

2003 NCATE Annual Report

(Part C of the AACTE Annual Report)

Section 1 - Institutional Information:

NCATE ID: 10432
AACTE SID: 1713
Institution: Kennesaw State University
Unit: Bagwell College of Education
Next Accreditation Visit: F04
Last Accreditation Visit: S00
Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C: 10/01/2003

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name: Dr. Yiping Wan
Unit Head Email: ywan@kennesaw.edu
Unit Head Phone: (770) 423-6117
Unit Head Fax: (770) 423-6527
Institution Unit Phone: (770) 423-6117
1st NCATE Coordinator: Dr. Beverly F. Mitchell
1st Coordinator Title: Assistant Dean
1st Coordinator Phone: (770) 423-6417
1st Coordinator Fax: (770) 423-6527
1st Coordinator Email: bmitchel@kennesaw.edu
2nd NCATE Coordinator: Dr. Vicki McLain
2nd Coordinator Title: Assistant Dean
2nd Coordinator Phone: (770) 423-6734
2nd Coordinator Fax: (770) 423-4331
2nd Coordinator Email: vmclain@kennesaw.edu
CEO: Dr. Betty L. Siegel
CEO Phone: (770) 423-6033
CEO Fax: (770) 423-6453
CEO Email: bsiegel@kennesaw.edu

Section 3 - NCATE Standards Categories & Weaknesses Section

Section A. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

Revisions to the conceptual framework from spring 2002 to November 2002 were not nearly as significant as those that occurred later that month following a rigorous study of Erskin Dottin's conceptual framework text and his interactive, guided discovery sessions with our faculty. Over the next 9 months, the framework was re-structured and re-written to better capture our beliefs and commitments. By grouping the proficiencies around their major emphases, three general categories emerged: expertise, facilitation, and professionalism. This new organizing structure helped us see ways to trim non-essential and redundant statements with the driving force being the need to simplify the framework. Immediately, assessments began to take on clear and definitive purposes, and the categories became major outcomes defined by specific candidate proficiencies. By the middle of spring semester, faculty had created and implemented three new unit assessments in large part due to clearer direction from the framework. In May of 2003, the Professional Teacher Education Unit unanimously endorsed the written document after taking more than 3 years to carefully critique and revise. The events leading up to this occasion included multiple reviews by all constituent groups, e.g. initial and advanced candidates, master teachers, and school administrators, whose candid remarks were taken into consideration as the document continued to evolve toward its final draft. KSU's teacher education conceptual framework is now posted on the web for public viewing. Plans this semester include ensuring that the framework is weaved throughout the evidence for the remaining standards and noting where future refinements are warranted.

Conceptual framework weaknesses cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard. (Refer to the NCATE 2000 Unit Transition Plan for information regarding the levels at which units should address Standards 1 and 2 during the first year of NCATE Unit Standards implementation)

Progress made during the 2002-2003 year included identification, development/revision and implementation of specific assessments: Candidate Performance Instrument - Exit (CPI for initial and advanced programs), Impact on Student Learning Analysis, Portfolio Narrative, Praxis II scores, and Candidate Performance Instrument - TOSS.

The I-drive continues to supplement our technology needs for data storage and retrieval even with the initiation of the new electronic Education Information Center (EIC). The results of data analysis on all unit assessments from fall 2002 and spring 2003 reside on this drive for easy access by all programs and service units in determining relevance and implications for improvement. Program syllabi and Praxis II data are also posted here.

Initial Programs. The CPI has been used in all program areas for student teaching since fall 2002, however, it was reinstated, effective fall 2003, in the required field experience prior to student teaching after a one year absence. The basis for its inclusion was recognition of its importance as a developmental assessment tool. An Observation Summary form used by University supervisors, cooperating teachers and candidates (self assessment of video-taped lesson) was created to supplement the CPI.

Advanced Programs. The CPI for Advanced Programs in its newest version from spring 2003 clearly shows the connections between the conceptual framework, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Program areas now require an evaluation of all 15 proficiencies by using the CPI during the last semester of the candidate's program of study.

Initial Programs. A portfolio is now required of all candidates in initial programs beginning with the early experience in EDUC 2201 Teaching and Schools in a Changing Society. Four elements are required but program areas have the flexibility of requiring

additional items. A portfolio narrative accompanies the portfolio in TOSS and Student Teaching where the candidate reflects upon each of the 11 unit proficiencies, choosing relevant entries from the portfolio as evidence of achievement. A new Impact on Student Learning Assignment was also implemented spring 2003 and requires TOSS and Student Teaching candidates to teach, assess, analyze and report results from assessments and to reflect upon the effect of their instruction and implications for future instruction. These assessments constituted three major additions to the unit's assessment system for initial programs. Work continues in the area of assessing dispositions. While the CPI is a source of information, concerns related to professionalism are also documented on a separate form that identifies the specific concern, the evaluator, and the context of the conduct. Candidates are informed any time a concern is raised and reported on this form.

Advanced Programs. Similar requirements were instituted with advanced programs. The portfolio with seven required components, the Portfolio Narrative and Impact on Student Learning Assignment became essential parts of the unit's assessment system for advanced programs. Modifications of the assessment rubrics were made for the Educational Leadership Program. Upon graduation, all advanced candidates complete surveys to rate program effectiveness including how well they perceive their preparation to be in teaching P-12 students from diverse backgrounds or to serve as school administrators in diverse communities.

All initial program areas prepared and submitted reports in September for Specialized Program Area (SPA) reviews where national standards were available. In addition, all programs are writing to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission standards in fall 2003. These reports will add further evidence to show how our programs are aligned with state and national standards as well as how candidates meet them.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

**Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).
Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard. (Refer to the NCATE 2000 Unit Transition Plan for information regarding the levels at which units should address Standards 1 and 2 during the first year of NCATE Unit Standards implementation)

In conjunction with recent revisions of the conceptual framework, the professional

community consisting of advisory board members, graduates, clinical faculty and principals as well as University professional education faculty, undergraduate and graduate candidates were instrumental in formalizing the assessment system after more than two years of analysis and development. Valuable feedback from these groups stressed that the system be connected with the framework, flexible in adapting to change and manageable as the system grows over time. From these discussions, the general structures of the assessment system for both initial and advanced programs were developed to represent all major assessments pertaining to candidate performance, monitoring and ensuring quality field and diverse experiences. NCATE's Transition Plan was helpful in guiding our decisions about the number of assessments, the basis for selection, when and how they are implemented, and the relationship to candidate transition points.

Historically, decisions about undergraduate candidate qualifications and readiness for upper level experiences have occurred four times during a candidate's course of study. At the initial Phase I Admission to Teacher Education, students apply for candidacy in the unit and a teacher education program. They are admitted upon successful attainment of criteria that represent both unit and program level requirements. These are related to completion of foundational course work, minimum GPA, minimum scores on state exams, and positive recommendations from University and school faculty. Once accepted, the candidate typically begins the in-depth study of content of the discipline for which s/he is preparing to teach. The next phase, Phase II Admission to Teaching of Specific Subjects (TOSS) or Practicum which typically follows the completion of most required content course work, requires the candidate to show that s/he is ready for extended time ranging from approximately 100-150 hours in school classrooms with opportunities to apply pedagogical content knowledge and skills under direct supervision of clinical faculty. Phase III Admission to Student Teaching is the final field experience of 750+ hours spent daily, all day, in one or more school settings (depending on the subject area) for 16 weeks under the supervision of a qualified clinical teacher and University supervisor. With successful completion of this experience, the candidate is eligible for graduation (Phase IV). The transcript is subject to an audit by the Registrar's Office to verify completion of the approved program and the Certification Officer who has the authority to recommend the candidate for teacher certification. Specific criteria govern eligibility for continuation in a program. Failing to maintain one or more requirements specified for Retention in Teacher Education prompts a program level review of the candidate and a remediation plan. A complete review of all admission requirements and processes for relevance and importance is currently underway.

For two years, the Candidate Performance Instrument (CPI) has been used in all initial programs to evaluate candidates' proficiencies during student teaching. University supervisors, cooperating teachers and candidates complete it at mid-term and end of semester. However, several revisions to the instrument occurred in spring 2003 as a result of continuing reviews of the conceptual framework and areas for improvement. One such revision was inclusion of the Observation Summary Form to substantiate the judgments of evaluators when completing the CPI. In addition, candidates are now required to complete an assignment involving the analysis of student assessment results following

the teaching of a series of lessons or a unit. The assignment and rubric emphasize the importance of reflection that helps candidates take into account the immediate effects of their instruction on student learning and the implications for future instruction. As candidates near the end of their student teaching experience, they finalize the evidence in their portfolios to reflect their progress as emerging, beginning teachers who have subject matter expertise, facilitate student learning, and collaborate as professionals. The last piece of evidence developed this spring was the required portfolio narrative where candidates show how the evidence they select and write about demonstrates how they attain each of the 11 proficiencies. The narrative, like the student learning assignment and CPI, is read and scored with a rubric by the University supervisor, cooperating teacher and candidate. After much discussion with program coordinators in spring 2003, all overwhelmingly agreed to require these four newly developed or revised assessments at the TOSS/Practicum level in addition to student teaching. All assessments including descriptions, the implementation schedule, and required elements were then compiled into a user-friendly data reference guide for faculty and University supervisors. The plan this year is to formally link the unit assessments to each admission/exit phase to demonstrate connection with the conceptual framework.

Advanced programs have two decision points, initial admission to graduate study and completion of the program (or graduation). For initial admission, the student must meet specific University and program specific criteria for candidacy; for graduation, all course work must be completed with a minimum GPA of 3.0. Like initial programs, all graduate programs use instruments similar to the CPI, student learning assignment, and portfolio narrative. Currently under review are all the admission/exit requirements and ways to strengthen the correlation with these performance instruments.

With the formal launching of the Education Information Center (EIC) this past August, we now have the electronic capability to track candidate admissions at all phases, monitor progress, determine eligibility, compile and report results from multiple assessments and decision points on a continual basis. The technology allows for real time and static data compilation and combinations of multiple variables for comparisons at the unit and program levels. The system, while too new to operate flawlessly, receives continual management oversight so that problems are dealt with as they occur.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).

Section C. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and

demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. **Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:**

Additional sources of essential evidence to meet and surpass "Acceptable" range for Standard 3 are now identified and include multiple data sources that are consistent across program areas for TOSS, Student Teaching, and the graduate programs. Gaps or deficiencies for each element have been determined, plans for correcting the deficiencies have been identified, and processes have been implemented to ensure data collection, data analysis, and data summary to effect change based on data results. New data sources and instruments, along with processes for collecting, compiling, and reporting this data, were created, communicated, and implemented. Following is a brief description of the significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 this past year.

Through collaborative discussion of common elements in the NCATE/PSC Standards, Standard Action Teams 1,2,3,4 determined 1. a need for multiple, consistent data across program areas, 2. a need for instruments that address student impact, reflection, and diversity, and 3. a need to ensure that assessments are aligned with the Conceptual Framework. These discussions led to the development of the Portfolio Narrative Rubric and the Impact on Student Learning Analysis, which were developed and approved for implementation in spring 2003.

In addition to the new evidence listed above, core components for undergraduate and graduate portfolios were approved as well as the requirement that the CPI be completed at the end of the TOSS experience. In addition, a Three-Tiered Partnership Plan was developed and approved, along with a grid of the partnership levels.

An EDUC 2201 Teaching and Schools in a Changing Society Field Experience Partnership Agreement, specifically aligned with NCATE/PSC and Georgia Board of Regents standards, was developed for jointly determined placements. Signatures were obtained from each partner EDUC 2201 school. As of Fall 2002, all EDUC 2201 field placements are in diverse schools.

The following steps were taken to ensure feedback on the conceptual framework and its communication to school and community partners: 1. a printed bookmark illustrating the conceptual framework theme statement and outcomes was designed, printed, and distributed, 2. an invitation to provide feedback on the Conceptual Framework was posted on the Center for Field Experiences and Partnerships' website, along with an electronic copy of the CF Bookmark, and 3. schools, community, and candidates provided feedback in response to specific presentations about the conceptual framework.

Concise statements for inclusion in syllabi beginning spring 2003 were drafted and approved by professional education faculty in initial and graduate programs. The statements adopted were: 1. an undergraduate (only courses with field components) and graduate (all courses) statements that promote our candidates' involvement in school-based activities, 2. a diversity statement, and 3. a conceptual framework summary statement. These statements were included in all spring 03 syllabi.

An evidence filing system aligned with the essential expectations and essential evidence related to this standard was developed. A checklist to verify end of semester data, along with directions for compiling the data and directions for posting to separate directories on the electronic I:drive was created for TOSS, Student Teaching, and graduate program data. Student teaching placements are compiled relative to the diversity characteristics of the schools so that the unit can monitor the distribution of placements and make adjustments for specific candidate needs when necessary.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

**Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).
*Standard 4. Diversity***

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

Each of the steps taken by the diversity standard team has undergone a process of discussion and approval beginning with the Steering Committee, moving to the Program Coordinators, and ending with the Professional Teacher Education Unit. The Diversity Committee, working closely with each of the standards' teams, assures that the element of diversity does not stand in isolation but is woven throughout our teacher education programs. A strong reliance on colleagues in technology has allowed the emerging tools to be fully developed and presented on the Bagwell College of Education Website.

Tools developed: Diversity Survey for KSU Candidates and Graduates - An electronic way to gather information from KSU candidates regarding their experiences with diversity in course work and field experiences; Diversity Check for Field Experiences - Candidates access the web tool and print out the demographic information for the school, county, and state in which they are completing a field experience, including TOSS and student teaching, to see if it meets the minimum level of diversity set at 25% by the Center for Field Experiences and Partnerships; Diversity Key Ideas - An electronic network of the instructional strategies, materials, and "Big Ideas" faculty are using to address multicultural education; Impact on Student Learning Rubric developed with standard teams 1, 2 & 3 as a developmental tool used by candidates to self-evaluate and discuss progress with University and school personnel in the design, implementation, and evaluation of lessons, as well as the impact on the learning of every student; Electronic Diversity Bibliography - References tied to the Elements of Pritchey Smith's work on diversity submitted by faculty and compiled by team 4.

Through the Impact on Student Learning Assignment as well as the Portfolio Narrative which are completed in TOSS, student teaching, and in graduate programs, candidates demonstrate they treat students equitably and provide access to the full curriculum by respecting individual differences and adjusting their teaching or administrative practices accordingly. This refers to diversity "IN" the curriculum, which relates to content. Accordingly, candidates demonstrate diversity "OF" the curriculum, which relates to how material is presented and how students complete assignments, by using multiple methods, technologies, and organizational arrangements to meet goals articulated for every student, including planning for the needs of students with exceptionalities.

One of the goals of the committee is to ensure opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse faculty. Likewise, the faculty is expected to model best practices in adjusting their own instruction and to be knowledgeable about preparing candidates to work effectively with diverse students. The committee recently developed two tools to monitor progress toward achieving this goal: 1. a Diversity Survey that asks candidates to provide input regarding their experiences with diversity in their University course work and field experiences, and 2. Diversity Key Ideas in which faculty describe specific strategies being employed in courses in which candidates participate. Additional support comes from Minority Recruitment and Retention Plans developed by Kennesaw State University and by the Professional Teacher Education Unit's efforts to strengthen the diversity of faculty, as well as the diversity of the staff and students at Kennesaw State University. The Professional Teacher Education Unit's recruitment plan seeks to attract diverse, high-quality students into teacher education with an emphasis on teaching fields with shortages. The two-phased plan was created this year in response to the Georgia Board of Regents' Principle II A 2 to target interest from students in local school systems, freshmen and sophomore students from the University and two-year institutions in the region of NW Georgia.

To help candidates become more effective in teaching students from different ethnic, family, racial, gender, language, socioeconomic, and religious groups, the goal of the unit is to provide candidates with multiple opportunities to work in school settings with diverse populations, thus stimulating reflection on their belief systems. The Diversity Survey, Portfolio Narrative, and Impact on Student Learning Assignment are used to gather this information. As early as their sophomore year, undergraduate candidates engage in multicultural field experiences that strengthen their effectiveness as educators working with diverse learners. By means of the Diversity Survey and the Diversity Check for Field Experiences, candidates are able to monitor their placements to determine breadth in diverse settings. Because advanced candidates typically have their own classrooms, other arrangements are made in instances where the composition of their own classroom does not measure up to the 25% minimum diversity level as defined by the unit. In these situations, candidates participate in a multicultural field experience to augment their class work.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

**Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).
Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.**

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

Progress has been made during the 2002-2003 academic year with an identification of data sources to demonstrate compliance with this standard. While the University employs highly qualified full time faculty, the unit must also verify the qualifications of individuals hired for supervision only, part-time instruction and individuals who serve as clinical faculty in school settings. The University has experienced significant enrollment gains this past year with advanced programs alone showing increases of more than 42%. Among the challenges the unit faces are 1. keeping pace with the increased need for additional faculty and, 2. filling vacant positions with qualified individuals. Two interim chair positions and a Gozuieta Endowed Chair position were approved this past academic year for a total of eleven new positions in the Bagwell College of Education. The Professional Teacher Unit, comprised of all faculty across all programs within and beyond the Bagwell College of Education, attempts to keep the size of professional teacher education faculty size in line with the rate of growth in the numbers of its candidates.

According to the compilation of information from faculty vita submitted electronically in the spring, most faculty hold terminal degrees and have extensive experience in P-12 schools. There is a large number of adjunct faculty - master teachers and site coordinators in partnership schools - who hold graduate degrees and preparation in the disciplines they teach, supervise or coordinate. P-12 Clinical faculty are also qualified teachers who supervise our student teachers and volunteer their classrooms for observations and related field experiences. Currently, a new teacher demographic form completed by all student teaching collaborating teachers and compiled by the Center for Field Experiences and Partnerships generates valuable information about teachers' qualifications related to educational and professional experiences. Similar data are already collected on a group of supervising master teachers.

Once the technology has been refined, the unit will be able to electronically compile and summarize on a regular and systematic basis the activities and accomplishments that faculty report in their vita. The first round of data collection occurred in the spring; faculty are required to complete annual updates of these records at the time of annual

reviews in late February. The objective of the project continues to be ease and accuracy in reporting and compiling faculty vita and annual review information in order to make the strong case that our faculty model best professional practices in teaching, scholarship, and service. The results summarized thus far show that the faculty meets the expectations of their ranks and positions through an impressive range of evidence derived from accomplishments in the classroom, professional organizations, and the discipline. A recently implemented practice is the evaluation of University and college level administrators by peers, staff and faculty. It took the first experience to identify problems but a design team in each college/university unit reviews the feedback for improvements to the process as well as the survey instrument.

Collaboration and opportunities for development are hallmarks of the professional climate at this University. Since the inception of teacher education programs and the Professional Teacher Education Unit, these efforts have been sustained through partnerships and induction programs with P-12 schools, collaborative grants, on-campus workshops, symposia, learning centers, and conferences. For example, the Center for Field Experiences and Partnerships has created induction programs around topics specifically requested by school systems in order to add a customized dimension to their efforts to meet constituent needs; Project Winning Teams, funded for three years by three state agencies and sponsored by the Department of Special Education, promotes professional and collaborative development for teachers who utilize the inclusion model in their school classrooms; and numerous Students First: Engaging All Learners conferences sponsored by the Center for Field Experiences and Partnerships provides induction support in separate one-day conferences for staff and teachers in high school, middle school and elementary school.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

**Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).
Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.**

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year:

Progress has been made during the 2002-2003 academic year with the identification of appropriate data sources to demonstrate compliance with this standard. Leadership and authority can be documented in the Faculty Handbook and in the Governance Documents of the Unit. Inventories of available facilities within the Bagwell College of Education and within the discipline departments that participate in the Unit are being compiled electronically. Budgets of the Bagwell College of Education and rosters of available

faculty and support personnel within the Bagwell College of Education are available in electronic format. A questionnaire has been developed that will capture the proportion of budget, faculty assignment (as well as that of other personnel) and other resources, including technology within participating discipline departments in other colleges and schools in the University that are allocated to teacher preparation programs. This questionnaire is being distributed to the appropriate deans and department chairs and will capture the appropriate data for each fiscal year beginning with FY 03. This data will be compiled in electronic format and will be available to all appropriate constituents.

The office of Academic Affairs has added an experienced budget officer to its roster of personnel. Among the duties of this individual will be responsibility for ensuring the accuracy of the data regarding budget allocations to all academic departments participating in the Unit. This person reports to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who is responsible for gathering and maintaining information pertaining to other aspects of standard 6. Plans for the coming year include design of the appropriate electronic format for presenting the data collected and continued refinement of the both the data needed and the collection methodology.

Areas of Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these areas of improvement (Optional).

Section 4 - Program Completers

The total number of candidates who completed education programs (initial & advanced) during the 2002-2003 academic year? 461

Enter the Name of the Person Filling Out the Report: Beverly F. Mitchell