letter and a postage-paid return envelope to a sample of 58 P-12 school principals with 23 surveys being returned. As shown in [Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#), supervising principals' responses indicated that our graduates are well prepared in terms of content knowledge; 87 percent (n=20) stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with candidate's ability to: Item 2-Plan instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs. Furthermore, 91 percent (n=21) of supervising principals were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with unit program completers' ability to: Item 4-Demonstrate a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, structures, and pedagogy of the content area.

In sum, evidence presented in response to the questions for Element 1a above demonstrates that our initial teacher candidates meet unit, state, and professional standards for content knowledge. They know the content they plan to teach with greater than 80 percent of program completers passing the content examinations required by the state for licensure. Further, as evidenced by results of program-specific COEAS key assessments, candidates in advanced M.S. programs for teachers have an in-depth knowledge of the content that they teach.

Ib. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers

What key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' pedagogical content knowledge as expected in professional, state, and institutional standards; and, what do the data indicate about candidates' knowledge and skills? Unit-level and program-specific key assessments provide multiple sources of evidence regarding candidate pedagogical content knowledge for both initial and advanced teacher education programs. For initial teacher preparation programs, these include Praxis II content and pedagogical licensure examinations, evaluation of student teaching, an exit survey, and follow-up surveys of program completers and employers of program graduates. The Praxis II content and pedagogical licensure exams required by the state assess both content and pedagogical content knowledge; and, as reported above in Element 1a, 91 percent of our initial teacher education program candidates passed the Praxis II examination for their content area in 2005-2006. The [*Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results*](#) reveal that in fall 2006/spring 2007 university supervisors and cooperating teachers ranked at least 95 percent of candidates as Acceptable or Proficient on Item 4-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students; and, at least 93 percent as Acceptable or Proficient on Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. An additional source of data that measures pedagogical content knowledge is found in [*Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results*](#) showing that on a five point scale from 1=Weak to 5=Very Strong, mean scores for Item 2-Planning and facilitating learning experiences that make content meaningful for students, were 4.30 in fall 2006 and 4.21 in spring 2007.

In advanced continuing education programs for teachers, evidence for pedagogical content knowledge of candidates is found in SPA reports (e.g., [*Early Childhood Education Advanced M.S. SPA Report*](#)), program specific key assessments aligned with professional standards (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> and select desired program, then select *Report by Standards*), capstone action research master's project evaluations ([*Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007*](#)), and follow-up surveys of program completers. Overall, evidence presented in these sources confirms that unit initial and advanced continuing teacher education program candidates know instructional strategies related to teaching specific content and can present content instruction in clear and meaningful ways.

What assessments demonstrate that candidates can integrate technology in their teaching; and, what do the data indicate? At the assessment point of admission to student teaching, all baccalaureate and postbaccalaureate initial teacher preparation programs require candidates to present evidence of successfully completing an Instructional Design and Technology course focusing on technology integration (i.e., IDT 3600-Technology in Education, and IDT 7061-Media and Technology). Further evidence of candidates' ability to integrate technology into their teaching also comes from [*Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results*](#). On a five point scale where 1=Weak to 5=Very Strong, mean scores for Item 8-Using technology

to enhance instruction, were 4.10 in fall 2006 and 4.12 in spring 2007. In another data source, candidates' ability to integrate technology in their teaching is embedded in Items 2 and 4 of the [*Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers*](#). One of the performances comprising Item 2-Plans instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs is: Designs instruction that utilizes materials, human and community resources, and technology in ways appropriate to the content area. In this case, at the Acceptable level, candidates are expected to demonstrate that: Materials and technology are chosen based on their relevance to the topic and support the achievement of goals and objectives. Similarly, for Item 4-Demonstrates a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, structures, and pedagogy of the content area, one of the performances assessed is: Assures that students have ample opportunity to explore, respond, and extend their thinking through technology, as appropriate to the content area. In this case, at the Proficient level the expectation is: Technology to facilitate student learning is integrated into the lesson. As indicated in Element 1a above, unit candidates perform well on Items 2 and 4 of the [*Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results*](#).

Tennessee professional education standards are identical to the ten INTASC standards with the addition of an eleventh standard focusing on technology. All initial teacher education programs have adopted program standards that are aligned with unit, state, and professional standards. For initial and advanced teacher education programs as well, program key assessments have also been aligned with SPA and other standards and provide evidence related to technology integration as reflected in these professional standards (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> and select desired program, then select *Report by Standards*). Evidence from SPA reports and COEAS key assessments—which are also aligned with unit and state/INTASC standards—demonstrates consistently that initial teacher education program candidates are able to integrate technology in their teaching.

In advanced programs for the continuing education of teachers, evidence of candidate ability to integrate technology in their teaching can be found in program-specific assessments of SPA standards (e.g., [*Early Childhood Education Advanced M.S. SPA Report*](#)). Evidence is also found in annual program reports (e.g., [*Instructional Design and Technology Advanced M.S. Annual Program report*](#); [*Physical Education Teacher Education Advanced M.S. Annual Program Report*](#); [*Special Education Advanced M.S. Annual Program Report*](#), etc.) as well as in program-specific COEAS key assessments (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> and select desired program, then go to *Report by Standards* or, *Report by Assessment*). Overall, the evidence is clear that unit candidates in advanced programs for the continuing education of teachers are able to integrate technology in their teaching.

What do follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge? As shown in [*Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results*](#), responses indicate that 82 percent of B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only candidates (n=56) and 80 percent of graduate candidates (n=71) were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation to: Item 4-Demonstrate a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, and structure of the content area; and 84 percent and 82 percent respectively were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation to: Item 5-Use research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. In addition, 84 percent of B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only candidates and 85 percent of graduate candidates reported

being either Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation to: Item 2-Plan instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs. As shown in [Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#), responses from 23 school principals indicate they perceived unit graduates to be prepared in terms of pedagogical content knowledge, with 91 percent (n=21) indicating they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with unit program completers preparation to: Item 4-Demonstrate a deep understanding of the central concepts, assumptions, structures, and pedagogy of the content area. Similarly, 74 percent (n=17) stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their ability to: Item 5-Use research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. Further, 87 percent of responding principals reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied with unit candidates' preparation to: Item 2-Plan instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs.

Ic. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

What assessments provide the unit information about candidates' professional knowledge and skills related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers?

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are assessed in initial and advanced continuing education programs for teachers by multiple types of assessments at specific assessment points. Assessments for initial teacher education programs include: program-specific COEAS key assessments, at least two and as many as four different Praxis II licensure examinations, Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers, Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey, follow-up survey of program graduates, and survey of employers. Specific evidence related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills is also summarized in Section V of each SPA report. Assessments for advanced continuing teacher education programs include: the SPA report for the ECED M.S. program, program-specific COEAS key assessments, capstone master's project/thesis, and follow-up surveys of graduates and employers.

Praxis II examinations required by the state for teacher licensure provide an important and systematic source of evidence showing how unit initial teacher education candidates meet standards for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. In addition to mandated subject area content examinations discussed above in Element 1a, all teacher licensure candidates also are required to take the appropriate Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis II examination ([State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area](#)); in addition, licensure in many areas also requires a focused pedagogy examination (e.g., Elementary, Secondary Math, Secondary English, Special Education, etc.). In particular, results from the Principles of Learning and Teaching examinations ([2007 Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam Performance Scores](#)) show that candidates have foundational knowledge required of all teachers (i.e., historical and philosophical foundations, child/adolescent development, professionalism, etc). Further evidence of positive performance around professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills by our initial program candidates is found in required pedagogy licensure exams ([2007 Praxis II Pedagogy Exam Performance Scores](#)).

Additional evidence for initial candidate performance is generated through assessment of student teachers ([Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#)). The 2006-07 academic year results show that cooperating teachers and university supervisors assessed at least 92 percent of candidates to be either at an Acceptable or Proficient level regarding aspects of planning instruction (items 1, 2, and 3) and at least 95 percent at those levels

for managing the learning environment (Items 9 and 10). From another perspective, [*Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results*](#) illustrate that initial program candidates reported positive perceptions regarding Item 3-Designing instruction based on an understanding of how children learn and develop; Item 4-Creating instructional opportunities for diverse learners; Item 5-Accessing appropriate services/resources to meet exceptional learning needs; Item 6-Using multiple teaching and learning strategies effectively; Item 7-Establishing effective procedures and expectations to create a positive learning environment; Item 9-Managing classroom behavior through established techniques and procedures; and, Item 10-Organizing, allocating, and managing time, space, and activities. Means on these items for spring/fall 2006 ranged from 3.80 to 4.32 where 1=Weak and 5=Very Strong. As a whole, the body of evidence from program-specific COEAS key assessments, a variety of Praxis II licensure examinations, Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers, and Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey, strongly supports the claim that initial teacher preparation program candidates have acquired and can apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn.

What assessments provide the unit information about advanced candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? Evidence for advanced teacher education candidate proficiencies regarding professional and pedagogical skills is derived from program-specific COEAS key assessments, capstone master's project/thesis, and follow-up surveys of graduates and employers. As can be seen in the discussion of evidence in Section V of the Early Childhood Education M.S. SPA report ([*Early Childhood Education Advanced M.S. SPA Report*](#)), and in other program-specific key assessments reported in advanced program [*annual program reports*](#), advanced candidates meet program standards related to professional foundations, planning, knowledge of child/adolescent development, and instruction. More specifically, data from 2006-2007 program-specific key assessments indicate that advanced candidates have acceptable levels of pedagogical knowledge and skills (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> and select the desired program and semester, then select *Report by Standards*). The action research master's project and thesis requirement for all advanced programs provide a rich source of evidence of candidates' ability to reflect on their practice and identify their strengths and areas of needed improvement. As advanced teacher education candidates engage in this professional self-study activity, they encounter and apply current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices. A central focus of this assessment requires teachers to critically analyze educational research and policies and apply it to their own practice. Evidence shown in [*Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-07*](#) provide clear evidence of positive candidate performance on this assessment. When viewed as a whole, evidence indicates that unit advanced teacher candidates can facilitate learning by all students as they apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills that are described in unit, state, and professional standards. They reflect on their teaching practice and are able to analyze and apply educational research findings to their practice. They demonstrate leadership as they share new research-based learning with others in the profession.

What do follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? Graduates of initial and advanced teacher education program candidates were surveyed regarding their perceptions of their preparation regarding core professional and pedagogical knowledge and

skills including Item 1-Establishing appropriate instructional goals and objectives; Item 2- Planning instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs; Item 3-Adapting instructional opportunities for diverse learners; Item 9- Creating a classroom culture that develops student intellectual capacity in the content area; Item 10-Effectively manage student behavior; and, Item 11-Manage classroom resources effectively. As shown in [Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results](#), B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only program completers (n=56) were Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding their preparation for Item 1 (95%), Item 2 (84%), Item 3 (70%), Item 9 (84%), Item 10 (79%), and Item 11 (86%). Graduate level program completers (n=71) reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding their preparation for Item 1 (87%), Item 2 (85%), Item 3 (77%), Item 9 (78%), Item 10 (63%), and Item 11 (72%). As shown in [Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#), responses from 23 school principals indicate they were either Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding unit program completer's preparation for Item 1 (100% n=23), Item 2 (87% n=20), Item 3 (52% n=12), Item 9 (70% n=16), and Item 10 (78% n=18). While it is well-known that new teachers often find classroom management and managing student behavior challenging, we are nonetheless concerned about the degree of program completers' and school principals' dissatisfaction in this area. We know from repeated exit surveys that initial program candidates leave the program with the perception that they have been well-prepared in this area (e.g., Item 7-Establishing effective procedures and expectation to create a positive learning environment; Item 9-Managing classroom behavior through established techniques and procedures; and Item 10-Organizing, allocating, and managing time, space, and activities) where means are consistently 3.92 or better on a five point scale. We know that mentoring of new teachers is particularly important regarding classroom management and student behavior and that mentoring varies widely by district and building in our service area; this may explain part of the perceptions. Overall, principals are satisfied with our graduates (91% feel confident in employing other unit graduates); however, further insight may be gained during the spring 2008 focus group interviews of employers of unit program completers.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

What key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' ability to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences? What do the data indicate about candidates' ability to help students learn? In both initial and advanced teacher education programs, candidates learn to use assessment to analyze student learning needs and to assess the effectiveness of their instruction in promoting learning for all students. In initial teacher preparation programs, assessments of Element 1d include the Principles of Teaching and Learning Praxis examination as well as appropriate Praxis II Pedagogy examinations required for many licensure areas ([State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area](#)). Evidence is also generated by the evaluation of student teaching, program-specific key assessments, an exit survey, and follow-up surveys of program completers and employers. In advanced teacher education programs, evidence for student learning is provided by program-specific key assessments as reported in SPA reports, annual program reports, COEAS reports by standard, and follow-up surveys of program completers. The action research master's project ([Master's Project Guidelines](#) and [Master's Project Rubric](#)) is designed to provide strong evidence of teachers' impact on student learning.

Evidence from the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam and the various Praxis II licensure area pedagogy exams demonstrate that unit initial teacher education candidates perform well on the aspects of these tests related to assessing student learning and instruction ([2007 Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam Performance Scores](#); and, [2007 Praxis II Pedagogy Exam Performance Scores](#)). Assessment of student teachers using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers instrument also provides direct evidence of candidate performance related to using appropriate assessments and reflecting on practice in clinical settings. As shown in [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#), in fall 2006/spring 2007 better than 93 percent of student teachers were rated as either Acceptable or Proficient by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on Item 6- Uses appropriate evaluation and assessments to determine student mastery of content and make instructional decisions; Item 7-Communicates student achievement and progress to students, their parents, and appropriate others; and, Item 8-Reflects on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments. Since individual initial program outcome standards are aligned with unit conceptual framework performance standards, state, and INTASC and SPA standards ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#)), unit program-specific assessments are also rich sources of evidence related to student learning. Specifically, evidence related to student learning as discussed in Section V of the [SPA reports](#) presents evidence that unit candidates are able to assess student learning and use the results of those assessments to promote learning. More specific evidence related to SPA standards on assessment and teacher reflection can be found in program-specific COEAS key assessments (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> then select the desired program and semester, then select *Report by Standards*). From another perspective, [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#) provide further evidence of initial program candidate perceptions about Item 11-Assessing student work and achievement in varied ways; Item 12-Monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction accordingly; and Item 13-Using test data to make instructional decisions. In spring/fall 2006, on a five point scale where 1=Weak and 5=Very Strong, means for these items ranged from 3.91-4.24. At program completion, not only did cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluate candidates as demonstrating proficiencies around assessment and evaluation of student learning, the candidates themselves also perceived they had received a strong preparation to assess student learning.

In advanced continuing education programs for teachers, evidence about candidates' ability to assess all students and help them learn is also reported in SPA reports (e.g., [Early Childhood Education Advanced M.S. SPA Report](#)), annual program reports, and more specifically in program-specific COEAS key assessments (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> then select desired program and semester, and then *Report by Standards*). Strong evidence for advanced teacher education candidates' performance around student learning is also generated by the action research master's project and thesis requirement. In the master's project, candidates assess their teaching, make a plan for improving their teaching, and then gather assessment evidence to document changes in their teaching and the impact those changes have on student learning. Candidate action plans are rooted in a thorough understanding of standards, best practices, research, and theory. Candidates reflect on and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. As demonstrated in [Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-07](#), candidates are able to document the impact of their teaching on students, and reflect on and adjust their teaching based on student data.

What do follow-up surveys of employers and graduates indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? Surveys of initial and advanced teacher education program completers and surveys of supervising principals (employers) provide additional information in determining that candidates possess the ability to help all students learn. Graduates of initial and advanced teacher education program candidates were surveyed regarding their perceptions of their preparation regarding assessment and evaluation including Item 6-Use appropriate evaluation and assessments to determine student mastery of content and make instructional decisions; Item 7-Communicate student achievement and progress to students, their parents, and appropriate others; and Item 8-Reflect on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments. As shown in [Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results](#), B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only program completers (n=56) were Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding their preparation for Item 6 (87%), Item 7 (78%), and Item 8 (86%). Graduate level program completers (n=71) reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding their preparation for Item 6 (83%), Item 7 (80%), and Item 8 (80%). As shown in [Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#), responses from 23 school principals indicate they were either Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding unit program completer's preparation for Item 6 (78% n=18), Item 7 (78% n=18), and Item 8 (65% n=15). While initial and advanced program completers and school principals who supervise these program completers were generally satisfied with their competence to assess and evaluate student learning, there were eight school principals who were less than satisfied with candidates' ability to reflect on their teaching practice and adjust it based on classroom assessments and evaluation.

Ie. Professional knowledge and skill for other school professionals

What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and program completion? All unit other school professional preparation advanced programs are either nationally accredited by NCATE partner professional associations (e.g., School Counseling—CACREP, Speech-Language Pathology—ASHA) or have submitted SPA reports (e.g., [Reading—IRA](#), [School Leadership—ILCC](#), [Library Media Specialist—ALA/AASL](#), and [School Psychology—NASP](#)). Tennessee requires candidates for PreK-12 licensure as reading specialists, school librarians, school psychologists, and school principals to complete a single Praxis II exam in the specialty area ([State Mandated Praxis II Exams by Licensure Area](#)). Evidence presented in [Praxis II Scores for Other School Professionals](#) provides clear evidence that unit candidates have achieved content and professional knowledge as measured by these licensure exams. In addition, evaluating candidate proficiencies related to area content and professional knowledge and skills at program completion, unit advanced master's other school professional education programs requires various capstone experiences such as oral examination, internship/practicum, or action research master's project or thesis. Evidence regarding professional knowledge and skill from these experiences is presented in Section IV² and V of the [SPA reports](#), and in some cases in action research master's project and comprehensive examination results ([Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007](#)).

What key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' professional knowledge and skills as expected in professional state and institutional standards? All unit programs for other school professionals are either accredited by NCATE partnership professional

²Throughout this IR, in order to review documents referenced as attachments in Section I and Section IV of the NCATE Program Review System SPA reports, the reader must remember to click on the Paperclip icon on the left-hand side tool bar to make the attached documents visible.

associations or submitted SPA reports. All programs seeking national SPA recognition have defined six to eight key assessments that are listed in Section II and discussed in detail in Section IV of the other school professional program SPA reports (i.e., [Reading](#), [School Leadership](#), [Library Media Specialist](#), and [School Psychology](#)).

What do assessment data indicate about candidates' demonstration of their ability to: know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practice; and use technology in their practice? SPA standards related to these proficiencies are assessed by program-specific COEAS key assessments (e.g., go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> and then select desired program and semester, then select *Report by Standards*, or *Report by Assessment*). For example, the School Administration and Supervision M.S. program assesses ELCC Standard 4.0-Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources through COEAS key assessments 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. In another example from the Reading Specialist M.S. program, the IRA Standard 2.2-[Candidates can support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices. Candidates help teachers select appropriate options and explain the evidence-base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. Candidates demonstrate the options in their own (and demonstration) teaching] is assessed by COEAS key assessment 3 and 6. In yet another example from the Library Information Specialist program, ALA/AASL standards related to the use of technology are assessed through COEAS key assessment 3. Review of assessment data related to professional knowledge and skills as reported in SPA reports Sections IV and V and in related COEAS key assessments indicates that unit advanced other school professional candidates meet standards related to knowledge of their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practice; and use technology in their practice. In addition, the capstone action research master's project and thesis require candidates to demonstrate their ability to use current research to inform practice in their work setting. Evidence from this assessment indicates that candidates are successful in demonstrating this proficiency ([Master's Project Comprehensive Exam and Project Results 2006-2007](#)).

What do follow-up surveys of graduate and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional knowledge and skills? Each year as part of its COEAS assessment system plan, the School Administration and Supervision program administers a follow-up survey to a sample of program completers who are now educational leaders in area schools. The Evaluation of the University of Memphis School Leadership Program is a series of 18 items that are aligned directly with the ELCC and Tennessee licensure standards. The survey also asks for comments and suggestions for improving the program. The survey measures the preparedness of program graduates in completing various administrative tasks related directly to professional knowledge and skills and that are essential in providing the best environment for student learning to occur. The most recent survey was returned by 11 program completers, who ranked items from 0=Very Dissatisfied to 4=Very Satisfied ([Results from School Administration Survey of Program Graduates](#)). Several of the survey items are aligned with ELCC standards and provide evidence related to candidates' ability to know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practice; and use technology in their practice. These items and their means follow: Develop a school improvement plan based on data and

school needs (3.27), Communicate the school's mission to parents and community members (3.36), Facilitate adequate parental involvement with their child's education (3.09), and Perform business and administrative functions (3.0).

Additional follow-up data regarding student learning for other school professionals comes from the School Psychology program survey of practitioners who supervise program completers. This assessment is a follow-up rating evaluation of graduates completed by the primary supervisor. The survey is sent at the end of the graduate's first, second, and third year of employment. Supervisors are asked to rate program graduates on 11 domains aligned with the National Association of School Psychologists standards. Domains related to evidence of candidates' ability to know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practice; and use technology in their practice include, for example: Information technology; Research and program evaluation; Home/school/community collaboration; and, Student diversity in development and learning. Supervisors were asked to rate school psychologist program completers as either: Below Expectation, Meeting Expectation, or Above Expectation. As indicated in [Evaluation of School Psychology Program Graduates by Employers](#), the data demonstrate that all students are rated overall as Meeting Expectations.

As noted earlier in this report, a follow-up survey sent to a list of all initial and advanced program completers may have been returned by candidates who completed advanced M.S. programs, but this level of demographic data was not collected in the most recent survey ([Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers](#)). Given that caveat; however, data from the following items provide evidence related to graduate degree program candidates' ability to know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practice; and use technology in their practice include, for example, Item 5-Use research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students; where 82 percent of graduate program completers indicated they were either Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation. On Item 12-Collaborate with colleagues and appropriate others, 86 percent of candidates completing graduate programs indicated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied. Overall, evidence from COEAS key assessments presented in Section IV and discussed in Section V of SPA reports, and from follow-up surveys of candidates and surveys of employers indicates that unit candidates for other professional school roles have an adequate understanding of the knowledge expected in their fields and delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They know their students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform their practices; use technology in their practices; and support student learning through their professional services.

If. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

What key assessments provide unit information about candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning; and, what do the data indicate about candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? All unit programs for other school professionals are either accredited by NCATE partnership professional associations or have submitted SPA reports. Key assessments that provide unit information about candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning are detailed in Section IV and V of the other school professional program SPA reports (i.e., [Reading](#), [School Leadership](#), [Library Media Specialist](#), and [School Psychology](#)).

What do follow-up surveys of graduate and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning?

In the School Administration and Supervision advanced M.S. program for the preparation of school principals, several items in their follow-up survey of program graduates are aligned with ELCC standards and provide evidence related to their ability to create positive environments for student learning:

Communicate the school's mission to parents and community members, Assess school culture/climate, Establish a culture of high expectations for staff and student performance, Facilitate adequate parental involvement with their child's education, and, Form partnerships with external partners such as community groups, businesses, higher education institutions ([Results from School Administration Survey of Program Graduates](#)). Additional follow-up data regarding student learning for other school professionals comes from the School Psychology survey of practitioners who supervise program graduates. Domains related to candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning include: Consultation and collaboration; Effective instruction and development of cognitive/academic skills; Socialization and development of life skills; Student development in diversity and learning; School and systems organization, policy development, and climate; Prevention, crisis intervention, and mental health; and, Home/school/community collaboration. As indicated in [Evaluation of School Psychology Program Graduates by Employers](#), the data demonstrate that all students are rated overall as Meeting Expectations. Finally, responses to the Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey (1a.7) returned by graduate level program completers provide evidence related to graduate degree program candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning. On Item 2-Plan instruction and student evaluation based on an in-depth understanding of the content and student needs, 85 percent of graduate level program completers perceived that they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation. On Item 9-Create a classroom culture that develops student intellectual capacity in the content area, 78% reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation. On Item 12-Collaborate with colleagues and appropriate others, 86 percent reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied. Finally, on Item 14-Communicate clearly and correctly with students, parents, and other stakeholders, 85 percent reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation. Overall, evidence from COEAS key assessments presented in Section IV and discussed in Section V of SPA reports, and from follow-up surveys of candidates and surveys of employers indicates that unit candidates for other professional school roles are able to create positive environments for student learning. They understand and build upon the developmental levels of students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.

1g. Professional Dispositions

What dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

Our initial approach to expected dispositions is derived from the unit conceptual framework's structure around the three core commitments to diverse communities, effective practice, and leadership. The professional dispositions inherent in these commitments are reflected in unit, state, and professional standards regarding professional behavior, reflective practice, and communication. However, as we concluded our first full cycle of the unit assessment system operation, it was apparent that a program-specific approach to assessing dispositions related to the three conceptual framework commitments was not working as we had envisioned. As a result, in late fall 2007, the Teacher Education Advisory Council approved a unit-wide set of specific dispositions along with related uniform policies and assessment procedures for all initial and advanced programs ([Dispositions, Policies, and Procedures for Assessment](#)). While

programs may continue to use program-specific disposition assessments if they wish, in the new approach to assessing unit dispositions initial and advanced candidates will be assessed at multiple points throughout their program using unit-wide dispositions that are clearly aligned with the conceptual framework commitments to diverse communities, effective practice, and leadership. Moreover, assessment of candidates using these unit disposition standards will be governed by policies that have been vetted by the university legal department, and will be assessed systematically at two specific transition points during the program. The new dispositions and policies and assessment procedures will be implemented by all programs in fall 2008.

What key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' dispositions; and, what do the data indicate about candidate's knowledge and demonstration of the expected dispositions? Initial and advanced teacher education and advanced other school professional program candidate dispositions are assessed through program-specific COEAS key assessments aligned with state, SPA, or other programs standards. Initial teacher preparation program candidate dispositions are assessed through the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers, which is aligned with unit, state, and INTASC standards. Candidate dispositions are also assessed through follow-up surveys of program completers and surveys of employers.

Specialized professional associations have standards regarding core dispositions around topics such as professional conduct, ethics, attitudes and beliefs that all students can learn, collaboration, and reflective practice (for example, see NAEYC, ACEI, CEC, NASPE, IRA, ALA/AASL, ELCC, NASP, etc. at <http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4>). Initial and advanced teacher education and advanced other school professional programs in the unit have adopted or aligned their program standards to SPA standards or other professional standards. As required by the unit assessment system (COEAS), all programs have developed key assessments for their program standards which are aligned with state, INTASC, and professional standards. Evidence from COEAS key assessments aligned with professional disposition outcomes indicates that initial and advanced teacher education and advanced other school professional candidates meet these performance outcomes (e.g, go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> then select desired program and semester, and then select *Report by Standards*). Evidence from *Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results* Item 11-Demonstrates professional behaviors and work habits, shows that during fall 2006/spring 2007 cooperating teachers and university supervisors rate 98 percent of candidates as performing at either an Acceptable or Proficient level. From the same source, evidence from Item 12-Communicates clearly and correctly with students, parents, and other stakeholders, 97 and 98 percent of cooperating teacher and university supervisors respectively rate candidates as performing at either an Acceptable or Proficient level. Similarly, on Item 8-Reflects on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments, 97 and 95 percent of cooperating teachers and university supervisors respectively rate candidates as performing at either an Acceptable or Proficient level.

What do follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of dispositions? When responding to items related to dispositions on the follow-up survey of program completers, 86 percent of B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only program completers and 82 percent of graduate degree program completers reported being Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Item 13-Perform professional responsibilities efficiently and

effectively ([Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results](#)). Similarly, on Item 14-Communicate clearly and correctly with students, parents and other stakeholders, 83 percent reported being either Satisfied or Very Satisfied.

Evidence from a survey of supervising principals (employers) indicates candidates have developed professional dispositions: 95 percent of responding principals stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with candidates' ability to: Item 11-Collaborate with colleagues and appropriate others; 87 percent stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with candidates ability to: Item 12-Engage in high-quality, on-going professional development; and, 86 percent stated they were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with candidates' ability to: Item 13-Perform professional responsibility efficiently and effectively ([Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#)). Similarly, on Item 9-Reflect on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments, 65 percent indicated they were either Satisfied or Very Satisfied; and, on Item 14-Communicate clearly and correctly with students, parents and other stakeholders, 91 percent reported being either Satisfied or Very Satisfied.

How does the unit know that candidates are developing dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? This question represents a revision to the 2000 NCATE standards that was ratified by the NCATE Board on May 11, 2007 and that will go into effect for institutions in fall 2008. At the present time, we have some evidence from observation of candidates during their clinical experience that they are developing these dispositions. Evidence from [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#) Item 3-Adapts instructional opportunities for diverse learners, shows that during fall 2006/spring 2007, 92 percent of candidates were assessed by cooperating teachers as being at Acceptable or Proficient levels, and 89 percent of candidates were assessed by university supervisors as being at Acceptable or Proficient levels. Similarly for Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students, 95 and 93 percent of candidates were evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors respectively as being at Acceptable or Proficient levels. Data from [Teacher Education Program Candidate Follow-up Survey Results](#) for Item 3-Adapts instructional opportunities for diverse learners reveals that 70 percent of B.S.Ed. and Postbaccalaureate Licensure-only program completers were Satisfied or Very Satisfied, and 77 percent of graduate degree program completers were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation in this area. The [Teacher Education Program Employer Survey Results](#) indicate that 52 percent (n=12) of responding school principals were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with program completers' ability to: Item 3-Adapt instructional opportunities for diverse learners; while 74 percent (n=17) were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with program completers ability to: Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students.

In advanced programs for other school professionals, SPA standards also provide evidence regarding dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. For example, the ELCC school leadership Standard 2 (Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff) accepts the proposition that all students can learn and that student learning is the fundamental purpose of schools. More specifically, ELCC Standard 5 (Candidates who complete the program are

educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner) also provides evidence regarding these dispositions. Evidence from COEAS key assessments of these two standards demonstrates that school principal candidates exhibit these knowledge, skills, and dispositions ([Educational Leadership Advanced M.S. SPA Report](#)). Similarly in the School Psychology program, NASP Standard 2.5 (Student Diversity in Development and Learning) and Standard 2.10 (School Psychology Practice and Development) address aspects of fairness and equity in professional practice. Results of assessments for these standards are cited in the School Psychology SPA report ([School Psychology Advanced MA SPA Report](#)).

To provide a more direct assessment of these particular dispositions, evidence will come from the newly adopted unit diversity standards that have been incorporated into our conceptual framework as we seek to live our commitment to diverse communities and also from assessment of unit-wide disposition standards for all professional educators. A set of 16 specific unit-wide disposition outcome standards has been identified and aligned with our conceptual framework commitments. Similarly, assessment procedures for these unit-wide dispositions have been proposed, and unit policies related to disposition outcomes have been developed and vetted by the university legal department. The Teacher Education Advisory Council has adopted these disposition standards, assessment procedures, and policies; and, candidates will be assessed using them beginning in fall 2008.

What the unit is doing well related to Standard 1. One of the primary commitments of the unit conceptual framework is our commitment to effective practice. We make this commitment visible in our systematic and on-going programmatic self-study against high standards: How can we improve our programs' effectiveness in preparing teachers and other school professionals by seeking national recognition that our programs meet professional association standards? To begin this process of changing our practice for the better, in September 2007, we submitted 17 SPA reports for initial, advanced, and other school professional preparation programs. This is significant in part because the Tennessee/NCATE protocol does not require submission of SPA reports, and in fact, most of the state's 18 NCATE accredited institutions have not submitted any SPA reports. Completion and submission of the SPA reports is but one—albeit significant—step in our self-study design, in the coming year we will use the feedback received from these peer reviews to examine how our educator preparation programs can be improved.

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The University of Memphis College of Education Assessment System (COEAS) is an organizing framework and an operations model that delineates how the College of Education (COE) and all its constituent programs—through ongoing self-study—provides regular and comprehensive assessment of four essential domains: applicants and candidate qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates' competence, and unit and program operations and quality. COEAS provides a common framework for assessing the COE as a unit, and all of its constituent programs, including programs preparing teachers and other school professionals—initial B.S.Ed. and M.A.T./Licensure-only teacher education programs, advanced continuing education M.S. programs for teachers, and advanced preparation M.S. programs for other school professionals. The University of Memphis COEAS is designed for three purposes: to monitor growth of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; to determine the efficacy of curriculum and

assessment of all COE programs; and to structure periodic analysis of data aimed at improving unit and program operations and quality.

2a. Assessment system

How is the unit assessment system evaluated and refined; and, who is involved? Structures are in place to ensure systematic evaluation and refinement of the COEAS by unit faculty, professional community members, and college administrators. Once a year at the end of each spring semester, initial, advanced continuing, and other school professional program faculty meet with professional community stakeholders to review assessment data and the assessment system; a required outcome of these annual assessment retreats is completion of the Annual Program Report (e.g., [2007 Annual Program Report format](#)) which, among others, includes the following questions: What changes need to be made in your program's candidate assessments and scoring guides or assessments of program operations during the 2007-08 academic year in order to provide more meaningful and useful data? Overall, how can the COEAS be changed to provide more meaningful and useful evidence regarding candidate performance and program operations? The professional community stakeholders who participate in the assessment retreats are members of each program's advisory committee and include P-12 teachers, administrators, and Arts and Sciences faculty. These Annual Program Reports are reviewed by unit department chairs, the Teacher Education Advisory Council, and the dean's leadership team, which includes associate and assistant deans for graduate studies, faculty and staff professional development, P-12 programs, as well as directors of teacher education, and assessment. The dean's leadership team is responsible for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the unit assessment system. In addition to these formal structures and systematic data sources, the director of Assessment also receives anecdotal evidence about the operation of the assessment system during meetings with departmental assessment committees and program coordinators. As a result of feedback from all sources, a number of changes have occurred during the first full year of COEAS operation; for example, many programs have revised key assessments and scoring guides for key assessments, changes have been made to the COEAS database including adding new report options for data output and simplifying data report formats, and revising scoring procedures for unit categorical key assessments such as the student teaching evaluation instrument ([Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#)) and the student teaching teaching-unit assessment instrument. Further, review of the assessment system by the dean's leadership team provided additional evidence that the unit needed to change the way it assesses professional dispositions for all candidates.

How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards? The COEAS operations model ([COEAS Operations Model](#)) is based on an annual cycle of data collection and reporting and is applied to assessment of four essential domains: applicant and candidate qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, and unit and program operations and quality ([COEAS Essential Assessment Domains](#)). COEAS incorporates several important structural features including assessment of candidates at multiple decision points, the use of multiple data sources for each of the four assessment domains, an annual cycle to structure regular analysis of assessment data to improve programs, and the use of information technologies to conduct, analyze, and archive assessments and data ([COEAS Assessment Domains and System Characteristics](#)). The COEAS model for assessing teacher education and other school professional candidates and programs ensures that decisions about

candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at admission into programs, at admission to the capstone experience, at program completion, and after program completion ([COEAS Model Transition Points](#)).

The unit conceptual framework identifies candidate knowledge, skill, and disposition performance outcome standards for P-12 education professionals ([six pillars of effective practice](#)). Each program has adopted these performance standards and has aligned them with their adopted SPA or other professional standards, INTASC standards, and Tennessee professional education standards ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#)). The COEAS has adopted the program-based NCATE SPA assessment system model (for example, see SPA program report forms at <http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4>) and thus requires all initial and advanced programs to identify six to eight key assessments, which are in turn used to assess candidate proficiencies in relation to professional, state, and unit outcome standards. Together with educator preparation program admission standards, program completer follow-up surveys, and employer surveys, the six to eight categorical-unit and program-specific key assessments provide comprehensive and systematic evidence that all initial and advanced program candidates demonstrate the proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards.

What are the key assessments used to monitor candidate performance on standards and at what points are they administered in programs? The table [Overview of Key Assessments and Assessment Points](#) presents an overview of the key assessments used to monitor candidate performance on standards and the points at which they are administered in programs. Also, more specific information about program specific key assessments is presented in the preceding response to Standard 1 as well as in Sections II and IV of the [SPA reports](#). Further, the table [Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments](#) provides additional detailed descriptions of the key assessments used to monitor candidate performance on standards and the points at which they are administered in programs.

What are the major transition points during programs, what assessments are used, and how are candidates performing on the assessments not reported in national/state program reports or Standard 1? As illustrated in [COEAS Model Transition Points](#), the COEAS model for assessing teacher education and other school professional candidates and programs employs four transition points. Assessment point 1: for initial candidates, admission to a teacher education program, and for advanced candidates, admission to the graduate school and a graduate degree program; Assessment point 2: for initial candidates, admission to student teaching, and for advanced candidates, admission to the capstone clinical internship, master's project action research, thesis or comprehensive examination; Assessment point 3: for initial candidates, exit from student teaching and program completion, and for advanced candidates, completion of the capstone experience and program completion; and, Assessment point 4: for both initial and advanced candidates follow-up as they begin performing as a beginning teacher, an experienced teacher, or a new administrator or other school professional. In addition to the categorical unit assessments that occur at admission (Assessment point 1) and after program completion follow-up surveys (Assessment point 4), each program has identified six to eight COEAS Key Assessments that are aligned with professional, state, and unit performance standards. These COEAS Key Assessments are identified in Section II and then described in great detail in Section IV of the [SPA reports](#) and are also labeled in the COEAS database (e.g.,

<https://coeas-data.memphis.edu/> Select desired program, then, *Standards & Assessments*). Further, as indicated just above, the table [Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments](#) describes the points at which key assessments are administered in each type of program.

Candidate performance on unit-level and program-specific assessments administered at Assessment points 2, 3, and 4 is well described in our response to Standard 1 above. Further description of the assessments, and when in the program they are administered, are found in [SPA reports](#) Sections II and IV. Initial and advanced program candidate performance on admission assessments administered at Assessment point 1 is detailed in the tables found in [Candidate Admission Data](#).

What process has the unit adopted to ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias? The unit takes effective steps at both the unit and program levels to eliminate sources of bias in performance assessments and works at both levels to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures. Assessments are fair when they assess what has been taught. To that end, at the beginning of the COEAS development process, program faculty reviewed the curriculum to ensure that candidates were provided opportunities to learn, practice, and demonstrate the expected proficiencies as they adopted standards. In addition, faculty constructed state approval curriculum/standards matrices as part of state program review. These matrices are charts showing where in the curriculum our candidates have opportunities to learn and practice what is specified in the standards. Fairness also means that candidates understand what is expected of them on the assessments. Review of attachments in Section IV of the [SPA reports](#) illustrates how instructions and timing of assessments are clearly stated and shared with candidates. In addition, candidates are given information on how the rubrics are used to score the assessments and how they count toward completion of their program. Additional examples of this aspect of fairness in operation may be observed in the capstone [master's project guidelines](#) and [master's project rubric](#), and the [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#).

Assessments are accurate when they measure what they purport to measure. To this end, the unit has aligned assessments with the standards and learning proficiencies that they are designed to measure; that is, the same or consistent categories of content appear in the assessments that are in the standards. For example, the [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#) is aligned directly with the state standards for teacher performance. To continue with this example, the student teaching assessment is congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the Tennessee standards, which are aligned with the conceptual framework outcomes and professional standards. To further ensure accuracy of assessments, program faculty systematically reviewed alignment and appropriateness of assessments as part of preparing SPA reports. In addition, assessments are reviewed annually during the systematic Assessment Retreats to determine if they are well-aligned with standards, appropriate for the standard being assessed; if revisions are indicated, they are so noted in the Annual Program Reports. As we are now in the second year of full operation of COEAS, we are increasingly in a better position to make data-based evaluations of the accuracy of assessments by documenting the relationship between assessment results and candidate performance on related assessments, Praxis II licensure examinations, grades, and program completion.

Closely related to accuracy is the elimination of bias. To ensure that the results of assessments adequately reflect what candidates know and can do, the unit and programs work to remove

problems with the assessment instruments that introduce sources of bias and thus adversely influence candidate performance. Assessment instructions and scoring guides are reviewed by program faculty to identify and eliminate problems with assessments such as missing or vague instructions, poorly worded questions, and poorly reproduced copies that make reading difficult. Results of these reviews may be observed in Section IV-Attachments A and B of the [SPA reports](#). Moreover, inspection of these assessments reveals that program faculty have been successful in ensuring that assessments are free of racial and ethnic stereotypes, poorly conceived language and task situations, and other forms of cultural insensitivity that might interfere with candidate performance and unintentionally favor some candidates over others. As indicated in the following responses to NCATE Standards 4 and 5, the rich racial and ethnic diversity of the unit faculty is a valuable resource in helping to ensure the elimination of bias.

The unit aims to ensure that assessments are consistent and produce dependable results or results that remain constant on repeated trials. Several strategies are systematically employed to help ensure that unit and program assessments are trustworthy. All university supervisors are trained every semester in the use and application of the [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#). In addition, for the key student teaching assessment, each candidate is evaluated independently by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. In another example, when advanced candidates are assessed for their comprehensive examination related to the master's project, two raters are employed.

What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit? Unit/program operations and quality are one of the four COEAS essential assessment domains; and like the other three domains, assessment data are gathered at multiple points, multiple assessments are used including both internal and external data, data are regularly compiled, summarized, analyzed, and used; and information technologies are used to maintain these data. As shown in the table [Unit and Program Operations and Quality Assessments](#), the unit assesses indicators of effective operations and quality that are aligned with the conceptual framework commitments to diverse communities, effective practice, and leadership.

2b. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

What is the unit's timeline for collecting key assessment data related to candidates meeting standards and unit operations? In general, the COEAS is based on an annual cycle of data collection, analysis, evaluation, and use. For each of the four essential assessment domains, COEAS specifies clearly the data to be collected, the frequency of data collection (timeline), who is responsible for collecting the data, and who is responsible for analyzing and evaluating data and monitoring its use to support candidate learning, and effective program and unit operations and quality ([COEAS Data Collection, Analysis, and Review Plan](#)).

What are the process and timeline used by the unit to collect summarize, and analyze data? As the table [COEAS Data Collection, Analysis, and Review Plan](#) indicates in detail, data in the Applicant and Candidate Qualification domain are collected from candidates in the process of applying for admission to the university, a teacher education program, the graduate school, and a specific graduate degree program. Data are generated by faculty as candidate grades are entered into the Banner system. Data are generated by candidates as they complete programs and as they apply for initial or advanced professional licensure. Data such as admission dates, completion dates, licenses applied for, and the like are entered into the university and COE databases by university and unit staff. Test data, such as GRE and Praxis I and II scores, are transmitted to the

university and the college electronically and are entered into the university and COE databases by university and unit staff. The COEAS database system has been programmed to summarize and report these data in charts. Thus for example, on demand the director of Assessment can print a variety of reports regarding enrollment and candidate performance on admission requirements. These reports are provided to program faculty and stakeholder advisory councils for use during the annual May assessment retreat. Data for the Applicant and Candidate Qualification domain are maintained jointly on the university Banner system and the COE database system.

Data in the Candidate Proficiencies domain is collected by Educational Testing Service (ETS) as candidates complete Praxis exams and report their scores to the university and the state for licensure. ETS sends test score data to the unit multiple times throughout the year and the unit database programmer enters the data into the COEAS database. Data from student teaching evaluations is recorded separately by university supervisors and cooperating teachers on the Student Teacher Evaluation Summary [OCR Scantron forms](#), which are then scanned and converted to a data file by the COE Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP). This data file is sent to the unit database programmer who enters it into the COEAS database. In addition to the unit-level Praxis II and student teaching assessment data, each initial and advanced program has identified four to six additional program-specific key assessments that are housed in required program courses. All candidates in a given program complete those key assessments (whether on- or off-campus), which are then assessed by faculty using a common program-specific rubric. At the end of the semester, each instructor teaching a course containing a COEAS key assessment logs onto the COEAS database website and enters the key assessment scores for each candidate (For instructions sent to all faculty each semester, see [How to Post COEAS Key Assessment Scores](#)). The COEAS database is programmed to convert the Praxis II scores, student teaching evaluation scores, and key assessment scores into tables, which are accessible to the program coordinators at any time. The COEAS database allows the director of Assessment, as well as individual program coordinators, to print tables showing results on Praxis II, student teaching and the program-specific key assessments either by standard or by assessment for use by program faculty and program stakeholder advisory committees during the annual May assessment retreat.

Data in the Graduates' Competence domain are generated each fall and spring semester when candidates complete the [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey](#), which is then scanned and converted to a data file by the CREP. The assistant dean for P-12 Programs then summarizes the data file as tables and distributes it to program coordinators. The unit surveys of program completers ([Follow-up Surveys of Program Completers](#)) and employers ([Follow-up Surveys of Employers](#)) are returned to the CREP and are scanned and a data file is created. [Reports in the form of tables](#) are prepared by CREP and forwarded to the director of Assessment who distributes the results to the program faculty for use with their stakeholder advisory committees during the annual May assessment retreat. The university conducts a [survey of alumni](#), focus group interviews with alumni employers, and the [National Survey of Student Engagement](#) on a three year cycle. The Office of the Vice Provost for Assessment, Institutional Research, and Reporting is responsible for completing these surveys, maintains the data from them, and reports the data as graphs and tables on its website.

As indicated in the [COEAS Data Collection, Analysis, and Review Plan](#), some of the data for the Unit Operations and Quality domain comes from the Candidate Proficiencies and Graduates'

Competence domains. Additional data for the Unit Operations and Quality domain comes from annual faculty evaluations, which provide data about the effective practice of faculty related to teaching, scholarship, service, and leadership. Data from student evaluations of teaching is a required component of the annual faculty evaluation. The university had been using the Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) but this year has changed to the Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-provost/sirs/all_about_sete.html These data are maintained on a university database and are accessed by faculty through Spectrum. Similarly, the annual faculty evaluation collects data about scholarly productivity related to publications, presentations, and grants and contracts. Further, it provides evidence related to faculty service and leadership. A [common instrument in electronic format](#) is now used to gather these data, which are maintained in the dean's office. Data regarding faculty development activities and participation are maintained by the assistant dean for Faculty Development and are reported in list form to the director of Assessment for inclusion in the [NCATE Part C Annual Reports](#). Enrollment trend data are maintained by the university Office of Institutional Research and are used by departments and the college in preparing the annual report to the provost (http://oir.memphis.edu/program_review/index.html). Data regarding SPA recognition or accreditation of unit programs are gathered annually by the director of Assessment and reported annually to department chairs and the dean.

How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The University of Memphis *Undergraduate Bulletin* (<http://academics.memphis.edu/bulletin/>) states that “Students have the right to appeal decisions made by University officials in the implementation of University policy. If a student feels that individual circumstances warrant an appeal, the request for appeal must be filed in the University office responsible for the implementation of that policy or the office specified in the policy statement.” Specific procedures are outlined for grade appeals. In the COE, undergraduates may appeal for alternative admission procedures. Records of these appeals are maintained in the Teacher Education Program office. Similarly, the university *Graduate Bulletin* (<http://academics.memphis.edu/gradcatalog/index.html>) then click on *Appeals Procedures on the left*) describes grade and retention appeals procedures. Appeals related to grades and candidate complaints are generally handled at the departmental level. Prior to meeting with departmental administrators, candidates complete a [Communication Form](#) in which they detail in writing the nature of their complaint. These forms, along with notes about resolution, are kept in a notebook in the departmental office.

2c. Use of data for program improvement

What are assessment data indicating about candidate performance on the main campus, at off-campus sites, and in distance learning programs? Assessment data indicate that candidates who complete programs on the main campus meet professional, state, and unit performance standards. To compare performance on key assessments between programs, we identify Jackson center candidates by instructor and candidate names and examine key assessment results. We have found no difference between their performance and those of candidates on the main campus (for example, the director of Assessment can go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu> and select *Data by Student* for *ELED 4352* for *Fall 2007* and then compare candidate scores recorded by “*acornels*,” an instructor in the Elementary Education program at the Jackson Center, with the performance of candidates scored by on-campus instructors). The unit participates in the [Tennessee Regents On-line Degree Program](#) (RODP), a consortium of

Tennessee Board of Regents universities offering an advanced continuing M.Ed. program in K-6 language and literacy education. Unit faculty offer only two of the 11 courses required in the program, including the capstone Master's Project. A review of results for this capstone assessment for the small number of all program completers who have elected the University of Memphis as their 'home' institution reveals no difference between their success rate and that of on-campus candidates taking the same course.

How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance? A [flowchart](#) has been prepared to illustrate, in part, who uses data and for what purpose. Results of key assessments are shared with candidates during the course in which the key assessment is administered. Candidates are able to review their performance in relation to the scoring guide or rubric to see how their performance can be improved. The COEAS database allows faculty to see their class assessments in relation to other faculty, which can be helpful if their assessments are out of line with others. Further, faculty are able to see how candidates perform on the various assessment tasks in relationship to the standards being assessed. This may be helpful to faculty to know that most candidates are generally doing well on a given key assessment but are all having difficulty with one aspect of the assessment—if so, how does instruction need to change? Is there a problem with the assessment? The assessment system also structures an annual review of data from all assessment points. As part of this review program, faculty consider if the data indicate that short- or long-term changes in the program curriculum or assessments are warranted ([2008 Annual Program Report format](#)). Further, faculty annual evaluation data are a part of the assessment system. When data about performance in teaching, scholarship, service and leadership are shared with faculty, this provides for connections to professional development opportunities to strengthen areas of weakness. As we explain in Standard 5 below, the assistant dean for Faculty and Staff Development provides a rich array of professional development activities that are linked to indicators of effective practice for faculty including teaching, research, service and leadership, technology, and diversity.

How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis? One of the primary purposes of COEAS is to structure periodic analysis of data aimed at improving unit and program operations and quality. COEAS is based on an annual cycle of collecting, analyzing and summarizing, and then using data to improve candidate performance and unit/program operations and quality. Annually in May, an assessment retreat is held that involves initial and advanced program faculty together with program stakeholder advisory committees in review of data, discussion of what the data mean, and consideration for what changes the data may indicate. Participants in the annual assessment retreat are provided with relevant data regarding applicant/candidate qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates' competence, and program operations and quality. They are also provided with a template for the Annual Program Report ([2008 Annual Program Report format](#)) that includes questions related to candidate proficiencies, program operations, and the assessment system. For example, in the section on Candidate Proficiencies, faculty and stakeholders are asked to consider: "What do the summarized key assessment, exit survey, and graduate follow-up survey data sets show about candidate performance on each standard that was assessed? Please address each program standard separately by providing a brief analysis of the data findings; and an interpretation of how those data provide evidence for meeting the standards." Then they are asked to consider the action implications of those data: "What specific short-term actions will be taken during the 2007-08 academic year in order to improve candidate performance? What are the long-term

action implications? Please specify tasks and timelines for planned actions.” The completed Annual Program Reports are reviewed and monitored by department chairs, deans and directors, and the Teacher Education Advisory Council. The template for the [2008 Annual Program Report format](#) has been modified to ask programs to report on changes they have made during the previous year as a result of the data they reviewed.

What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years? The table below presents a sample of data-driven changes that have occurred during the past three years.

Data Source	Summary of Changes Made Based on Assessment Data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Feedback meetings each semester with Cooperating Teachers and Office of School-Based Clinical Practice staff ▪Annual meetings with Memphis City and Shelby County Schools to discuss field and clinical experiences. ▪Title II Report Praxis II exam scores ▪COE Annual Report enrollment trend data ▪Annual Program Reports – Evaluation of the Assessment System ▪SPA Reports ▪COE analysis of staffing needs and commitment to effective teaching practice ▪Annual COE Summit meetings and annual reports of Aspiration Implementation Teams ▪Evaluation of COEAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Changing the start date of student teaching to the beginning of school and immediately when candidates return in January ▪Adopting a single lesson plan design for use by student teachers ▪Changing dates for submitting student teaching requests ▪Revised Teacher Education Program admission requirements for all initial candidates ▪Expanded off-campus offerings in initial and advanced other school professional programs at the Millington center; initiation of an on-line Library Media Specialist program. ▪Modification of COEAS Database reporting functions ▪Revisions to program Key Assessments and assessment scoring guides ▪Adding a <i>Report by Assessment</i> function to the COEAS Database ▪Creation of Clinical Faculty positions, hiring several Clinical Faculty in the COE, and establishing an evaluation system and promotion criteria for them ▪Development and approval of new unit Diversity Standards ▪Development of unit-wide Disposition Standards

How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?

Assessment data are shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders in many ways. Candidates receive information about their performance on key assessments throughout their program. Faculty have constant access to COEAS database key assessment data through their program coordinators who can print a variety of reports at any time during the year. Each May

during the annual assessment retreat, faculty receive data reports and tables showing data from all four COEAS essential domains. Similarly, each program has a stakeholder advisory committee whose members participate with faculty during the May assessment retreat. [Annual Program Reports](#) are posted on Spectrum and are available to all faculty. Annual program reports are also reviewed by department and college administrators as well as by stakeholders participating in the Teacher Education Advisory Council. Some evidence regarding program operations and quality are also shared with the public and stakeholders through departmental and college news letters as well as unit annual reports (see for example: [ICL Newsletters](#); [Dean's Updates](#); and, [COE Annual Report](#)).

What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2? A primary strength of the COEAS is the integrated database systems coordinated and maintained by a full-time director of Assessment and a full-time database programmer. The COEAS Key Assessment database is the centerpiece and was designed to mirror the NCATE SPA assessment system structure and format. Program faculty can easily define and modify program-specific key assessments, align them with standards being assessed, input candidate performance data, and print out reports of candidate performance by standards or by assessments. Because the COEAS Key Assessment Database is integrated with the university Banner system, faculty teaching courses housing key assessments can enter candidate performance scores just as they do when they enter grades. Program coordinators can, at anytime, print out a variety of reports of candidate performance. Similarly, the Applicant/Candidate Qualifications database integrates the Banner system data warehouse and the COE database to allow on-demand printout of a variety of reports.

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Carefully structured field experiences and clinical practice opportunities in school settings allow University of Memphis candidates to apply their knowledge of teaching and learning and further develop the skills associated with effective practice. Ongoing program evaluation efforts have led to increased emphasis on the quality of, and accountability associated with, field-based clinical practice.

One of the key aspiration/action teams resulting from the COE's 2005 Futures Planning Summit focuses on Mutually Beneficial Clinical Sites. The aspiration statement driving the work of that team is: "All COE students have multiple high quality, authentic field-based experiences throughout their programs of study. Collaborating partners select, nurture, and support clinical practice sites that promote a culture of professional growth, assessment, and research for their mutual benefit" ([Aspiration Team #12 Template](#)). A major outcome of that team's efforts is the creation of the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice to manage field experiences and clinical practice. Staffed with two professional positions, a receptionist, and graduate candidates, this organizational structure is much better equipped to support performance-based programs and high quality clinical sites than was previously possible.

In October 2005, the College of Education (COE) received a three-year federal Teacher Quality Enhancement grant to conduct a pilot program serving as a precursor to the "reinvention" of all teacher preparation programs. The primary goal of the Three R's project program (*Recruitment and Retention through the Reinvention of Teacher Preparation at the University of Memphis*) is to create, pilot, and evaluate a performance- and clinically-based program in partnership with identified clinical sites ([U.S. DOE Grant Performance Report, Executive Summary](#)). Although

currently impacting only a small percentage of teacher candidates and COE faculty, evaluation of this program, conducted by the Collaborative for Teaching and Learning in Louisville, KY will inform not only the pilot itself, but also the future direction of clinical practice throughout the COE ([Three R's Spring 2007 Report](#)).

Preparing individuals for school leadership positions was also revised at the University of Memphis in 2002 with the establishment of the Center for Urban School Leadership ([Center for Urban School Leadership Program Description](#)). Using a non-traditional approach, aspiring school leaders and practitioners are afforded experiential activities in critical areas while in the program and also continue to receive mentoring, guidance, and other support services once placed in a school leadership role.

3a. Collaboration between unit and school partners

Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences? The University of Memphis is committed to collaboration with diverse communities in all aspects of its operation. This commitment is evidenced in the relationship that the COE has developed with its West Tennessee P-12 school partners as we collaborate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of candidates in initial licensure programs and advanced programs. Primary partner districts include Memphis City, Shelby County, Tipton County, Fayette County, and Jackson/Madison County in Tennessee, and DeSoto County in Mississippi ([Jackson Area Collaborative Agreement](#) and [Center for Urban School Leadership Program Description](#)). In addition to COE faculty and staff, membership on the Mutually Beneficial Clinical Sites action team includes representatives from Memphis City, Shelby County, and private schools and the Memphis Education Association. Tennessee allows alternatively licensed candidates to begin as teachers of record prior to completion of required university coursework and to teach as many as three years prior to earning the apprentice license as long as progress toward licensure is satisfactory; in these cases, the design and delivery of clinical experiences are influenced by the unit, while primary evaluation of actual practice rests with the school district.

The COE benefits from two laboratory schools: the university's Campus School, a Memphis City School adjacent to the E.C. Ball Education Building (<http://www.campuschool.org/>), and the Barbara K. Lipman Early Childhood School and Research Institute, located on the north side of campus (<http://lipman.memphis.edu/about.htm>). Administrators and school staff participate actively in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. The unit's Teacher Education Advisory Council, with membership from all university departments involved in the preparation of P-12 professionals as well as representatives from local school systems ensures that decisions involving the preparation of school-based professionals are sound and in the best interest of our candidates, the university, and the school districts we serve ([Teacher Education Advisory Council Meeting Minutes](#)). In addition, each program area in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership (housing nearly all teacher preparation programs in the COE) meets each semester with a community advisory council comprised of a wide range of stakeholders. The Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative unites all higher education institutions in the Memphis metropolitan area involved in teacher preparation ([Agendas of Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative Meetings](#)).

How have partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences? Feedback from school-based partners is obtained through multiple systematic structures and used to evaluate and improve the design and delivery of field and

clinical experiences. The director of Teacher Education and professional staff from the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice meet annually with both Memphis City and Shelby County Schools personnel to discuss policies and procedures for the placement of teacher and counselor candidates and to initiate changes when necessary. The most direct, comprehensive, and systematic feedback for teacher candidates is obtained through the questionnaire completed by all cooperating teachers following the student teaching semester ([*University of Memphis Clinical Student Teaching Program Evaluation – Cooperating Teachers*](#)). Partners also contribute data through focus group discussions. Field and internship experiences for administrators rely heavily on partners, as they are designed, delivered, and evaluated collaboratively with LEAs. In addition, each teacher education program's active community advisory council meets with the faculty each spring during the annual assessment retreat to review assessment data (including data from student teaching evaluations) and consider what changes may be necessary based on those data. As a direct result of partner feedback, the student teaching calendar has been changed to correspond with school calendars rather than the university calendar, allowing candidates to attend in-service activities at the beginning of each semester and more quickly assimilate into the teaching role. Feedback has also been used to determine the most effective placement of the Junior Achievement experience in the field experience continuum.

The Master's Project course, which serves as the capstone experience for both initial and advanced teacher preparation programs at the master's level, was collaboratively developed by COE faculty and representatives from Memphis City and Shelby County Schools. The course is based on a set of agreed-upon principles and conducted in the field ([*A Position on Action Research for Professional Development Conducted by Candidates Enrolled in ICL 7992 Master's Project*](#)). Action research proposals are approved each semester by representatives of these districts.

The K-12 School Psychology program is jointly administered by the COE and the Psychology Department in the College of Arts and Sciences. All aspects of the program are collaboratively designed, delivered, and evaluated.

A new level of collaboration in the area of teacher education is being piloted through implementation of the Three R's project program. Fellows in this program share a teaching position and are supported by full-time clinical faculty at the school site as well as university faculty. University coursework for the Three R's project program is based on six comprehensive clinically-based performance assessments developed jointly by university faculty (COE and Arts and Sciences) and Memphis City Schools personnel. Principals and clinical faculty in the four middle schools serving as clinical sites and the Memphis City Schools personnel director are active partners with COE faculty and staff in not only implementing the pilot but also in identifying elements of the pilot that can be replicated on a large scale.

How are student teacher and internship placements determined? The Office of School-Based Clinical Practice coordinates placements for all preservice teachers in Memphis, Shelby County, and Tipton County and collaborates with faculty and staff at the Jackson Center for candidates in Jackson/Madison County. This office also works closely with the Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Research to secure appropriate placements for school counseling candidates, and with the Department of Psychology for school psychology candidates, and coordinates the Advanced Clinical Practicum for Library Information Specialist candidates. The Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative coordinates the matching of all

local colleges with Memphis City School sites on a rotating basis. Coordinators in the COE Office of School-Based Clinical Practice then work with district personnel and administrators in our assigned schools to arrange placements for individuals seeking initial licensure. University faculty may also be involved in the placement process. Factors contributing to placement decisions are

- diversity of placements based on geographic location (e.g., urban, suburban, rural).
- diversity of placements based on grade level within the licensure range.
- prior field experience placements.
- Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative approved rotation list.
- cooperating teacher ratings by previously placed candidates.
- each school's history of support for preservice teachers.

Field experiences for candidates at the Jackson Center campus are implemented and evaluated by faculty in Jackson; student teaching placements are assigned and evaluated through the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice. All administrator placements and internships are determined collaboratively by faculty of the Department of Leadership and school-based partners.

Candidates in advanced (M.S.) teacher education programs complete field experiences in their own classrooms, and if not employed in P-12 school settings, placements are provided by collaboration between faculty and the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice.

How do the unit and school partners share expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice? The COE depends upon outstanding school-based practitioners to serve as instructors for key courses comprising programs preparing teachers and other school professionals. School partners serve on all advisory councils and planning teams for major initiatives involving field experiences and clinical practice, including both the Mutually Beneficial Clinical Sites Aspiration/Action Team and all management teams for the Three R's project program. Clinical faculty in the four middle schools serving as Three R's clinical sites, who were carefully selected on the basis of their expertise, provide continuous support for these fellows during their internship year. Expertise is shared in formal focus groups ([Three R's Program Principal Interview Protocol](#) and [Three R's Program Clinical Faculty Interview Protocol](#)) as well as more informal interactions among faculty, candidates, school-based practitioners, and coordinators in the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice. As previously mentioned, school partners were instrumental in restructuring the student teaching calendar so that candidates are now able to participate in orientation and professional development activities before the beginning of the school year, greatly enhancing their assimilation and consequent learning at the school site.

3b. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

What field experiences and clinical practices are required for each program or categories of programs? The table [Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program](#) summarizes the field and clinical practice experiences provided in programs preparing teachers and other school professionals. Detailed field and clinical experience information for individual programs can be found in [Field and Clinical Experience Description Tables](#).

How do the field and clinical experiences help candidates demonstrate the candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards? Candidates in initial teacher education programs at the University of Memphis are required to complete a wide range of field experiences designed to facilitate their development as successful teachers. Course syllabi provide detailed descriptions of expected outcomes related to

both the COE conceptual framework and state and professional standards. These experiences support the unit's six pillars of effective practice as well as Tennessee's Professional Education standards ([Clinical Student Teaching Handbook](#), pages 7-11; [Educational Leadership Advanced M.S. SPA Report](#), pages 2-4 and 8-9). The COE commitment to preparing teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to serve in diverse communities is reflected in all clinical experiences, but is most evident in the careful selection of diverse placements to fulfill student teaching and internship requirements. Candidates in the B.S.Ed. elementary education program, preparing to teach in grades K-6, complete an internship at a clinical site prior to their student teaching semester, known as the "block," designed to provide a cohesive and concentrated field experience at a single clinical site and ample opportunity to demonstrate required proficiencies prior to entering the student teaching semester.

The [Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#) instrument is used by university supervisors and cooperating teachers to evaluate candidate performance during student teaching. The evaluation is an adaptation of Tennessee's Framework for the Evaluation and Professional Growth of Teachers and reflects both state and professional standards. By aligning preservice and in-service evaluation instruments and processes, the unit ensures that candidates gain familiarity with and expertise in the proficiencies expected of Tennessee's teachers during their years of preparation to teach.

In advanced programs for the preparation of teachers and most other school professionals (e.g., Instructional Design and Technology, School Library/Media, and Reading Specialists), school-based experiences are linked to program outcomes in two ways. First, in program coursework candidates are assigned tasks that are to be completed in their work settings. Second, all advanced teacher education programs require a capstone experience, either a thesis or an action research study master's project focusing on improving some aspect of their work. Almost all advanced candidates select the action research master's project, which requires them to implement a six week action plan designed to improve their teaching and to collect data to document changes in their teaching and the impact of those changes on their students ([ICL 7992-Master's Project Syllabus](#)). Advanced programs for other school professionals also design experiences in the field that ensure mastery of the proficiencies identified in state and professional standards, which are aligned with the COE conceptual framework. For example, candidates for the School Administration and Supervision M.S. produce an Artifact Portfolio directly linked to the ELLC Standards ([Artifact Portfolio Products](#)). Candidates in the School Psychology program are evaluated using a rubric designed to be consistent with NASP's Standards for School Psychology Training Programs ([School Psychology Program Handbook](#)). The Tennessee Department of Education's Library Information Specialist State Model for the Library/Media Specialist Practicum is the model used for the design and evaluation of this advanced program requirement ([Library Information Specialist State Model for Local Evaluation](#)).

How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences or clinical practice? Teacher education faculty are expected to model the effective use of technology for instruction (described in Standard 5). All initial teacher education candidates take a course in the use of media for instruction ([Syllabus for IDT 3600-Technology in Education](#) and [Syllabus for IDT 7061-Media and Technology Utilization](#)) and are expected to be proficient in this area. As part of their student teaching assessment, candidates are evaluated on their ability to assure that "students have ample opportunity to explore, respond,

and extend their thinking through technology, as appropriate to the content area” ([Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#)). All candidates in initial and advanced programs are encouraged to take full advantage of technology available in their clinical and field experience sites. Electronic portfolios using iWebfolio are being piloted in the Three R’s project program, the Physical Education Teacher Education program, and the Level I Foundations of Education course (LEAD 2010). Documenting practice through the electronic portfolio process encourages and supports the use of technology as an instructional tool.

What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals? School-based personnel who serve as cooperating teachers and supervise candidates’ student teaching experiences must be fully and appropriately licensed and must have a minimum of four years teaching experience. They must be evaluated as highly competent through local assessment and/or state evaluation procedures and must be both able and willing to assume the multiple roles expected of a cooperating teacher. Their selection is a collaborative effort among the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice, the school systems, and school administrators. Their qualifications are further verified by a Cooperating Teacher Information Sheet collected systematically by the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice ([Cooperating Teacher Data Form](#)). Candidate evaluations of university supervisors and cooperating teachers conducted each semester provide detailed information regarding the quality of modeling provided; subsequent selection of school-based clinical faculty is advised by these data ([Clinical Student Teaching Program Evaluation, Cooperating Teachers](#) and [University Supervisor Evaluation](#)).

In advanced programs for other school professionals, candidates for the administrator license are mentored by experienced building administrators recommended by the district as able to provide a rich, meaningful experience for the candidates. The university supervisor, candidate, and site supervisors meet regularly to review the major responsibilities of each party and to assess the quality of the candidate’s experience. Candidates in the School Psychology program work under the supervision of credentialed school psychologists employed by a local public or private school system.

What preparation or professional development activities do school-based clinical faculty receive to prepare them for roles as clinical supervisors? In addition to receiving a handbook detailing policies, procedures, and expectations associated with field-based experiences, school-based clinical faculty also attend an information session prior to beginning supervisory work ([Cooperating Teacher Informational Session Documentation](#)). The Office of School-Based Clinical Practice provides professional development sessions for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors to ensure that expectations for candidates’ learning and professional behavior are clear and universally understood. Principals and instructional supervisors also attend these sessions. Clinical faculty supporting Three R’s Fellows receive mentor training through the New Teacher Center. This professional development is available to all clinical faculty ([New Teacher Center Mentor Training Modules](#)).

What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals? In initial teacher education programs, systematic surveys of cooperating teachers and university supervisors ensure that data are gathered for continuous improvement. Focus

groups with teacher education candidates and graduates also provide rich data that are used to refine and enhance candidates' experiences in the field. The table [Candidate Perceptions of Quality of Student Teaching Experiences](#) contains items relevant to clinical practice on the exit questionnaire completed by all candidates attending the final student teaching seminar each semester ([Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey](#)). Candidates record their perceptions regarding overall quality of their preparation (Very Weak to Very Strong on a five point Likert scale) and satisfaction level (Very Satisfied to Dissatisfied on a five point Likert scale). Candidate responses on all items are generally very positive, with the most positive satisfaction levels recorded on the item dealing with quality of student teaching experiences. The quality of these experiences in our urban environment is established and maintained by the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice.

Other evidence that clinical faculty provide regular and continuous support for initial and advanced program candidates is found in policies regarding supervision during clinical practice and internship experiences. For example, the [Clinical Student Teaching Handbook](#) specifies that candidates will be observed by the university supervisor at least four times during each placement and that formal and informal feedback will be provided in post evaluation conferences. In Master's Project, advanced teacher education candidates meet weekly with their instructor who closely monitors implementation of the six-week action plan and data collection process. Active involvement of school administrators, school psychologists, and other school professionals in the preparation of candidates ensures a bridge between preparation and induction.

3c. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

How many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? How many complete successfully? The table [Student Teaching Applicants and Completers](#) presents the number of candidates who have applied for student teaching for the past four semesters, the number who were accepted and began their first placement, and the number and percentage who successfully completed. Requirements for acceptance into student teaching have been revised during the past year and now include a passing score on the appropriate Praxis II content examination; as a result, the percentage of applications accepted has decreased slightly. Non-completers include voluntary withdrawals precipitated by health or personal issues as well as candidates removed for inadequate performance. The table [Master's Project Enrollment and Completion Rates](#) presents the number of candidates enrolled in Master's Project, the capstone clinical experience for most advanced continuing education programs, and the number and percentage successfully completing this course. The table [School Administration and Supervision Internship Candidates and Completers](#) presents the number of candidates in the School Administration and Supervision program applying for internship placements, accepted and placed, and successfully completing the internship. Finally, the table [School Psychology Internship Candidates and Completers](#) presents internship data for the School Psychology program. These candidates complete a master's degree followed by a year-long internship and other program requirements resulting in the Education Specialist degree.

How are assessments during field experiences and clinical practice conducted? Teacher candidates are formatively and summatively evaluated during their student teaching experience by university supervisors and cooperating teachers using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers ([Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth](#)

[of Student Teachers](#) and [Student Teacher Evaluation Summary Form](#)). This evaluation instrument was collaboratively developed with Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative partners and is based on Tennessee's Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth, with performance standards modified to meet expectations for preservice, rather than in-service, teachers. Candidate performance data for each domain assessed during student teaching are provided each semester and used for program improvement ([Summative Student Teaching Assessment Results](#)). The table, [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#), reflects summative assessments conducted by university supervisors and cooperating teachers for fall 2006, spring 2007, and fall 2007.

Assessments for field experiences vary by course and outcome expectations, but are largely based on candidate-provided data and reflections for which they receive feedback. Licensed teachers in advanced programs complete field experiences in classrooms and are evaluated on their reporting of and reflections on these experiences. Master's candidates must complete a master's project as the culminating experience for the degree, for which they plan, conduct, and report a research study dealing with the improvement of their own teaching practice. Candidates for licensure in administration and school psychology are assessed through a series of rubric-scored performances ([Educational Leadership Advanced M.S. SPA Report](#) and [School Psychology Handbook](#)).

Candidate dispositions are assessed at multiple points in each program. This process has historically been program-specific; however, as discussed earlier in this report, the COE has developed and is in the process of implementing college-wide dispositional expectations and procedures.

How is time for reflection and feedback incorporated into the field experiences and clinical practice? Teacher candidates and licensed teachers in advanced programs have multiple opportunities to reflect on field experiences and to receive feedback from university faculty during their early coursework. They submit weekly journals during their student teaching semester, providing opportunity for reflection and feedback. A feedback process, which has been initiated to record candidates' ongoing progress, documents the support of university supervisors in clinical sites. Administrator candidates engage in continuous reflection and feedback with their university and site supervisors.

What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3? Our unit is particularly strong in the area of student teacher placement, support, monitoring, and evaluation. The creation and staffing of the Office of School-Based Clinical Practice has placed clinical practice at the center of teacher preparation, and all aspects of this critical element are experiencing continuous improvement. In 2007, candidates were systematically placed in a total of 156 public and 28 private schools with priority given to ensuring diversity in clinical experiences.

Additionally, the Three R's pilot project is receiving acclaim from the Collaborative for Teaching and Learning and from the State Department of Tennessee for its ground-breaking work in clinically- and performance-based teacher preparation. This model addresses national priorities for improvement of teacher education, as reflected in the NCATE standards for accreditation ([CTL Evaluation Excerpt](#)) and is being discussed at the state-level as potentially driving the reform of teacher preparation in Tennessee.

What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit? A statewide study comparing the classroom practice of traditionally prepared teachers and teachers in two alternative programs (Transition to Teaching and Three R's) is currently underway. Quantitative data are being collected using the School Observation Measure, developed by the CREP at the University of Memphis.

Standard 4 - Diversity

The College of Education (COE) is committed to diversity and diverse communities. This commitment is visible in our vision and mission goals of serving the Memphis urban and metropolitan areas. Commitment to diverse communities is a foundational commitment expressed in our conceptual framework. Unit and program curricula provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate knowledge about diverse children, families, and communities and to use this knowledge effectively to help all students learn and develop. Moreover, it is visible in a diverse unit faculty who model effectively our commitment to diverse communities as they teach, study, and collaborate. Our commitment is visible in our diverse body of candidates and the multiple opportunities they have to interact with each other in classes, field and clinical settings, and candidate organizations. Further, our commitment is seen as the diversity of the urban and metropolitan schools and agencies is used as a rich resource for field and clinical settings for all candidates.

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

What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate? The University of Memphis is a large metropolitan institution that takes seriously its urban mission and our conceptual framework's commitment to diversity and diverse communities. The urban and metropolitan context is characterized by many forms of diversity including ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, exceptionalities, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical areas. This urban mission and our diverse context fit with the program aspirations of the unit and the ways in which we prepare professionals at all levels, initial and advanced. Because of our mission to become a leader in the preparation of urban professionals, diversity is integral to our program standards, to our candidates' opportunities to apply what they learn, and to our assessments.

The proficiencies related to diversity our candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate are expressed clearly in national, state and institutional frameworks. Building upon these frameworks has enabled us to create a set of well-grounded expectations that communicate our unit's commitment to our candidates' abilities to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Our unit's diversity proficiencies emanate from the Tennessee Professional Education standards, the parallel national frameworks in the Interstate New Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium (INTASC) diversity standards (<http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>), and the various SPA standards ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#)). In addition, the [Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth](#) builds upon and is aligned with both the INTASC principles and SPA standards. Thus, the unit outcomes for diversity are: "Candidates understand how students differ in their approaches to learning; and they act on this understanding to create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners."

These Tennessee and professional proficiencies are been aligned with our unit's conceptual framework ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#)) and our new unit diversity standards. One of the three key commitments in our conceptual framework is Commitment to Diverse Communities. It reads: We are committed to preparing effective professionals who understand and value diversity, and who act proactively in all relationships. This commitment applies to both our initial preparation programs and advanced programs. This commitment is represented in the [conceptual framework](#) and further translated into our unit's outcome standards—and in particular to three of the six pillars of effective practice for professional educators:

- **Pillar of Practice 2. Knowledge of the Learner** Successful teacher candidates will understand and address the uniqueness of the learners they encounter.
 - They consider the impact of socio-cultural experiences and SES on student preparedness and perspective.
 - They respond appropriately to the unique issues faced in urban educational settings.
- **Pillar of Practice 3. Pedagogy/Instruction** Successful teacher candidates meet the CREDE standards for instructional practice
 - They use developmentally appropriate planning.
 - They contextualize teaching and curriculum in students' existing experiences in home, community, and school.
- **Pillar of Practice 5. Management of Classrooms and Individuals** Successful teacher candidates will have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to organize the classroom so that teaching and learning are productive, purposeful, efficient, and effective.

Through integration of these pillars of effective practice, our candidates become aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and those with exceptionalities. The conceptual framework is applied to both initial preparation and advanced programs.

Recently, acting on our commitment to diversity and diverse communities, the COE further interpreted these standards, frameworks, and commitments into a set of [COE Diversity Standards](#), which will further inform curriculum and assessments for all programs in the college. These standards were adopted by all departments in spring 2007, and efforts are underway to implement these standards across all programs. At present, the Diversity Standards are being used by programs to articulate specific diversity outcomes candidates are expected to develop during their professional programs.

What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other professional school roles to develop awareness of the importance of diversity and the knowledge, skills and dispositions to adapt instruction/services for diverse populations?

Diversity is not an obtuse concept for our institution and college. It has clear, concrete transfer into coursework and experiences that ensure our candidates have numerous opportunities to understand diversity and can adapt their work for a very diverse population, including students with exceptionalities and increasingly large populations of English language learners. Each program has aligned its coursework and experiences with unit, Tennessee, and SPA standards to enable candidates to become aware of the importance of diversity in teaching and to learn to adapt instruction for diverse learners. This alignment is reflected in the matrices showing learning opportunities in relation to the Tennessee Professional Education standards and the [Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#). As required for state approval,

each program matrix links the Tennessee Professional Education standard for diversity with the relevant coursework and field and clinical experiences. Completing these matrices assures that programs are designed to deliver, implement, and evaluate candidates for their preparedness to effectively work in diverse contexts. In addition, all initial licensure programs require a special education course and a course on urban education or on teaching in diverse environments. These courses are specifically designed to ensure candidates develop the practical knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to teaching in diverse environments (See syllabi for [ICL 4001](#), [ICL 4002](#), [ICL 7709](#), [SPED 2000](#), [SPED 7000](#), [SPED 6900](#), [LEAD 2010](#), and [LDPS 7330](#)). Diversity is not necessarily separated in individual courses at the advanced levels. The experience of advanced candidates allows faculty to integrate diversity in course syllabi, select texts that also integrated diversity, and to discuss diversity issues in analyzing our local contexts. As discussed above in Standard 3, the Office of School Based Clinical Practice tracks all field placements for initial teacher candidates to ensure they are placed in diverse settings across their program. In the student teaching semester, each candidate has two separate placements at different grade levels and in different types of schools. For other school professional candidates, individual programs adhere to similar diverse requirements in their placements. Further, because of the diversity within our geographical area, candidates in advanced continuing education programs who are employed in these school districts experience diversity within their professional contexts and also provide rich, diverse experiences for our initial candidates.

What assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity; and, how are candidates performing on these assessments? The assessment system articulated in Standard 2 generates systematic evidence related to our candidates' proficiencies related to diversity and reflects appropriate assessments for the standards by programs. ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#), and, go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu> and select the desired program and then go to *Build the Matrix* to see the relationship of key assessments to SPA program standards). Thus, assessments are identified specifically for diversity to assure that we systematically collect and utilize evidence demonstrating candidates proficiencies related to diversity. Each program has articulated program design elements (coursework, field experiences, and student teaching) to correlate diversity understanding and proficiencies with assessments. This process establishes triangulation of data to be used, not only to assess candidate proficiencies, but also to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn. The assessments are systematically administered throughout the program and represent both unit-level and program specific assessments. Because the unit diversity outcomes are tightly aligned with Tennessee Professional Education Standards and the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Teachers, there are several direct assessments including, the [evaluation of student teaching instrument](#), the [Teacher Education Program Reflections exit survey](#), [follow-up surveys of candidates](#), and [surveys of employers](#). In addition, evidence is generated from required [pedagogy Praxis II exams](#) as well as program-specific key assessments aligned with state and SPA standards.

Results from the [Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers](#) reveal that during fall 2006, spring 2007, and fall 2007 at least 92 percent of cooperating teachers and 89 – 92 percent of university supervisors rated student teachers as either Acceptable or Proficient on Item 3-Adapts instructional opportunities for diverse learners. Similarly, during this same

period of time, 95 – 99 percent of cooperating teachers and 89 – 99 percent of university supervisors rated student teachers as either Acceptable or Proficient on Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. The [Teacher Education Program Reflections exit survey results](#) demonstrate that candidates perceive they have been well-prepared to work with diverse learners. For example, during 2005 – 2007, on a five point scale from 5=Very Strong to 1=Very Weak, mean scores were 3.80 – 4.15 for Item 4-Creating instructional opportunities for diverse learners; and, 3.83 – 4.07 on Item 5-Accessing appropriate services/resources to meet exceptional learning needs. [Results from Follow-up Surveys of Candidates](#) reveal 74 percent of initial and advanced candidates were Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding their preparation for Item 3-Adapts instructional opportunities for diverse learners; and, 80 percent were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with their preparation regarding Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. [Employer Survey Results](#) reveal that 52 (n=12) percent of responding employers were Satisfied or Very Satisfied regarding unit program completers' preparation for Item 3-Adapts instructional opportunities for diverse learners; and, 74 (n=17) percent were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with unit program completers' preparation regarding Item 5-Uses research-based classroom strategies that are grounded in higher order thinking, problem-solving, and real world connections for all students. All initial candidates are required to complete the appropriate [Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching pedagogy examinations](#) each of which includes a subsection related to students as learners, development, diverse learners, motivation and environment. Pass rates on these PLT exams range from 88 – 92 percent. Finally all initial and advanced program standards are aligned with unit, state, and SPA standards. Thus, program-specific key assessments also provide evidence that candidates meet program diversity standards that are aligned with state and national standards ([Alignment Matrix of Unit, State, and Professional Standards](#) and, go to <https://coeas-data.memphis.edu> and then select *Report by Standards* to see candidate performance on specific program standards related to diversity).

4b. Experiences working with diverse faculty

How diverse is the faculty who work with education candidates? The COE faculty is among the most diverse on the campus. A comparison of the table showing [Faculty Demographics](#) of professional education faculty teaching in both initial and advanced programs and the table showing [Candidate Demographics](#) reflects that we have achieved a status of diverse faculty working with diverse candidates. Further, this diversity also reflects the diversity of the population in our service area (refer to Service Area Demographics column in the [Candidate Demographics](#) table). The absolute diversity of the 236 professional education faculty is shown more clearly in the table, [Professional Education Faculty Gender & Race – 2007-08](#).

What opportunities do candidates have to interact with higher education and school faculty from diverse groups? Interacting with diverse faculty at the University of Memphis and at area school districts is essential to actualize our diversity commitment into meaningful, relevant practice. Initial and advanced program candidates interact with faculty from diverse groups in general education, professional education, professional licensure area coursework, field experiences, and student teaching and internship experiences. The tables [Faculty Demographics](#) and [Professional Education Faculty Gender & Race – 2007-08](#) profile the diversity among our faculty that candidates have an opportunity to experience. This profile assures that our candidates have an opportunity to interact with, learn from, and experience the curriculum from

various perspectives and to understand what that means for the diversity they will experience as teachers in our urban and metropolitan area. Because of our conceptual framework commitment to developing educational leaders committed to diverse communities, we work proactively to assure that candidates have diverse opportunities through rich diversity among our professional education faculty and school-based faculty.

What knowledge and experiences do unit and clinical faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups? The professional education faculty and clinical faculty receive professional development in this area through various activities within the departments as well as activities offered through the office of the assistant dean for Faculty and Staff Development. Three programs offered through this office have particular relevance to developing faculty for their roles in preparing candidates to work with diverse groups: The Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence pedagogy training in Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, Facing History and Ourselves, and the annual mentoring symposium ([Professional Development Activities for 2006](#)). In addition, the Center for Urban School Leadership (<http://coe.memphis.edu/CUSL/>) also provides opportunities for the faculty to engage with key issues related to education in urban settings that serve diverse student populations. Because of our commitment to living as a learning community, these professional development activities are attended by unit faculty and clinical faculty to learn together. These efforts both assist the faculty in positioning themselves to prepare candidates for diverse contexts and enable faculty and candidates to learn together. Finally, in 2006, the COE appointed Dr. Beverly Cross to the [Moss Chair of Excellence in Urban Education](#), an endowed position with responsibility to also assist faculty in preparing for their roles in preparing candidates to work in diverse settings and to engage the COE with the metropolitan and urban communities that we serve. She launched the Urban Education Symposium in 2007 which brings a leading scholar to campus to engage with the faculty, candidates, and community around scholarship about diversity and urban education.

What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty? Recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty is a long-standing initiative of the University of Memphis. Several institutional practices demonstrate the value of diversity including: addition of diverse faculty over the past decade, mentoring programs, and research support/releases to support research start-up for new faculty. Efforts are underway now to determine additional ways to retain diverse faculty members. This is communicated as a value to the campus community and as an accountability measure. It further is valued by the COE as integral to our identity of becoming a leader in urban education and extending our commitment to diverse communities. In addition, the university's Affirmative Action office monitors and enforces affirmative action guidelines, policies and procedures to hold units accountable for diversifying the faculty. At each stage of the search and screen process, this office monitors and provides feedback to the committees and dean to stress developing a diverse pool of faculty candidates. In addition, the search and screen committees are expected to contain graduate candidates and community members as other voices for diversity. These efforts will continue to expand as the campus operates under the Access and Diversity Initiative of the Tennessee Board of Regents. These efforts have proven successful for the COE. For example in 2001-2002, 15 percent of unit faculty were from minority status groups. In 2006-2007, that percentage had increased to 23 percent. This surpasses the nationwide average of 16.5 percent as reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in its September 28, 2007 issue.

4c. Experiences working with diverse candidates

How diverse are the candidates in the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? The unit candidates are diverse, particularly in relation to all the candidates in the university, and in relation to the demographics of our service area ([Candidate Demographics](#) and [Comparison of University, College, and Service Area Demographics](#)).

What opportunities do candidates have to interact with candidates from diverse groups? The nature of the diversity among our initial licensure candidates and advanced candidates affords them multiple opportunities to learn together through their courses, field and clinical experiences during general education, professional education, and licensure area program components. The strength of the diversity within our candidates is capitalized on by the faculty to employ various pedagogical approaches that assure our candidates work collaboratively across diverse groups. Group projects are used often to allow candidates to learn from various perspectives based on their backgrounds and to utilize the strength of our diversity to prepare for their professional lives. Student organizations at the university level and particularly professional student organizations at the college level provide candidates with other valuable opportunities to interact with diverse peers (e.g., University of Memphis Association for the Education of Young Children, Student National Education Association, among others). There are 158 Registered Student Organizations on campus that are based in ethnic, gender, religion, discipline, linguistic, and various interests. Candidates have numerous opportunities to participate in sponsored activities designed to promote interaction of diverse student groups (<http://saweb.memphis.edu/Leadership/RSO.html>).

What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups? The relationship between Shelby County and Memphis City School students and the university has resulted in a consistent, diverse group of candidates similar to that of our metropolitan area. In fact, the COE has been recognized nationally as among the Top 100 producers of African American undergraduate and master's degree completers for several consecutive years. Our rating has been compared to that of historically Black colleges and universities. With this point of pride; however, one area continues to be of concern for us—African American male candidates. As a result, the Teacher Quality Enhancement grant Three R's project program ([Three R's Project Program Description](#)) specifically targeted this population to improve participation in our programs and in the teaching force in our area. We are now in the process of determining what we can learn from this program to institutionalize and increase our recruitment of diverse candidates. The COE also recently hired a faculty member with expertise in English language learners to improve our ability to serve candidates with linguistic diversity and to prepare candidates and advanced candidates to teach this growing population in local schools. In addition, a three-tiered system to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups is in place. At the college level, an instructor serves as a part-time recruiter and works very closely with schools to recruit diverse students into COE programs. She targets most of her recruitment efforts to schools that serve large populations of underserved students including those who are racially, socioeconomically, and linguistically diverse. She also serves as liaison to the university's Office of Admission and Retention and represents the COE at their numerous recruitment activities throughout our geographical service area. These activities are coordinated and varied to reach potential candidates in the immediate area as well as those in contiguous states. Finally, she represents the COE on the recruitment and retention activities through

Student Services. All of these efforts have resulted in our recognition as a college that serves a diverse candidate body.

4d. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? The students in our clinical sites are diverse and largely represent the diversity in our demographic service area ([Demographics of Clinical Sites for Initial and Advanced Programs](#)). This diversity includes ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and disability. Our area is increasingly becoming linguistically diverse as well. As articulated throughout this report, the COE and program areas are proactively preparing candidates for this rich, diverse context through content, experiences, and assessments.

How does the unit ensure that each candidate has at least one field experience with students from racial and language groups different than their own, students with exceptionalities, and students from different socioeconomic groups? The coordinated offices of the director of Teacher Education and School Based Clinical Practice provide a sound infrastructure for diverse field experience placements for candidates in consultation with COE faculty and our LEA partners. All licensure candidates complete at least one student placement in a diverse setting. Candidates are assured of completing at least one, and likely multiple experiences, in diverse contexts through placement recommendations made by faculty and through the monitoring of student teaching placements in diverse schools through the staff of the School Based Clinical Practice office. Computerized records are maintained on each candidate to ensure that all candidates complete placements in diverse P-12 school setting. The district and school data area ([Demographics of Clinical Sites for Initial and Advanced Programs](#)) reflect that placements are made in districts that are racially/ethnically diverse and socioeconomically diverse. In addition to the data in the table, the districts report 2.2 percent Limited English Proficient students. Furthermore, the districts serve approximately 15.9 percent special education students. They are also utilizing the Tennessee Model for Inclusion to create more inclusive classrooms (<http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/doc/04-05AnnrptComp.pdf>). The collaborative nature to field experience placements affords a system of checks and balances critical to providing our candidates with exposure to groups different from their own. In addition, the diversity within and across our clinical sites affords numerous opportunities for candidates to have diverse field experience.

How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

Knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity are systematically integrated into coursework, field experiences and clinical practice, and are integral to our assessment system. This assures the alignment of the assessment with the program of studies. For example, the student teacher evaluation instrument requires systematic rating for how candidates adapt instructional opportunities for diverse learners; plan instruction and student evaluation based on in-depth understanding of the content, student needs, curriculum standards, and the community; communicate student achievement and progress to students, their parents, and appropriate others; create a classroom culture that develops student intellectual capacity in the content area; and communicates clearly and correctly with students, parents and other stakeholders ([Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth of Student Teachers Instrument](#)). These particular assessment items ensure reflection, dialogue and improvement strategies to assist candidates in developing proficiency related to diversity. In addition, all initial licensure programs require a

special education course and a course on urban education or on teaching in diverse environments. These courses are specifically designed to assure candidates develop the practical knowledge, skills and dispositions related to teaching in diverse environments (See syllabi for [ICL 4001](#), [ICL 4002](#), [ICL 7709](#), [SPED 2000](#), [SPED 7000](#), [SPED 6900](#), [LEAD 2010](#), and [LDPS 7330](#)). In addition, as presented in Standard 1, results from the Teacher Preparation Program Reflections exit survey indicates that over the past four years, candidates have ranked their preparedness to create instructional opportunities for diverse learners at 3.98 on a five point scale. These data are used by program areas for program revisions to better equip our candidates for work in diverse settings ([Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#)).

How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups? Candidates are required to reflect on a variety of topics, including diversity, during their clinical practice in both formative and summative ways. Throughout their program, candidates are required to reflect on feedback from peers, faculty, and cooperating teachers through seminar discussions, reflective journals, and formal and informal seminar discussions with supervisors and cooperating teachers. Summative assessments and feedback are ensured through the use of [Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth of Student Teachers Results](#) tables, which provides the program with feedback from the cooperating and faculty supervisor, and through the [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#). For example, the student teaching data indicate that on the item: Adapts for diverse learners, candidate performance improved during the second placement as indicated by assessments from both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The exit survey was developed to align with the INTASC Standards and also provides feedback on candidates' skills in working with students from diverse groups. Results over the past four years indicate that candidates rank preparedness for working with diverse learners at 3.98 and preparedness for working with exceptional learners at 3.89 on a five point scale. This rating represents a general increase in candidate's overall quality of preparation over the four years.

What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4? We not only understand but act on a key statement made in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*-- "Diversity feeds on itself." This means that diversity works best on university campuses when it is well represented in both the faculty and candidate bodies. While we still strive to increase in both areas, we are proud of our recognition in the *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* as a COE that graduates large numbers of African American graduates and undergraduates, a level comparable to many historically Black colleges and universities. We are also proud of our recognition as one of the top three units on campus for hiring and retaining faculty of color.

What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit?

Considering our status in terms of what we do well, we have initiated a research focus to determine how well we are living out our conceptual framework and our values related to diversity. We want to know how we are doing in terms of understanding our diversity standards, enacting them into programs, and creating/sustaining an environment that embodies our values and standards. This year, the research is funded by the Tennessee Board of Regents and includes surveys, faculty and staff dialogues, and practical interpretation of the standards into program content and candidate performances. All of the activities of this Diversity and Access Grant are designed to inform program improvement.

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

The unit's conceptual framework commitments to Diverse Communities, Effective Practice, and Leadership are clearly visible in faculty qualifications, performance, and development. Full- and part-time faculty are qualified as seen in earned degrees and exceptional expertise. There is abundant evidence that all faculty model best professional practices in teaching, scholarship, service, leadership, and collaboration. Established structures ensure systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty. A strong commitment to professional development ensures a rich array of opportunities for all faculty to develop new knowledge and skills related to our conceptual framework commitments.

5a. Qualified Faculty

What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty?

Earned doctorates are an indication of strong knowledge and expertise. In 2007-08, there are 96 percent of tenured and tenure-track professional education faculty who hold doctorate degrees. In addition, four professional education faculty members in the unit hold prestigious professorships (e.g., [*Moss Chair of Excellence in Urban Education*](#), Distinguished Professor of Urban Literacy), and two faculty are Faudree University Professors ([*Faudree Professorships*](#)). Ninety-eight percent (98%) of adjunct faculty members have a master's, post-master's, or doctorate degrees. The selection, qualification requirements, and evaluation of faculty at the Jackson and Millington Centers are the same as those on the main campus ([*Faculty Qualifications; Academic Qualifications of Professional Education Faculty 2007-2008*](#)).

For faculty members without terminal degrees, what expertise qualifies them for their assignments? Three full-time tenured or tenure-track professional education faculty do not hold the doctorate degree but have considerable experience and expertise in their areas, e.g., library science, music, and theatre and dance ([*Professional Education Faculty 2007-2008*](#)). Many of the part-time adjunct faculty members are retired COE administrators, superintendents, supervisors, and principals who hold state licensure (also evidence of expertise) and considerable experience, but all do not hold doctorates. Some adjuncts are currently P-12 school teachers who are recognized for their expertise in particular subject areas. Fifty-three percent (53%) of adjuncts hold doctorates ([*Professional Education Faculty 2007-2008*](#)). The unit advisors included in the data are not expected to hold doctorates but have a range of 3-23 years in advising candidates within the unit.

How many of the school faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? All cooperating teachers are licensed in the fields that they teach and supervise. The COE follows guidelines of the Tennessee State Board of Education in selecting cooperating teachers: a) at least 4 years of professional teaching experience in their area of licensure; b) regular teacher licensure in the appropriate content area/grades; c) evaluation as a highly competent teacher through local assessment and/or state evaluation procedures; d) willingness to assume the roles expected of a mentor; and e) ability to work as a team member and facilitate learning experiences including pedagogical instruction. Similarly, all cooperating administrators are licensed in a teaching field and hold licensure as an administrator. The COE also follows state guidelines in selecting cooperating administrators: a) complete an approved graduate level program of studies in school administration and supervision, b) be recommended for licensure by an approved institution of higher education, c) pass a state required test/assessment, and d) and complete a professional development program and local evaluation as a beginning principal. In

collaboration with the Office of School-Based and Clinical Practice, the employing schools verify the credentials of cooperating teachers and administrators based on the guidelines of the Tennessee Board of Education.

What contemporary professional experiences in school settings does higher education clinical faculty have in school settings? University supervisors must be licensed classroom teachers or administrators in the area that they supervise. Many higher education clinical faculty have been licensed classroom teachers and/or administrators in the past and continue their work in schools as they provide in-service sessions for P-12 teachers and administrators or supervise student teachers, interns, and preservice candidates as they complete clinical hours required for method courses. They must also attend all orientation sessions so that they are familiar with the Tennessee Framework for Growth and Evaluation assessment instrument and how to utilize it for assessing student teaching performance. An orientation session is held at the beginning of each semester along with an end-of-semester focus group session. Higher education faculty who supervise administrator and school psychology interns are licensed administrators and psychologists. In addition, they must attend all orientation sessions so that they are familiar with the Field Experience Internship Summative Evaluation assessment instrument and how to utilize it for assessing student administrative performance. An orientation session is held toward the end of each semester to review the assessment instrument. The table below—*University Faculty with Contemporary Experience in P-12 Schools in 2006*—shows that of the 75, or 57 percent, of the 135 faculty (reporting data on P-12 school experiences indicated that they were involved with schools in January-December 2006 ([Faculty Year End Evaluations for 2006](#)).

University Faculty with Contemporary Experience in P-12 Schools in 2006

Number of faculty with experience in P-12 schools in 2006*	75
Number of faculty reporting data**	135
Percentage of faculty with current experience in P-12 schools in 2006	57%

*Based on data submitted in spring 2007 for faculty members in the 2006 calendar year.

**Includes regular full-time faculty, administrators, and part-time faculty; excludes candidate advisors.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields? All courses in teacher education reflect the conceptual framework, e.g., a commitment to diverse communities, effective practice, and leadership. In addition to these three major commitments, teacher education preparation courses enable candidates to develop the required skills in content knowledge, knowledge of the learner, pedagogy and instruction, assessment and responsive practice, management of classrooms and individuals, and personal and professional growth. The alignment between courses and the conceptual framework is revealed in each syllabus (<https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/>). Year end evaluations reveal some of the ideas mentioned most often related to the conceptual framework, current research, and developments in fields related to teacher preparation ([Instruction and the Conceptual Framework](#)). For example, faculty members referred often to preparing candidates to be educational leaders, being able to use effective practices, and enabling them to work in diverse communities. Faculty members revealed that candidates will be well informed about theories, research, and effective practices relevant to their content areas. Several faculty members indicated that they used a constructivist approach to teaching and learning; hand-on-activities, cooperative learning groups, student-centered practices; and Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence standards of

joint productivity, instructional conversation, language development, contextualizing teaching and learning as a regular part of their classroom instruction.

How does unit faculty encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions? Faculty members use a variety of strategies to encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions. Candidates have opportunities to develop skills as reflective practitioners as they participate in some of the following activities: reflective journal writing, self-evaluation of their teaching practices, reflections on research readings, on-line reflections related to course experiences, reflections after small group discussions, large group discussions, at the close of each class and field experiences, dialogue journals, and reflections in final portfolios on artifacts related to concepts, theories and objectives emphasized in courses. Critical thinking and problem solving skills are addressed through the use of prepared case studies as well as the construction of case studies, self assessment papers, critiques of journal articles and research reports with implications for professional practice, discussions of controversial issues, application questions on mid-term and final course examinations, and development of research-based products that require active candidate engagement in using the problem solving skills of synthesis, analysis, and evaluation of multiple variables.

The development and assessment of professional dispositions has, in the past, consisted of each candidate signing the COE's Expectations of All Candidates Seeking Licensure at the University of Memphis form at the time of their admittance to the Teacher Education Program. Subsequent to admission to the program, program area faculty have designed and used specific dispositional assessment instruments. After unit-wide discussions centered on unifying the various program areas approaches to assessing candidates' dispositions, a set of unit-wide specific disposition standards and policies and procedures for assessing them was drafted. This new unit-wide approach aligned the unit's conceptual framework and the assessment of dispositions for candidates. In addition, policy and procedures were outlined in the document regarding how dispositional concerns about individual candidates will be handled at the unit level. This document was distributed to the Teacher Education Advisory Council during fall 2007. The Teacher Education Advisory Council revised and approved the draft dispositional policy and guidelines at the end of fall 2007. The draft policy will be disseminated during spring 2008 for approval by the Dean's Leadership Team. Professional dispositions are encouraged in various ways: list of professional dispositions are discussed and signed by each candidate at beginning of course, used as a guide throughout the semester, and assessed via a conference with candidates at the close of the semester, often with assigning a rating that becomes a part of the candidate's assessment folder; final disposition checklist assessed before student teaching; addressed in classes and reinforced as needed throughout semester. Dispositions are also assessed through journal entries, modeled by faculty in interactions with candidates, and reinforced in syllabi. Feedback is provided to candidates throughout the semester on demonstration of professional dispositions, through individual conferences with candidates, and discussed and assessed on a regular basis through conversation and responses via problem-based case analysis (*Reflection, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Dispositions* and course syllabi <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/>).

What types of instructional strategies and assessment do unit faculty model? Faculty model a variety of instructional strategies and assessment and report the use of the following instructional strategies in their classes: interactive lectures, guest lectures, whole group and small

group discussions, Think-Pair-Share, instructional games, multimedia rich presentations (video, slides, video conferencing, PowerPoint, discussion boards), web-enhanced learning, Wikispaces, written reflections, personal consultation, cooperative learning activities, candidate presentations, brainstorming, learning contracts, graphic organizers, concept maps, jig-sawing, and school-based observations and participation, and simulations (*Instructional Strategies Used by Faculty* and Course Syllabi at <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/>). Unit faculty members report using and modeling both formative and summative assessment strategies in their courses, as well as using traditional and authentic assessments. Faculty members use written essay and multiple tests (in-class and take home exams), skills assessment of selected performances such as demonstration of selected psychomotor skills, oral presentations, evaluation of lessons taught, authentic interviews, lesson and unit plans, and reflections on field experiences. Assessments also include the use of checklists, rubrics, reflective papers and journals, annotated bibliographies, lab reports, critique of research articles, completion of literature reviews, online and classroom discussions, interest inventories, pre- and post-surveys, midterm and final written exams, research papers, projects, group projects, grant proposals, and e-portfolios (*Assessment Strategies Used by Faculty* and Course Syllabi at <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/g-icl/syllabi/SPRING%202008/>).

How does unit faculty instruction reflect their knowledge and experiences in diversity? A review of course syllabi and year-end faculty evaluation reports reveal the integration of diversity across program and content areas (*Practices Used to Address Diversity*). Candidates in both initial and advanced teacher preparation programs pursue courses designed specifically to address diversity issues in schools settings, e.g., LEAD 2010-Teaching and Schools in Urban Settings, SPED 2000-Issues of Human Diversity, ICL 4001- and ICL 7709-Learning in the Urban Environment. Faculty members also note that issues of diversity are integrated throughout content courses such as social studies, science, mathematics, literacy, physical education and music. A variety of instructional strategies are used throughout teacher preparation programs within the unit to provide candidates with opportunities to effectively teach students from diverse backgrounds, e.g., diverse clinical and student teaching experiences, case studies, reading and literature written by scholars of color, cooperative and collaborative group activities, modeling of varying instructional strategies, and guest lecturers who present diverse perspectives on culture, ethnicity, and gender. As noted above in our response to Standard 4d., all licensure candidates complete field and clinical experiences in schools that have diverse school populations.

How does unit faculty incorporate the use of technology into instruction? All unit faculty members reported integrating various types of technology applications in their instruction (*Practices Used to Integrate Technology*). Faculty members within the unit teach both online courses and web-enhanced courses. All classrooms in the building where most education classes are held (Ball Hall) are equipped with comprehensive technology systems (SMART classrooms) that contain the needed hardware to facilitate the integration of technology into classroom instruction. Annually, faculty members have opportunities to order software that is most appropriate for their use and their candidates. Four computer labs are located in Ball Hall as well as classroom buildings throughout the university campus and the library are available to candidates to complete related classrooms assignments and available to instructors to use for whole class-class instruction. In addition, a laptop cart with 25 computers is available to use in regular classrooms for instructional purpose. The applications mentioned often were PowerPoint, databases, web searches, web page development, digital cameras, video tapes, DVD's, online

discussions, e-portfolio development, and UMdrive (an Internet site set up by faculty where candidates may access all course materials for classes in which they are enrolled). Program candidates report that they are well-prepared (4.12 average on five point survey scale) in using technology to enhance instruction as noted in [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#). Some other examples of the incorporation of technology into instruction include the following.

- Faculty members who taught online courses at the university for many years used the WebCT course management system. The university began using eCourseware in summer 2007 for online instruction in place of WebCT.
- A faculty member who teaches a research course uses ALEKS, an online tutoring system and SPSS statistical software, a data management package for analysts and researchers.
- A mathematics educator noted the use of graphing calculators and the Geometer Sketchpad software in a mathematics methods course.
- Several faculty members used Teachers Learning in Network Communities, a weekly online discussion tool for preservice and in-service teachers that was developed in cooperation with the University of Memphis, the University of Washington, the University of Colorado, and the National Commission on Teaching and America's future, and funded by Microsoft.

What do candidates think of the quality of teaching by faculty in the unit? Student ratings indicate that they feel quite positive about the quality of teaching provided by full- and part-time professional education faculty. Each semester, candidates are requested to complete an evaluation of each course in which they are enrolled by completing the online Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS). Item 28 on the SIRS evaluation is used as a rating of the overall effectiveness of the teacher for each course which states: "In general, the instructor was an effective teacher." The choices on the rating scale range from 1-5 with 1=Strongly Agree (most positive) to 5=Strongly Disagree (most negative). The aggregate mean scores for the college are well within the positive range. For example, the aggregate mean scores for the 2007 spring semester were 1.39 for lower level courses, 1.54 for upper level courses, and 1.56 for graduate courses ([SIRS Online Survey](#) and [2006 and 2007 COE Aggregate SIRS Mean Scores](#)).

How does unit faculty systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching? A variety of strategies are used by faculty to assess their teaching including a review of data from the Student Instructional Rating System, peer observations, pre- and post assessments (based on course objectives) designed for some courses, and exit slips that may be used by selected faculty throughout the semester and at the close of the semester ([COE Assessments](#)). In addition to overall effectiveness as a teacher, Student Instructional Rating System evaluations also cluster feedback into five additional categories that provide data for improving instruction in selected areas including: instructor involvement, student interest, instructor interaction, course demands, course organization, and effective use of technology. A new candidate evaluation instrument is being developed by the university. The data and format included in this report are from the evaluation used through the summer 2007 semester ([University SIRS Summary Form](#)). The Student Instructional Rating System feedback along with the other examples of candidate and faculty feedback is used by faculty in the self-assessment process in making instructional decisions throughout the semester as well as at the close of the semester. These data are also used by all faculty as a part of the self-assessment processes for annual faculty review, third-year review, and tenure and promotion. The Faculty Annual Report ([Faculty Annual Report Form](#)) shows that all faculty members are asked to reflect on their teaching performance. The faculty

member, along with the department chair and in some instances tenure and promotion committees, use both the formative and summative data in teaching to suggest and plan professional development activities designed to improved teacher performance as needed.

5c .Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

What types of scholarly work are expected as part of the institution’s mission? The University of Memphis has a Carnegie classification of Doctoral/Research Universities– Extensive. As noted in the university handbook, college and departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate a commitment to scholarship. Scholarship is defined as a discipline-based, multidisciplinary activity that advances knowledge and learning by producing new ideas and understanding. Scholarly contributions include peer-evaluated, discipline-appropriate works such as books, articles, chapters, films, paintings performances, and choreographic or theatrical design. Each department may emphasize contributions in some of five sub-categories, e. g., application, creativity activity, inquiry, integration, and the scholarship of teaching, more than others as described in its mission statement and tenure and promotion documents.

In what types of scholarship activities are faculty engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? [*Modeling Best Practices in Scholarship*](#) shows that teacher education faculty have demonstrated a high level of scholarly productivity in 2006, which is typical of our yearly level of activity. Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty engaged in publishing articles, books, book chapters, and book reviews, and making presentations at conferences and developing grant proposals. Faculty members write about and make presentations related to their teaching and research, which translate into advanced content knowledge and best practices in their teaching. At the University of Memphis, engaged scholarship now subsumes the scholarship of application. It adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to collaborative problem-solving with urban, regional, state, national and/or global communities and results in a written work shared with others in the discipline or field of study. Departments may refine the definition as appropriate for their disciplines and incorporate evaluation guidelines in departmental tenure and promotion criteria (go to *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, Tenure and Promotion Overview, at http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Chapter4.htm).

What percentage of the unit’s faculty is engaged in scholarship? All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in scholarship activities. Scholarship is not required for the performance review of full-time clinical faculty, part-time or advisors, even though many of these faculty members are involved in scholarship productivity. From January through December 2006, tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the professional education unit completed 85 publications, made 172 presentations, have 138 works in progress, and were awarded support for 50 grant proposals. Fifty-five or 98 percent of the 56 tenure and tenure-track faculty who completed the [*Faculty Year End Evaluations for 2006*](#) were engaged in scholarship activities ([*Modeling Best Practices in Scholarship*](#)).

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

What types of service are expected as part of the institution’s and the unit’s mission? Our conceptual framework’s commitment to leadership and diverse communities is understood to mean, in part, a commitment to serving university, local, state, national and international communities. Each COE faculty member is expected to perform service to the university,

profession, as well as outreach to various communities. A vital component of the university's mission, public service, must be characterized at the same high levels of quality that characterized teaching and research. Service to the community includes presentations related to the discipline, professional advices, and counsel to groups or individuals, particularly in the university's service area. Institutional service includes serving on departmental, college and university committees, while professional services refers to work done for state, regional, national or international professional organizations such as association leadership, journal editorships, article and grant proposal review, and guest lecturing on other campuses. Service is one of the categories of annual evaluation for faculty.

In what types of service activities are faculty engaged? College and university professional education faculty, as well faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, are involved with the professional world of practice in P-12 schools including a variety of collaborations/partnerships. Faculty members work with preservice and in-service educators in the classrooms where our candidates are placed. They also provide workshops, consulting, and other professional services to P-12 school districts and the wider community. Examples of services (including collaborations and partnerships with P-12 schools and the wider community) include the work of the New Teacher Center, Center for Research in Educational Policy, Center for Experiential Education, Center for Urban School Leadership, Ready, Set, Grow!, Memphis Literacy Academy, Memphis Striving Readers Project, the Reading Center, Supporting Urban Science and Mathematics Educators, Three R's Program, Transition to Teaching (T2T), Assistive Technology Training and Integration Network (Attain Project), Become a Special Educator in Tennessee Teaching Program, Restructuring for Inclusive School Environments, and Tennessee's Early Intervention System (See sample minutes and agendas related to collaboration and partnerships with P-12 schools in the following exhibits: [Teacher Education Advisory Council Meetings](#), [Agendas of Memphis Area Teacher Education Collaborative](#), [FDAC Minutes Related to Collaboration with P12 Schools](#), and [Collaborations and Partnerships](#)).

Unit faculty members also provide education-related services at the local, state, national, and international levels. Faculty members attend and make presentations at the annual state, national, and international meetings of professional organizations. Some also hold office for these organizations; serve as editors and on the editorial boards of the associations' refereed journals, and serve on other committees. For example, faculty members in the College of Education (COE) serve as editors of the following international/national refereed journals: *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, *Journal of Rehabilitation*, *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *Research in Higher Education*, and *The Reading Teacher*. Faculty members within the unit hold memberships in a variety of professional organizations related to their particular disciplines ([Memberships in Professional Associations](#)). The COE also conducted a year long Leadership Institute for 15 junior faculty members who were interested in enhancing/develop their leadership skills in three areas for future roles in the college and university: administration, research and publications, and university and P-12 teaching ([Leadership Institute](#)). An example of how unit faculty model the conceptual framework's commitment to leadership and diverse professional communities is seen clearly in [Modeling Best Practices in Leadership](#).

What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? All teacher education faculty members are heavily involved in the work of the university, their professions, and the community. Fifty-five, or 77 percent, of the 71 tenured and

tenure-track faculty reported on their involvement in professional and community service activities in January-December 2006. This is representative of the level and kind of involvement of faculty in service activities.

Summary of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Involvement in Service in January-December 2006

Committees	University	College	Department	Professional	Community
Number of committees/events	71	100	137	154	98

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the faculty evaluations for adjunct/part-time, tenured and non-tenured faculty, as well as for graduate teaching assistants?

Tenure and Promotion. Upon initial appointment, each faculty member receives a statement that outlines university expectations related to teaching, scholarship, and service. Specific expectations related to each of the three areas may vary depending on the role of the new faculty member and the needs of the particular department and college. The tenure and promotion process used within the Professional Education Unit is consistent with university guidelines found in the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook* (See Chapter 4-Tenure and Promotion, at http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Chapter4.htm). Application for tenure is submitted to the department chair following the fifth year of a six-year probationary period (unless otherwise approved by the dean and provost). Faculty members may apply for promotion whenever they believe they meet the established criteria. The tenure and promotion process begins with a letter of intent to the department chair in the spring semester. This follows a review of the candidate’s application in the fall semester of the sixth year (or earlier) by the departmental tenure and promotion committee, department chair, college tenure and promotion committee, and the college dean. A recommendation is made at each level and then forwarded to the provost. After a review of the application, the provost submits a statement of recommendation to the president and the Tennessee Board of Regents takes final action based on the recommendations of the president. Prior to submitting the application for tenure, each candidate is involved in the annual review process detailed below as well as a mid-tenure process, usually during the third year. Tenure and promotion candidates are also required to have external peer review of their record of scholarly activity by qualified peers who are not affiliated with the University of Memphis (go to: University Peer Review Requirements, in the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, at http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Appendices.htm#Form:%20External%20Evaluators%20List)

Annual review of full-time faculty. During the spring semester of each year, each full-time faculty (tenured and non-tenure track) submits a completed annual review evaluation form that outlines accomplishments during the past year in teaching, scholarship and service, proposes plans for the upcoming year, submits the faculty effort certification form, completes the Delaware Survey, presents candidate evaluations for each course taught during the evaluation period, and completes an updated curriculum vitae (on-line) as part of the evaluation process. The department chair reviews the materials and then prepares a narrative and an overall evaluation of the faculty member’s performance by assigning one of the following five

performance categories: a) exceptional performance, b) very good performance, c) good performance, d) improvement needed, and e) failure to meet responsibilities. The department chair uses the annual review process as the primary mechanism for the annual evaluation of faculty, for giving specific feedback to faculty on their performance, for making recommendations on how to improve performance consistent with the department's and/or academic unit's goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and for planning next year's assignments and workload. Full- and part-time faculty members who teach at the Jackson and Millington Centers are evaluated the same as faculty on the main campus ([Faculty Annual Report Form](#)).

Part-time faculty. The initial appointment of part-time faculty (adjuncts and teaching assistants) are made based on a review of their curriculum vitae, a completed application form, references letters, and recommendations of the faculty within the unit. Re-appointment of part-time faculty each semester is made by department chairs based on feedback from student evaluations or SIRS forms for each class taught and in consultation with faculty and program coordinators within specific concentration areas ([Data Forms for Part-time Faculty](#)).

How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? The majority of the faculty performed very well on the unit's evaluation. The table below reveals that 94 percent of the faculty performed in the range of Good to Exceptional for the 2006 calendar year. The faculty evaluation process occurs in early spring and covers work performed in the preceding calendar year (i.e. 2007 evaluations are for faculty activities and accomplishments in the calendar year, 2006). A faculty member's summative evaluation rating is assigned by the department chair, reviewed by the faculty member, and returned to the chair for approval. The chair also presents a written summative narrative on the faculty member's annual performance. The rating scale ("Exceptional" to "Failure to Meet Responsibilities") is applied to all full-time faculty at the University of Memphis.

Summary of Full-time Faculty Performance for January – December 2006*

Performance Categories	Number of Faculty	Percentage of Faculty
Exceptional	38	35.5%
Very good	52	48.5%
Good	11	10.0%
Improvement needed	6	6.0%
Failure to meet responsibilities	0	0
Total	107	100%

*Number excludes faculty members on professional development assignments and/or sick leave.

How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service? Using feedback from the annual review process, the department chair and unit faculty member collaborate on an action plan (or professional development plan) to improve faculty performance that is consistent with the department's and academic unit's goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Additional details about this process are included below under *5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development*.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

How is professional development related to needs outlined in faculty evaluations? How does this happen? As part of the annual evaluation and third-year review process, each faculty member works with the department chair to develop suggested areas of focus based on needs

identified in the evaluation process, as related to the development of new knowledge and skills required relevant to the conceptual framework and other emerging practices. Teaching, scholarship, grants, publications, university, professional and local service, and collaboration with other professionals and community organizations are expected of unit faculty. Thus, faculty evaluations focus on these areas. To support faculty in these expected areas of performance, the unit has appointed an assistant dean for Faculty Development ([Job Description for Assistant Dean](#)) and established the Office of Faculty and Staff Development to coordinate many of the activities related directly to the areas in which faculty are evaluated. The faculty development activities conducted are guided in part by an active faculty development advisory committee that makes recommendations based on input from each department within the unit. Relevant professional development activities (based on needs identified in faculty evaluations, surveys, workshops, and study groups) are pursued through a variety of avenues. Faculty members at the Jackson and Millington Centers are eligible to participate in all the same professional development activities as faculty on the main campus ([Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007](#)).

What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and any aspect of the unit's conceptual framework? Professional development activities offered to faculty within the unit are focused on the three major commitments noted in the conceptual framework: diverse communities, effective practice, and leadership. In addition, professional development activities noted in this section further note events related to specific effective practices that are outlines as the six pillars for our educator preparation program, e.g., content knowledge, knowledge of the learner, assessment and responsive practice, management of classroom, and individuals and personal growth.

One of the major sources of professional activities is the Office of Faculty and Staff Development in the COE ([Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007](#)). A sample of some of the workshop topics offered in 2006, and their related themes, include mentoring and coaching novice teachers (*content knowledge, knowledge of the learning, assessment and responsive practice*), planning and designing instructions tailored to learner needs; teaching controversial topics (*professional growth and development*), effective grant writing, reflecting on data to inform practice (*assessment, differentiation in instruction*), teacher leadership skills (*teacher leaders*), culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (*diversity and all of the six pillars*), mentoring for equity (*diversity*), mentoring for English Language Learners (*ELL, diversity, emerging practices, six pillars*), developing effective syllabi, CREDE--Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (*pedagogy and instruction, emerging practices of joint productive activity, contextualization, challenging activities and instructional conversation*), successful strategies for chairing doctoral committees (*leadership*), Leadership Institute (*leadership, personal and professional growth and development*), and the relationship of choice theory and reality theory to the preparation of teachers (*emerging practices, personal and professional growth and development*). Faculty members new to the COE have opportunities to receive instruction in the use of fully-equipped technology classrooms as a part of their orientation at the beginning of the fall semester. The Office of Faculty and Staff Development is committed to offer professional development activities each year related to the proposed candidate dispositions and to the three major themes in the Conceptual Framework: leadership, diversity, and effective practice. The exhibit [2006-07 Activities CF Themes](#) reveal how 2006-07

professional development activities are related to the conceptual framework. With input from all departments via the Faculty Development Advisory Committee, department chairs, and other members of the Dean's Leadership Team, a mentor checklist was designed to be used by mentors and new faculty as one tool for induction and retention of new faculty ([Mentor Checklist](#)).

Other on-campus sources include the Advanced Learning Center (*technology*), New Teacher Center, departments within unit (*research*), Office of Research Support Services (*grants and faculty research grants, professional growth and development*), Office of Affirmative Action and Diversity (*diversity*), and the Provost's Office (*tenure and promotion, professional growth and development*). See [Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007](#), as well as for [2005](#), [2004](#), and [2003](#) for more details. In addition, faculty members are allocated funds to attend and make presentations at the meetings of state, regional, national, and international professional associations as part of their professional development plans.

How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? All faculty in the unit have multiple opportunities each month to participate in on-campus professional development activities offered by the unit's Office of Faculty and Staff Development, departments within the unit, and several university-wide events sponsored by divisions such as the Advanced Learning Center, Office of Research Support Services, Office of Affirmative Action and Diversity, and the Provost's Office. For example, attendance sheets from professional development activities offered just by the COE Office of Faculty and Staff Development during the 2006-2007 academic year reveal that 1,011 faculty, staff, and P-12 partners participated in these activities. Faculty members also attend and make presentations at local, regional, and national conferences throughout the year that provide additional opportunities for professional development.

What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5? The Professional Education Unit does at least two areas related to Standard 5 particularly well. The college has developed several major partnerships with P-12 schools and the local community and provided professional development activities for faculty in response to their identified needs. First, the COE has worked very aggressively to collaborate with the College of Arts and Sciences to improve subject matter content for regular courses and special partnerships with P-12 schools. The college has developed several major partnerships with local P-12 school districts in the areas of leadership, literacy, mathematics, science, special education and induction and mentoring. These partnerships offer opportunities to improve the academic achievement of P-12 students, professional development of P-12 teachers and administrators, and improvement of teacher preparation programs within the unit. Secondly, of particular note for this unit is that a position of assistant dean is in place that is devoted primarily to the professional development of both faculty and staff. With input from the faculty and staff advisory committees and the commitment of financial resources, the Office of Faculty and Staff Development is able to respond very quickly in planning and conducting a wide range of professional development events that meet the needs of faculty and staff. This is a clear indication of the high value placed on the continuing professional development of faculty and staff in the pursuit of excellence within the COE. See details provided in [Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007](#), [2005](#), [2004](#), [2003](#); [Collaborations and Partnerships](#), and responses to Elements 5d and 5f above.

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

6a. Unit leadership and authority

How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators? The College of Education (COE) is organized into four departments, two college-wide centers, and also has early childhood and campus elementary schools (*Organizational chart*). The College Leadership team, consisting of an associate dean, two assistant deans, four department chairs, and directors of development, of teacher education and support services, and of assessment meet monthly with the dean to manage and coordinate activities of the college. Coordination between programs primarily within the college and those primarily outside the college is carried out through the Teacher Education Advisory Council, chaired by the director of Teacher Education. Curriculum development typically originates from faculty within programs, is considered at the department level and forwarded to either the College Undergraduate Curriculum Council or College Graduate Studies Council, and then forwarded to the appropriate university undergraduate or graduate council. When curriculum issues involve more than one college, appropriate representatives discuss them, and then they are discussed at the university council. If curriculum issues are initiated at the college level, they are referred to the appropriate departments for consideration and then come back through the process described above.

What members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate? The professional community participates in program design through annual Summits, a COE Advisory Committee, and program specific advisory committees. In May 2005, the COE held a two day Summit with about 250 participants consisting of education faculty and staff, other university administrators and faculty, candidates, and community stakeholders. At this Summit, 15 Aspiration Teams were formed to work on future directions for the college. At the May 2006 Summit, about 200 participants considered team reports, modified aspirations, reorganized teams, and set direction for the next year. At the May 2007 Summit, about 200 participants considered the progress made, encouraged appropriate teams to continue, and coalesced aspirations into three “Big Ideas,” which are being worked on this academic year and next (*Aspiration Statements and Innovation Implementation Teams*; <http://coefutures.memphis.edu/> and *Summit III – Big Ideas*).

The College Advisory committee consists of the dean and a group of external stakeholders who consider the major accomplishments and discuss future overall direction. The program specific advisory committees, consisting of program faculty and external stakeholders, consider the needs of the program, the direction of the program, and the expected competencies of program completers. During the May 2007 assessment retreat, programs included stakeholders while reviewing assessment data.

How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling? In addition to advising within departments, the Office of Teacher Education and Students Support Services provides advising to all teacher education candidates regarding both academic requirements and licensure requirements (<http://coe.memphis.edu/advising-and-student-services.htm>). They work with candidates in person, via phone and email, as well as posting requirements on the web (<http://coe.memphis.edu/advising.htm>). In addition to typical

office hours, this office also holds evening advising sessions monthly on campus and meets with candidates at the Jackson and Millington Centers.

The university also provides services to candidates through the Student Health Services (<http://saweb.memphis.edu/health/>) and the Center for Counseling, Learning and Testing (<http://saweb.memphis.edu/cclt/>). A survey of alumni conducted by the assistant vice provost for Academic Program Effectiveness shows that advising had positive ratings ([survey of alumni](#)). Similarly, the [Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey Results](#) indicate that candidates are satisfied with the quality of advising information.

What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How clearly and consistently are they described in publications and catalogues? Recruitment is done in collaboration with the University Office of Recruitment. Ms. Bonnie Cummings works with the recruitment and admissions offices, even to the extent of attending college recruitment fairs across the state. Admissions policies for undergraduate candidates are described in the "Colleges and Degree Programs" section of the Undergraduate Bulletin (<http://academics.memphis.edu/bulletin/>) for the COE under the heading "Admission to Teacher Education," which is followed by the heading "Alternative Admission." Admissions policies for graduate candidates are described in the "Degree Programs and Courses" section of the Graduate Bulletin (<http://academics.memphis.edu/gradcatalog/>) for the COE in general terms and specifically for teacher education the section for Instruction and Curriculum Leadership. Admission for both graduate and undergraduate candidates is based upon appropriate combinations of grade point average, standardized test scores, interview, and letters of recommendation. Detailed admissions procedures for the Teacher Education Program are available on the web (<http://coe.memphis.edu/TEP-admissions.htm>).

How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current? The official university academic calendar, catalogues, grading policies, university publications, and advertising are controlled by the appropriate administrative office. In the fall semester, the college and then university Undergraduate Curriculum Council and Graduate Studies Council consider curriculum changes and revisions in the catalogs. In June, the college council chairs review the relevant sections of the catalogs after editing and just prior to publishing on the web at the links above. We no longer publish print catalogs. The same council chairs, department chairs, and specific program coordinators share responsibility for maintaining accuracy of information on the COE web pages and links.

6b. Unit Budget

What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units on campus or similar units at other institutions? From the 2003-04 year to the 2006-07 year College of Education expenditures have increased from \$12.7 million to \$15.2 million, with the increase primarily related to additional funds for salary increases and the funds recovered from grants. The expenditures for 2006-07 are similar for the College of Education, the College of Communication and Fine Arts, and the Fogelman College of Business and Economics. Summary table ([Budget enrollment faculty](#)) shows these expenditures range from \$15.2 to \$15.4 million while Business had 3031 students, Education had 2811 students, and Communication and

Fine Arts had 1958 students. The College of Arts and Sciences had a largest budget and also many more students.

What financial support is available for professional development opportunities for faculty?

Faculty professional development takes place via professional development assignment, attendance at professional conferences, and our Office of Professional Development. Professional development assignment is the institution's term for sabbatical, and three to five education faculty per year have received either one semester at full salary or a year at half salary. Attendance at professional conferences is supported via departmental travel funds, and preference is given to faculty presenting or serving in a leadership role of the sponsoring professional association. The college Office of Faculty and Staff Development has been supported with a minimum of \$20,000 annually by dean's and provost's special allocation for the conduct of professional development activities for both faculty and staff.

What changes to the budget since the last visit have affected the quality of the programs offered?

Budget changes have taken place in the areas of graduate assistant support, faculty salaries, and grant and contract funding. Regarding graduate assistants, the university established the minimum compensation of \$1,500 per semester if half time and \$3,000 per semester if full time. This increase was accompanied by \$150,000 additional stipend money available to the college to be used primarily in support of teaching assistants. Each of the last six years there have been state mandated across the board increases, and in five of these years, the university has also implemented a merit based salary increment program. The greatest changes in budget have been in the areas of external grants and contracts, which increased from approximately \$8 million to \$17 million.

6c. Personnel

What are the institution's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty?

What are the institution's workload policies? The Tennessee Board of Regents recommends that faculty with 100 percent teaching responsibility would be teaching 15 undergraduate or 12 graduate hours per semester. In contrast however, the University of Memphis and COE practice a differentiated staffing model, which is detailed below.

What are the actual workloads of faculty for teaching and clinical supervision? The unit has five instructors who only teach and consequently follow the Tennessee Board of Regents recommendation. All faculty with other responsibilities teach less. Each faculty member meets with his/her department chair annually for evaluation of the prior year and to negotiate work responsibilities for the following year, concluding with percentage allocations across the various faculty functions. Typically a new tenure-track faculty member will teach two courses (assume three credit hours each) per semester, while experienced faculty will two courses per semester or two course one semester and three the other. Tenured faculty with little research productivity may be assigned additional teaching responsibility. Teaching at off-campus locations is considered part of the regular teaching load. Teaching an overload course (on- or off-campus) is very rare and requires the approval of both the department chair and dean. Student teaching supervision is translated into equivalence of a three credit course for supervision of five candidates across both placements. The non-instructional time is allocated to the other faculty functions of advising, work in P-12 schools, research, dissertation advisement, and work on external grants and contracts. Distribution among these functions varies according to the expertise of the individual faculty member and the needs of the department as can be seen the

document showing workload distribution across categories ([effort table](#)) and the workload table which show that about 65% of the full time faculty teach 1 or 2 courses per semester ([teaching loads table](#)).

To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service? Typical faculty workloads are described above. Maximum enrollment in a section of a course is determined by the faculty of the program area for that course and the department chair. The bases for determining class size are the level of the class and primary instructional strategies used. For example, doctoral seminars may be limited to 12 candidates, while an undergraduate lecture class (assisted by a teaching assistant) may have 50 candidates. Spring 2008, the college has several hundred sections of classes—some seminars with 6 candidates enrolled, one large lecture class with 50, and 25 sections with over 30, but not more than 45. Online courses typically have a lower maximum enrollment than the corresponding face to face class. For example, Instruction and Curriculum Leadership classes, which typically have a maximum enrollment of 24 or 25, are capped at 20 if offered online. Faculty time devoted to the collaborative development of the College of Education Assessment System (COEAS) has been part of the work assignment for service to the department and college. This applies to all programs, even those not part of NCATE. The faculty members writing SPA reports received extra compensation since most of this work was done during the summer.

How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs? Part-time faculty are recruited for special expertise (education and experience) to teach particular courses and when teaching at the graduate level credentials are reviewed to determine eligibility for graduate faculty status. A full-time faculty member serves as Professor of Record for every course. This Professor of Record has the responsibility of presenting the official syllabus to part-time faculty members and discussing the course. Each syllabus includes the logo for our conceptual framework, college norms, text, relationship to knowledge base and skill requirements, course objectives, and assessments, which together contribute to integrity, coherence, and quality. For relevant courses, the key assessments are explained and scoring rubrics provided. At the beginning of each semester, there is a meeting of all part-time faculty with program coordinators, and the primary teacher education program department has a handbook specifically for part-time faculty (<http://coe.memphis.edu/ncate/standards/6/ICLParttimeFacultyHandbook.pdf>).

What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel? Each department has office staff proportional to its size. In addition, the Office of Teacher Education and Student Support Services does nearly all of the advising for teacher education candidates regarding licensure and related academic requirements. This office also coordinates all teacher education field and student teaching placements. The college budget supports two technical support personnel and one database programmer. They share responsibilities to support the computer labs as well as computers and printers in faculty and staff offices. The database programmer also maintains the college and departmental websites ([College of Education Support Personnel](#)).

6d. Unit facilities

How adequate are unit facilities—classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, and school facilities—to support teaching and learning? Since the last visit, a concrete access

ramp and new doors have been installed at the Ball Hall entrance near the auditorium to facilitate access for handicapped. The landscaping on the west side of Ball Hall and the planters near the main entrance have been replaced. This year the exterior is being painted.

During the last four years, five of twelve classrooms in Ball Hall have had individual tables seats replaced with new tables and chairs. In four rooms, the college had previously installed tables and chairs. Several classrooms in the Fieldhouse had very old wood tablet chairs replaced with used molded fiber and steel tablet chairs. Classrooms used for instruction in the Jackson Center are shared with Jackson State Community College, some have tablet chairs and others have tables and chairs, and most have a computer and projector. The major facilities issue is that Ball Hall and the Fieldhouse are too small to house all of our faculty, classes, and research projects. Faculty have offices in four buildings on the main campus, research projects in two buildings on our Park Avenue Campus (about 1.5 miles away), and are teaching classes in 12 on campus buildings in spring 2008. We also teach classes in university facilities in Collierville and Millington. Classrooms at these locations are equipped with strip tables and chairs and most have projectors and computers with internet access ([Facilities for the College of Education](#)).

All faculty on the main campus have private offices ranging in size from very small to spacious. The faculty based in Jackson have offices created by modular furniture in one large room. Since the last NCATE visit, the university built the McWherter Library that is spacious and has technology resources that are growing annually. Candidates enrolled in classes in Collierville or Millington also use McWherter Library. Candidates at the Jackson Center use the Jackson State Community College Library, which has some books and journals specifically for our candidates and has electronic access to the university's main library.

6e. Unit resources including technology

What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty actually use these resources? The university provides desktop computers for all faculty, with replacement on a rotating basis. The University provides site licenses for the most frequently used software ([technology support doc](#) and [TAF software summary](#)). For the last four years, new tenure-track faculty have received a start-up package of a minimum of \$2,000, and most have elected to spend part of this on laptop computers. All lecture type classrooms in Ball Education Building and the Fieldhouse are equipped with a ceiling mounted LCD projector connected to both a computer and a VCR. When education classes are scheduled, most faculty insist upon use of a "smart classroom" of which the university has 201 (*Smart classrooms:* <http://trl.memphis.edu/smartclassroom.php>). The university lists 78 computer labs; the COE has four computer labs that are used for both direct instruction and general candidate use (*Computer labs:* <http://trl.memphis.edu/computerlabs.php>). The COE also maintains an Advanced Instruction Media Lab with eight MAC's and eight PC's. Usage statistics and reserved time for computer labs show that they are used. Use of technology in classroom space can be observed, but is also known by two projectors that have been replaced due to wear and others have had bulbs replaced ([Technology Resources for the College of Education](#)).

The Office of Faculty and Staff Development, described above in Standard 5, conducts professional workshops, several of which have focused on technology usage. See [Professional Development Activities for 2006-2007](#), as well as for [2005](#), [2004](#), and [2003](#) for more details.

Assistance to faculty with development of online courses is available from the university's Advanced Learning Center.

What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system? For over 10 years, the COE has employed a database programmer whose role has evolved into development of a database that merges data from the university database system, PRAXIS and GRE scores, and key assessment information. Further, in 2002, the college appointed and continues to support a director of Assessment. When the source of assessment data is the individual instructor, that person directly enters data via a data entry screen. This system is used for issuing reports and can be queried for data on individual candidates and programs. The security of this system allows access to only approved faculty and staff via use of a university issued ID code and a specific password. Data are maintained on all COE candidates and all candidates admitted into the Teacher Education Program. This database is linked with the COEAS developed by this programmer and the director of Assessment.

What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current? How accessible are resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus and distance learning programs, through electronic means? McWherter Library is the primary locations for both print and electronic access to books, reference materials, and government documents. Web access is available to the online catalog, electronic books, World Cat, and interlibrary loan requests. Journal articles are also available to faculty and candidates via the web through such entities as JSTOR, LexisNexis Academic, Science Direct, and ILLiad, along with state and federal government databases. These electronic library resources are available to all candidates on campus or at remote locations. Each department in the college has a library contact faculty member and an annual allocation for purchase of new books. Individual faculty members submit requests to his/her representative to compile and submit to the library. The library is also annually expanding access to electronic full text journals. The COE is also designated as a state textbook repository for current P-12 instructional materials. These are distributed across five classrooms in Ball Hall for use during instructional methodology classes.

What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6? The College of Education has developed greatly and does very well in the generating external grants and contracts. In 2002 the total expenditures for externally funded projects was just under \$8.0 million and reached a peak of nearly \$17.8 million in 2006. For the most recent year the grant expenditures declined to \$15.2 million. For five years the external grants have totaled more than our university budget. Over half of these research/service expenditures (\$8.6 million in 2007) were in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership, the department most integrally involved in teacher education ([2002-2007 External funding](#)). The broad range of faculty expertise in the grants arena can be learned from the list of [grants by professional education faculty](#) for January 1 – December 31, 2006.