



The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Continuing Visit

Continuous Improvement Pathway

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

P.O.Box 2119

Huntsville, TX 77341-2119

November 1-3, 2015

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report for a Continuing Visit (Continuous Improvement Pathway)

Updated May 2013

OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).

When asked what office—U.S. representative from Tennessee, governor of Tennessee, general of the Texas Army, president of the Republic of Texas, governor of Texas, or U. S. senator from the state of Texas—had given him the most pride, Sam Houston replied, "When a young man in Tennessee I kept a country school. . . . I experienced a higher feeling of dignity and self-satisfaction (from that) than from any office or honor which I have since held."

Today, General Houston's legacy lives on through the College of Education at his namesake institution, Sam Houston State University (<http://www.shsu.edu>). Located in the Piney Woods of East Texas, Huntsville, is a small city of 38,548 residents, the home and burial place of General Sam Houston, "Texas' Greatest Hero." Although only 70 miles north of downtown Houston, Huntsville is surrounded by forests, lakes, and ranch land. Created by the Texas legislature in 1879 as Sam Houston Normal Institute, its purpose was to train teachers for the public schools of Texas. In 1918, the curriculum was expanded to four years and the baccalaureate degree was first awarded in 1919. As programs and enrollment increased, several name changes ensued, with the final change to Sam Houston State University (SHSU) occurring in 1969. The college was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1925 as an institution of higher learning and in 1954 the educator preparation programs were among the first accredited by NCATE. In the decades of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, the university continued to expand its offerings to keep pace with its dynamic environment by adding degree programs at all levels. These additions were accompanied by significant improvements in faculty credentials and growth in faculty research activities. In recent years, SHSU has been the fastest growing University in the state with 59% growth from 2000 until 2014. SHSU averages 3.5% annual enrollment growth each year over the past 14 years. The statewide annual rate of growth averaged 2.4% each year across the same time period. In this same period of tremendous growth, SHSU's graduation rate increased from 44% to 60% and currently matches the statewide average graduation rate. The institution has seen a 72% increase in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded across the past 14 years and was ranked 7th in the nation for African American students' graduation rates by the Education Trust Study. A recording of President Dana Hoyt's 2014 State of the University Address outlining many of these and other aspects of SHSU is available online at <http://tinyurl.com/nly8kyc>.

SHSU is a regional, public, doctoral-intensive institution located 70 miles north of Houston, Texas. The institution serves students from rural, suburban and urban areas, offering 85 undergraduate degree programs, 56 masters' programs, and 8 doctoral programs, five housed in the College of Education.

SHSU is a member of the Texas State University System. The University recently reorganized to include a total of seven colleges: Sciences (COS), Business Administration (COBA), Criminal Justice (CCJ), Education (COE), Fine Arts and Mass Communication (CFAMC), Health Sciences (CHS), and Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS). SHSU also opened the SHSU Woodlands Center in May 2012 to support continued enrollment growth and diversification of degree programs. In fall 2014, the College enrolled 2,625 students (1,592 undergraduates and 1,033 graduate students). The College accounted for 13% of the institution's enrollment in fall 2014 and had the largest enrollment of online students (nonline = 676). The attached Overview of Student Body provides a detailed description of the demographics of the university's and unit's student bodies.

4000 character limit

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

The Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) is housed in the College of Education (COE) and partners with academic departments offering majors in a teaching content field. The EPP's mission is "Through excellent collaborative instruction, research, and field experiences, the EPP provides candidates with opportunities to develop dispositions, skills, and knowledge that enable them to create an environment in which they plan, implement, assess, and modify learning processes, while serving effectively in diverse educational roles, reflecting meaningfully on their growth, and responding proactively to societal needs." The EPP guides the administration of 38 different certification areas, 25 of which are housed outside of the College of Education. The unit has 10 advanced certifications and 28 initial certifications. Fall 2014 enrollments of NCATE –covered certification programs are offered in 2013-2014 NCATE Program Headcount. An overview of the institution and unit's missions, vision statements, and goals can be found in Institutional Mission, Vision, and Goals.

In 2013, SHSU reorganized to include a new College of Health Sciences and the Department of Health and Kinesiology was relocated to the CHS. The unit also developed an Executive Council, the primary leadership team of the unit. This Council consists of the Dean, Associate/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, and Assistants to the Dean. The EPP reports to the Associate Dean of Teacher Education. The unit also houses the Center for Assessment and Accreditation, with the mission of supporting faculty and students in pursuit of high quality academic standards and in meeting the unit's responsibility to Texans. The Center has guided faculty-led accreditation efforts for over twenty-five SPA reports since 2010. The Center is led by a faculty member who also serves as the Assistant Dean of Assessment, a Director of Accreditation and Accountability Services, Assessment Coordinator, and administrative support staff.

2000 character limit

I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.

Undergraduate candidates for certification in Grades EC-6 and 4-8 receive a degree in Interdisciplinary Studies conferred by the COE. Secondary education candidates received degrees conferred by the COS, CFAMC, and CHSS. Over twenty initial certifications are offered by units outside of the College of Education. For a candidate to receive certification in the EC-6 program, the state requires two licensure exams-the TExES Generalist EC-6 and the TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-6. TExES Content exams for secondary candidates are also provided. Overall, 93% of all candidates are passing content exams and licensure exams.

Post-baccalaureate candidates for teaching participate in either a certification-only program or a Master's degree program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Graduate degrees and certifications for other professional personnel are offered in Administration, Instructional Technology, School Counseling, School Librarian, Educational Diagnostician, and Reading Specialist. Master's degrees in Special Education, Reading, Curriculum and Instruction, and Instructional Leadership are also conferred by the unit. A master's degree in School Psychology is offered by the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. A nationally-recognized program in Physical Education is offered through CHS. Several of the advanced programs [M.Ed. in Instructional Technology, M.Ed. in Administration, M.Ed./M.A. in Instructional Leadership, M.S. in Library Science, and M. Ed. in Reading] are offered exclusively on-line or as hybrid. The College accounted for 13% of the institution's enrollment in fall 2014 and had the largest enrollment of online students (nonline = 676). Fall 2014 enrollments of NCATE –covered certification programs are offered in 2013-2014 NCATE Program Headcount.

2000 character limit

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

Stakeholders associated with the Educator Preparation Programs believe that learning is a science and a developmental process that through reflective experience can become an art. To fulfill societal needs for quality educators, EPP faculty work collaboratively with faculty in the CFAMC, COS, and CHSS, school district personnel, the general public, and candidates.

This philosophy permeates the unit's structures, committees, curricula, coursework, student/faculty interactions, and assessment efforts. The unit's Conceptual Framework (CF) identifies concepts critical to curricula and is mapped to courses, assignments, and, assessments. The Unit Assessment System Matrix documents the central role of the CF in assessment.

The Conceptual Framework Elements include:

Knowledge Base (CF1)

Technological Learning Environment (CF2)

Communication (CF3)

Assessment (CF4)

Effective Field Experience with Diverse Learners (CF5)

Definitions of these Elements are offered on pages 6-8 of the attached Conceptual Framework. The Conceptual Framework is based on theoretical models, research, and sound educational practice identified by faculty, candidates, and public school stakeholders. Routinely evaluated through unit and program level assessments, the Conceptual Framework provides both a foundation and a central theme for our programs. The common syllabi format, adopted by the faculty, integrates the alignment of candidate proficiencies, national and state professional standards, and the five elements of the SHSU Conceptual Framework to insure the preparation of outstanding graduates in the fields of elementary and secondary education, counseling, school psychology, and educational leadership to have a positive effect on learners.

Beginning in 2012, the CF was included on all EPP course's syllabi (See Syllabi Template). While no major changes were noted to the CF in the past accreditation cycle, changes that were driven by the CF were noted in courses and the Syllabi Template.

Overview of the Self-Study

Faculty from across the unit have partnered to refine programs and processes based upon the previous accreditation visit and SPA reports. Accreditation efforts have been an ongoing reflective process and many evidence-based changes have been realized in the three years. This self-study report is the

culminating representation of faculty authors' and colleagues' reflections on the unit's assessment efforts. Faculty drafted reports that reflects the unit's efforts in each standard. This self-study was compiled and refined by Center leaders before being reviewed once more by the wider constituency of the unit through a public comment period. Feedback was collected at every step in this process.

To support the review team's efforts and in the unit's spirit of transparency, all exhibits, attachments, and the Self-Study Report are posted on the unit's website at <http://tinyurl.com/SHSU-NCATE>.

This self-study is an initial representation of the unit's efforts since 2011. Faculty and staff are anxious to engage the site visit team in the off-site and site visits to gain additional perspectives on its successes and areas for potential improvements.

6000 character limit

I.5 Exhibits

I.5.a	Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

References
Exhibit I.5.a Catalog Entries
Exhibit I.5.b Overview
Exhibit I.5.b Appendix B
Exhibit I.5.b Appendix C
Exhibit I.5.b Appendix D
Exhibit I.5.b Appendix E
Exhibit I.5.c Conceptual Framework
Exhibit I.5.d SPA Reports and Findings
Overview of Student Body
2013-2014 NCATE Program Headcount
Institutional Mission, Vision, and Goals
Unit Assessment System Matrix
Syllabi Template

See **Attachment** panel below.

II. Unit Standards and Movement Toward Target

Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 4: Diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 6: Governance and Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

Initial and advanced programs in the unit have a strong commitment to developing candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to educate Texas' students, lead educational organizations, engage families and partners in educational processes, and support diverse student growth and development. The unit has developed and implemented a Unit Assessment System targeting specific transitions in the candidates' development. This System provides aggregate, unit-level data on dispositions, yet is flexible enough to allow for specialization at the initial and advanced levels.

The unit requires three unit-wide assessments of all candidates in its Educator Preparation Programs: (a) Passing of specific, curriculum-aligned exams, most often a certification exam (b) Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies (DDP), and (c) Graduate/Employer Surveys. Certification exams for initial programs include Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) content exams and the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Exam. Candidates for initial certifications must also submit a demonstration of their teaching skills, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). In addition to the aforementioned unit-wide assessments, advanced program faculty also assess candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions through highly specialized, program-specific assessments. (See Exhibit 2.4.a, Data Management Schedule, Unit Assessment System Matrix, and Key Assessments Inventory).

TExES Exam Performance and Pass Rates in Initial and Advanced Programs

SHSU teacher candidates have an in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach which is aligned to professional, state, and institutional standards. They demonstrate their knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis of content. To earn teacher certification in Texas, the teacher candidates must pass two or more state exams. One exam (TExES Content Exam) is an exam in the content in the area of certification and the second is the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam. The Texas Education Agency's (TEA) data from the 2014 academic year indicate an overall 93% pass rate for undergraduate and advanced program completers on TExES content exams [See State exam (TExES and PPR) Pass Rates for the Past Three Years]. The unit analyzes these data in more detail (i.e. program, minority sub-populations) to recognize trends and areas of concern. Thirteen program areas report a 100% pass rate. These programs include the following: Health EC-12; Life Science 7-12; Math 7-12; Music EC-12; Art EC-12; Reading Specialist EC-12; Technology Application;

Speech; School Counselor; Superintendent EC-12; Agriculture Science and Technology 6-12; Business 6-12; Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility (PPR) 4-8 and 8-12. This strong level of performance—among the best in the state—indicates candidates are graduating with the content knowledge and skills the TEA views as critical to education in the coming decades.

During academic year 2014, the overall PPR pass rate for initial certification candidates is 97% of all program completers. Mathematics 4-8 and Mathematics/Science 4-8 candidates obtained a 96% overall pass rate for the past 3 years and 94% of English Language Arts and Reading 4-8 candidates passed the PPR in the same time period. Overall, the Early Childhood- 6th Grade pass rate on the PPR was 90% while Special Education EC-12 was 96%. Passing the PPR indicates the candidate possess skills in four standards: (a) Designing instruction and assessment to promote student learning, (b) Creating a positive, productive classroom environment, (c) Implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment, and (d) Fulfilling professional roles and responsibilities. These four standards are associated with 13 competencies articulated by the TEA for certification.

The TEA has established the desired criteria of 80% of candidates passing TExES exams in their first attempt, as long as the test recorded at least 10 SHSU test takers within the past year. Additionally, the TEA and SHSU faculty adhere to this same desired level of performance for all sub-groups of gender and racial categories. Overall, 93% of all TExES exam takers have passed their respective exams in the three year period preceding this report and every program in the unit has a pass rate higher than the average statewide pass rate. Moreover, candidate performance in gender and racial sub-categories also surpasses this criteria level. See State exam (TExES and PPR) Pass Rates for the Past Three Years. Candidate performance on TExES exams has been and remains strong and is a point worth celebrating throughout the unit.

Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies in Initial and Advanced Programs

Initial and advanced programs focus on the development of candidates' dispositions and their potential to work with diverse students, families, colleagues, and leaders across the state. The primary means of assessing these areas is through the unit-wide Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies (DDP) assessment process (See Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix). The DDP process relies on coursework timed at specific transition points in respective curricula. The Unit Assessment System Matrix outlines which courses contain assignments meant to serve as a direct assessment of candidates' dispositions and diversity-related abilities. At multiple points in their curriculum, candidates are asked to upload assignments into the unit's assessment management software system, Tk20. Faculty then assess each assignment using rubrics developed by SHSU faculty to assess candidate performance. Possible ratings include (a) 0=Rarely [demonstrated competence], (b) 1=Exhibits Progress [toward competence], and (c) 2=Consistently [demonstrated competence]. Candidates are provided feedback via Tk20 and data are aggregated for initial and advanced programs.

Data are reviewed each semester by the Assessment Committee, program faculty, Department Chairs, and Executive Council. Faculty also participate in annual Data Day events to interpret data and formulate recommendations. A key component of the DDPs is their reliance on artifacts of candidate performance in courses sequenced at meaningful transition points throughout the initial and advanced curricula. This transition point approach to assessment allows the programs increased diagnostic capacity by contextualizing data with candidates' anticipated development at progressing levels of performance.

Initial and Advanced Programs' Use of Graduate/ Employer Survey Data.

In keeping with the unit's commitment to transition point assessment, SHSU programs have valued their use of educational leaders' reflections on the skills of SHSU alumni. Beginning in 2009, the unit began administering a Graduate/Employer survey, wherein graduates of any initial or advanced program who were employed in a Texas school in any capacity were surveyed asking them to reflect upon SHSU's contributions to their skills and abilities. The alumni candidates' employment supervisor was also asked

to respond to a parallel survey reflecting upon the candidates' performance in the 1 to 3 years following the candidates' graduation.

In 2012, the TEA began administering an exit survey of all graduates of initial program using the same methodology described above. However, data from the TEA-administered survey had only been received the week prior to report submission. Data from the 2010 and 2011 administrations of the survey are available and have figured prominently in unit-, program-, and course-level decisions. In 2010 and 2011, alumni indicated that educating diverse students was a challenge for them and that they were not well prepared in this regard. Interestingly, principals' ratings of initial candidate alumni did not support this perspective on the candidates' abilities. Faculty on the Assessment Committee still recommended an increased focus on diversity-related topics in courses. During the fall 2014 Data Day, initial programs also benefited from the use of Graduate/Employer data in developing an alumni event known as Bring 'em Back Kats. This event is designed to support recent graduates' skills and confidence in dealing with a number of instruction-related skills. Graduate/Employer data were useful in identifying areas in which unit alumni believed they were not as well prepared as they would like such as communication, assessment, and working with parents.

Assessment of Initial Candidates through the Teacher Work Sample

One of the requirements of initial certification programs is the successful completion of a capstone demonstration, Teacher Work Sample (TWS). The TWS is completed in the first six weeks of the student teaching placement or in the second semester of the post-baccalaureate program internship. Candidates must provide a comprehensive set of artifacts and reflections. The TWS consists of seven domains in which candidates must demonstrate competence: (a) Contextual Factors, (b) Learning Objectives/Goals, (c) Assessment Plan, (d) Design for instruction, (e) Instructional Decision Making, (f) Analysis of Student Learning, and (g) Reflection and Self-Evaluation. See the Spring 2015 Guidelines for Student Teaching for details on the domains assessed in the TWS.

Completed TWS submissions are scored by faculty and reviewers hired and trained by the unit.

Reviewers, most of whom are former or current K-12 teachers, professors, or leaders, read each TWS entry and provide one of three evaluative ratings: (a) 1=Unmet, (b) 2=Partially Met, and (c) 3=Met. To enhance the reliability of the TWS review process, each submission is reviewed by two reviewers.

Validity of unit assessments is regularly examined by the Assessment Committee. For example, in AY 2013-14, the first two reviewers for each TWS submission agreed on the ratings of candidate submissions 59.3 percent of the time.

10000 character limit

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

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

15000 character limit

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

Evidence-Based Improvements Made Using TExES Exam Data

Some programs report TExES exam pass rates lower than the desired level. Many of these programs have less than 10 test takers, the minimum number of test takers necessary for the TEA to consider TExES exam performance. In 2014, 70% of History 8-12 candidates passed their TExES exam and in 2012 and 2013 69.2% and 73.3% (respectively) of History 8-12 candidates passed their TExES exam. In the fall 2014 semester, the Associate Dean of Teacher Education initiated conversations with faculty in the History program to support remediation and test taker support efforts.

In 2013 and 2014, 75% of Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT) takers passed the exam in their first attempt. In 2013 two-thirds of Languages Other than English (LOTE) Spanish exam takers passed their exam. The SHSU faculty have remained focused on this area of concern and, through Data Day events, made proposals to augment instruction in Literacy Methods classes. However, faculty also note, as documented in Statewide and SHSU TExES Pass Rate Comparison, 2011-2012, that SHSU's pass rate on both the BTLPT and LOTE exams were well above the respective statewide average exam scores of 57.6% and 46.3%. Faculty continue to develop new and innovative approaches such as new course content, professional development seminars for candidates, and ten online modules for candidates in the Spanish program's content methods classes.

Improvements Made Using DDP Data

Candidates in initial programs work with students, families, colleagues, and communities in ways that reflect the dispositions expected of professional educators. DDPs are assessed at three points during an initial certificate candidates' experience: (a) Transition Point 1: Expected Novice Level Assessment collected via candidate observations in CIED 5397, CIEE 3374, CISE 3374, and CISE 3383 (early in the teacher candidate curriculum), (b) Transition point 2: Expected Emerging Level collected via candidates' early instructional experiences guided by K-12 mentor teachers and professors in CIED 5398, CIEE 4334, CIEE 4335, CISE 4363, CISE 4364, and READ 3370 (Mid-point assessment), and (c) Transition Point 3: Expected Advanced Level collected during Student Teaching. A summary of these data are available in the Key Assessments Inventory.

Advanced program data for the DDPs are aggregated across each and all advanced programs. Advanced candidates are asked to upload course assignments related to DDP statements and faculty assess candidates' skills using rubrics. During academic year 2013-14, a total of 740 advanced candidates' dispositions were assessed by faculty, who provided quantitative rankings: 0 = Rarely (unsatisfactory), 1 = Sometimes (exhibits progress) and 2 = Consistently (proficient). Aggregating DDP data for all advanced programs in academic year 2013-14 allows the unit to calculate the frequency and percent of passing DDPs for all programs. Nine out of 10 the DDPs had candidates receiving passing scores over 90% of the time with the exception of DDP2, 'using technology to create an authentic learning environment...'

Several advanced programs have made changes to their courses, curricula, and program operations based upon evidence from the DDPs. In 2012, for example, Library Science faculty used DDP data to

examine the extent to which candidates were able to develop strategies for effectiveness in his/her professional role. In all, 9.97% of candidates in their program were providing nominal or unacceptable evidence of their abilities in this regard. As such, the faculty implemented new professional development strategies for library science candidates in 2012. Additionally, the faculty began collecting evidence through the DDPs of the kinds of diversity candidates were exposed to while in field experiences. In 2012, 98% of library science candidates indicated they had been exposed to students of different ethnic backgrounds, 93% had experiences with students with exceptionality, and 96% of candidates had experiences with students from lower socio-economic and linguistic diversity backgrounds. As a result, Library Science faculty are pleased with candidate performance and exposure to diverse learning in field experiences.

Faculty in the superintendent certification program have also learned many interesting perspectives about candidates' skills and dispositions. In 2009, the superintendent program was experiencing sub-standard pass rates on TExES certification exams with a 67% passing rate. Faculty began aligning course content to TExES standards. In 2010, 83% of candidates were exhibiting sufficient documentation in regards to respecting diverse perspectives and designing programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. Although this level of performance was acceptable, faculty desired improved performance in this regard. A concerted effort to align course content and offer candidates additional support in specific diversity-related areas was undertaken in 2010 and 2011. Additionally, in EDAD 6362: Campus Leadership/Internship, superintendent candidates are asked to review school demographic data when they apply to work with a district to ensure that the demographics of the school population will expose candidates to a unique school setting. School demographics are also reviewed by the program coordinator and if a new school placement is needed, candidates are advised to take on a placement that support learning in diverse environments. Since 2011, one candidate each year has been advised to find a new, more diverse field placement. During the internship experience, candidates complete a reflection paper for the DDP assessment process and faculty assess the reflections using the rubric. Presently, over 95% of superintendent candidates provide evidence of being respectful and inclusive of diverse perspectives and in designing programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. As an added benefit, the superintendent program also saw improved performance on TExES exams and has enjoyed a 100% pass rate since 2011.

Use of Graduate/Employer Survey Data

In 2010 and 2011, alumni indicated educating diverse students was a challenge for which they were not well prepared. Interestingly, principals' ratings of initial candidate alumni did not support this perspective of the candidates' abilities. Faculty on the Assessment Committee still recommended an increased focus on diversity-related topics in courses. In 2010 and 2011, candidates also indicated a significant percentage (over 80% in both years) of students in their classes were English Language Learners. These data, triangulated with TWS data, were the impetus behind the development of 10 new resource modules in Content Methods classes to support candidates' abilities to world languages pedagogy. During fall 2014 Data Day, faculty used Graduate/Employer Survey data in developing an alumni professional development event to be called Bring 'em Back Kats an event to support recent graduates' skills, abilities, and confidence in dealing with instruction-related skills. Graduate/Employer data were useful in identifying areas such as communication, assessment, and working with parents in which unit alumni believed they were not as well prepared as they would like.

The unit has maintained its commitment to assessing alumni and employer's abilities in advanced programs. Despite TEA's decision to administer the Graduate/Employer survey for initial programs, the unit has continuously administered the survey to advanced program alumni employed in Texas' schools and their supervisors. Given the unique, specialized nature of the unit's advanced programs, the Graduate/Employer surveys are developed and shared with each program annually. As requested, data are aggregated across years to provide program faculty with larger data sets for use in programmatic decision making. Aggregate data have been useful in identifying candidates' strengths and areas in need

of improvement.

Teacher Work Sample in Initial and Post-Baccalaureate Programs

Throughout the TWS process, teacher candidates assess, devise goals, implement instruction, reflect on the instruction, analyze student performance, plan for additional learning, assess and reflect on the entire process, and analyze how they have impacted student learning. In this final reflection, teacher candidates self-evaluate and plan for further professional development. Each initial teacher candidate must receive an acceptable or target level score to receive credit for student teaching or internship. Data provide evidence that initial candidates are performing well in all domains of the TWS. However, candidates' abilities to apply theories of language acquisition and to use technology to further student learning have been areas wherein a significant portion of candidates perform at the "unmet" level. TWS Data have been critical in refining initial candidates' curriculum, course content, and program services.

Findings from the TWS process are detailed in TWS Three Year Trend Data and TWS Data Report. However, to summarize, initial candidates most frequently demonstrated unsatisfactory performance on aspects of technology implementation and English language learner theory. As documented in Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes, the TWS has been critical to course refinements. When lower-than-desired performance is noted in a specific domain of the TWS, the TWS Committee and faculty in Curriculum and Instruction and Languages, Literacy, and Special Populations offer recommendations for improved course content. Additional program services have also been offered. For example, faculty in LLSP and Spanish collaborated to develop 10 online modules to provide pre-service Spanish teachers with specific instruction in world languages pedagogy in content methods courses. The TWS has led to significant changes in curricula, courses, and programs.

10000 character limit

1.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

The last Accreditation Action Report lists three AFIs under Standard 1, all related to advanced programs. Each of AFI is followed by the description of the activities, processes, and outcomes that the unit has enacted in response to the concerns.

AFI 1: The unit lacks sufficient evidence that advanced candidates possess expected dispositions. Using the assessment structure within the unit, the Diversity and Dispositions Proficiencies (DDPs) instrument, consisting of 10 standards, was designed to allow candidate performance to be assessed at two points during their advanced programs. This effort was led in direct response to this AFI and faculty calls for unit-wide assessments of candidate learning and skills. Candidate performance on each DDP is rated on a three point scale: 0 (Rarely – Unsatisfactory), 1 (Sometimes – Exhibits Progress), 2 (Consistently – Proficient). The complete set of standards and related scoring rubric are included for review in Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix and <http://tinyurl.com/ddp-rubric>. Advanced program data for the DDPs are aggregated across each and all advanced units. Advanced candidates are asked to upload course assignments related to DDP statements and faculty assess candidates' skills using rubrics. During academic year 2013-14, a total of 740 advanced candidates' dispositions were assessed by faculty. Aggregating DDP data for all advanced programs in academic year 2013-14 allows the unit to calculate the frequency and percent of passing DDPs for all programs. Nine out of 10 of the DDPs had candidates receiving passing scores over 90% of the time with the exception of DDP2, 'using technology to create an authentic learning environment...'

The data from all advanced programs for AY 2013-2014 reveals that performance by candidates on the 10 statements ranges from 73% proficient (Standard 2 – Commitment to use of technology to promote problem solving and decision making for diverse learners) to 92% proficient (Standard 3 – Practices

ethical behavior and intellectual honesty). Over 80% of candidates in advanced programs are shown to be at Level 1 or 2 on each standard. Data from 2010 to 2014 indicate about 30% of candidates that have at least two DDP measures showing increases in their score across time, indicating that the program requirements are impacting candidate dispositions and diversity proficiency. Specific AY 2013-2014 DDP data, disaggregated by each advanced program, are available for review to support progress by the unit in addressing concerns about candidate possession of expected dispositions. The Unit Assessment System has been developed and specific attention has been paid to improving advanced programs' abilities to aggregate and disaggregate DDP data to inform candidate growth and development in these critical areas of the Conceptual Framework. See DDP Trend and Profile Data and Key Assessments Inventory- Advanced Programs.

AFI 2: The unit has limited evidence on the ability of advanced teaching candidates and other school professionals to impact P-12 student learning.

The unit has three advanced programs focusing on teacher preparation: (a) M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership, (b) M.Ed. in Instructional Technology, and (c) M.Ed. in Reading (with certification as a Reading Specialist). These programs engage in the Graduate/Employer Survey and program specific assessments aimed at examining candidates' abilities to influence student learning (Item five of the Unit Assessment System Matrix for each program).

M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership

Advanced candidates in the M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership participate in the School Improvement Plan assessment and, as alumni, they and their employers participate in the Graduate/Employer Survey. However, the response rate for the survey has been low (9 graduates and 3 employers responding since 2011). Despite these low responses, candidate feedback has been positive. In instances of low response, faculty are advised to review open-ended, qualitative data for feedback which have been positive [i.e. 2013 respondents "Assessments tools are used on a daily basis." "I have learned to communicate my ideas better by increasing my professional knowledge. Many of the students I work with come from diverse backgrounds and have a range of diverse needs I can now better support."]. The unit has initiated new marketing materials to increase responses rates. Fortunately, data are triangulated using multiple assessment and candidates complete the School Improvement Project. Candidates submit an artifact of their abilities to develop a vision for the school that promotes the success of all students. Since 2011, 87% of candidates (n=100) completely address this standard. These data have been helpful in identifying community relations as an area of concern wherein 79% of candidates perform acceptably. As a result, faculty began offering additional course content on this topic in 2012. By 2014, 92.3% of candidates were scored in the highest category on this item. See Key Assessments Inventory.

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology

Candidates in this program participate in the Graduate/Employer Survey and a portfolio which contains Developing Materials for the Web and Professional Social Networks assignments. A sufficient response size has not yet been obtained for the Graduate/Employer surveys. However, open ended feedback has been reviewed by faculty for its usefulness. The Developing Materials for the Web assignment has indicated areas for improvement. Since 2012, 79.66% of candidates have performed acceptably in their use of instructional design models to inform web learning efforts, an area of relative weakness. Faculty have implemented new course content and assignments to focus on candidates' abilities to research and synthesize the basic tenets of theories. Candidates have shown strong performance in the Professional Social Networks assignment, with 95% performing acceptably in producing a blog on research and engaging learners in discussions about their reflections on the research.

M.Ed. in Reading/Language Arts (Reading Specialist)

Acceptable levels of candidate performance impacting student learning in the Reading Specialist are noted through the program's portfolio, which contains a Writing Lesson Plan assignment as its assessment of candidate impact on student learning. This assignment asks candidates to upload a sample lesson plan which is uploaded to Tk20 and scored by faculty using a rubric. Across the 2011-2014 period, candidates performed very well in regards to their ability to craft learning objectives; 98% (n=65) performed acceptably in this area. However, faculty note that 70.8% of candidates were able to demonstrate fundamental aspects of inclusive instruction. Based on these data, faculty have begun to

review the rubric to ensure that it was aligned to International Reading Association standards. Initial findings suggest the rubric requires updating and alignment. Faculty will monitor student performance in future assessment efforts. The program has also used qualitative sections of the Graduate/Employer survey, since responses to the surveys between 2011 and 2014 obtained 7 graduates and 13 employers' ratings. Results have been highly positive.

AFI 3: The unit has limited evidence that candidates have the expected professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers at the advanced level.

The unit has three advanced programs focusing on teacher preparation: (a) M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership, (b) M.Ed. in Instructional Technology, and (c) M.Ed. in Reading (with certification as a Reading Specialist). These programs have made a number of improvements in their collection and use of assessment data related to candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. As previously mentioned, employers of graduates in these programs evaluate candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through the Graduate/ Employer survey and several program specific assessments such as field supervisor evaluations, portfolios, and course projects. The following sections describe assessment efforts and improvements developed in each of these sections.

M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership

Candidates in this program engage in a curriculum alignment project, the school improvement plan, an internship evaluation, and the Graduate/Employer Survey. For the curriculum improvement plan, across the past 3 years, candidate performance has been strongest in candidates' abilities to translate recommendations into policies (78.43% rated in the highest level of the three point rubric) and weakest in candidates' abilities to use state accountability data to inform decision making (74.51% rated in the highest level). As a result of these data, the faculty implemented the State of Education Report assignment and assessment in EDAD 6372: Practicum in Supervision, which calls upon state data to formulate recommendations. Across this same time frame, candidates completing the School Improvement Project performed strongest in making ethical decisions to sustain their improvement project (90.29% scored in the highest level) while involving parental and community groups in improvement efforts was a challenge for candidates (79.41% ranked in the highest level). As a result, faculty began offering additional course content on this topic in 2012. By 2014, 92.3% of candidates were scored in the highest category on this item. Internship evaluations indicate candidate performance is strong with 94% of candidates performing acceptably on this assessment. Graduate/Employer Surveys also offer positive depictions of candidates' skills and pedagogical abilities. See Key Assessments Inventory.

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology

Candidates in this program engage in a copyright and fair use assignment, assessing student performance with technology assignment. Candidates also participate in the Graduate/Employer Survey, which offers positive results of candidate skills and abilities. Across the past three (years 2011-2014) candidates in this program completing the copyright and fair use assignment have exhibited strengths in articulating instances in which copyright and fair use laws have been violated (84.39% met this indicator) and reviewing the relevant literature and acts pertaining to the copyright and fair use laws (79.4% met). In contrast, candidates have been challenged by the accurate use of references and citations (62.46% met). As a result faculty began requiring an annotated bibliography assignment in CIED 5367: Readings and Trends in Instructional Technology. The assessing student performance with technology assessment has demonstrated candidates' strengths in developing implications for future teaching (83.68% met). However, candidates have been challenged in their ability to adjust instruction based upon participants' reactions (57.38%). Faculty have taken a heightened focus on this skill since 2013 and in 2014, 100% of candidates met this indicator.

M.Ed. in Reading/Language Arts (Reading Specialist)

Candidates in this program engage in the school literacy case study assignment, a lesson planning assessment, a literacy coaching project, and the Graduate/Employer survey. Although positive results have been obtained, the response rate from the Graduate/Employer survey, has been very low in the past three years (3 responses). In regards to the school literacy case study, across the past three years, candidates have consistently exhibited strong writing abilities (86.67% exceeding expectations) and

effective argumentation style (86.7% exceeding expectations). Candidates were challenged in effectively using a variety of information-gathering techniques and information resources (46.67% exceeded expectations). Faculty implemented new professional development seminars and integrated librarians into several courses and anticipate improvements in this skill in the coming years.

12000 character limit

1.4 Exhibits for Standard 1

1.4.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.4.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.4.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.4.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.4.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.4.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.4.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.4.h	Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.4.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates
1.4.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.4.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

Exhibit 1.4.b: Title II submissions 2010-2014
Exhibit 1.4.e: Key Assessments and Scoring Guides
Exhibit 1.4.f: Aggregate Dispositions Data
Exhibit 1.4.K: Agency Reports
Data Management Schedule
Detailed Explanation of Program Specific Assessments
State exam (TExES and PPR) Pass Rates for the Past Three Years
Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix
Unit Assessment System Matrix
Examples of Program Specific Assessments
TWS Three Year Trend Data
TWS Data Report
Compilation of Assessment Committee Meetings
Spring 2014 Guidelines for Completion of the Teacher Work Sample
Exhibit 1.4.g: Analysis of P-12 Learning Examples
Exhibit 1.4.h: Examples of portfolios
Exhibit 1.4.a: State Program Review Documents
Exhibit 1.4.c (Part 1): Initial Program's Key Assessments and Scoring Guides

Exhibit 1.4.c (Part 2): Advanced Program's Key Assessment and Scoring Guides

Exhibit 1.4.d: Key Assessment Data

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Since the last NCATE visit, the unit has implemented or refined a comprehensive, unit-wide, transition-point assessment system in initial and advanced programs. Throughout the design of the Unit Assessment System, specific attention was given to (a) providing candidates with timely feedback on performance, (b) maintaining a course-based approach to direct assessments of candidate work, (c) ensuring faculty involvement in the development of the assessment system and rubrics for assessing candidate work, (d) assessing candidates' skills and abilities at meaningful transition points, and (e) maintaining an ability to aggregate or disaggregate data to provide for the most meaningful analyses possible. The unit also implemented program-specific and unit-wide means of using data to inform decision making and continuous improvement through Data Day events. See Exhibit 2.4.a and Data Management Schedule.

The Unit Assessment System is comprehensive for all initial and advanced programs. The unit's key assessments are described below along with an explanation of their impact on candidate performance and program quality. Exhibits 2.4.a, 1.4.c (parts 1 and 2), Unit Assessment System, and Data Management Schedule offer detailed overviews of the units assessment system.

An integrated approach to the Unit Assessment System allows programs throughout the unit to aggregate and disaggregate data on candidate experiences and performance in standards-based proficiencies. Standards assessed in the Unit Assessment System are related to the unit's conceptual framework, along with state, regional, and national standards. Moreover, programs have selected a number of assignments in courses that also support the Unit Assessment System because and, in most instances, candidates submit assessment data that also serve as course assignments.

All elements in Standard 2 are highly impacted by the Unit Assessment System. Therefore, the capacity and effectiveness of the assessment system is evaluated on a regular basis. Systematically, data are collected, analyzed, and evaluated to facilitate continuous program improvement and candidate performance. Faculty from across the unit and institution serve on the Assessment Committee, whose charge is, in part, to define and develop unit level assessments for monitoring candidate performance and unit or program quality. The Committee is co-chaired by the Assistant Dean of Assessment and a faculty member and provides recommendations to the Executive Council regarding data collection, analysis, and reporting. The Committee is comprised of several Program Coordinators and SPA program review writers for initial and advanced programs in the unit. Monthly meetings are held during the fall and spring semester. The Assessment Committee is committed to systematically evaluating the Unit Assessment System and unit-wide assessments for both the initial and advanced programs. Faculty on

the committee have been pleased with the Unit Assessment System for its comprehensiveness, use of course-based assignments, ability to aggregate and disaggregate data across programs and the entire unit, and the quality of data offered.

However, as early as 2011, faculty expressed concerns over the extent to which data are used throughout the unit and in programs. Therefore, the unit implemented and has had great success with its Data Day events. Each fall semester, faculty gather to review, analyze, and interpret data to develop recommendations that support improved candidate performance. The purpose of the first Data Day event in a semester is to familiarize faculty with the data; the second Data Day in a series is meant to allow faculty to interpret data and develop recommendations based upon the data. During these Data Day events, findings are triangulated across a number of data sources and recommendations for improvements are reported to the program faculty, program advisory committees, and the Executive Council. In round-table discussions, data are presented from unit assessments highlighting a targeted aspect of the triangulated data. Faculty members identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in candidate performance and program quality.

The flexibility and comprehensiveness of the data system is facilitated by the unit's software solution for data collection, Tk20, an electronic toolkit used by candidates to provide evidence that they have mastered state and professional standards. Tk20 also assists candidates in managing their program requirements and also acts as a repository of assessed coursework, field experience reflections, and other candidates' work. It is an assessment, accountability, and management system to help the unit measure and improve candidate performance and program quality. Faculty and administrative staff were consistently involved in refining the unit's approach to Tk20. In particular, Mr. Andy Oswald, Assessment Coordinator for the unit, has been critical in offering improved data collection efforts, supporting faculty as they refine rubrics, and, most recently, offering a comprehensive support website and videos for faculty and candidates. The unit's support website for Tk20 can be viewed online at <http://tinyurl.com/os8hn6s>.

The Unit Assessment System was founded upon transparency. The Center for Assessment and Accreditation's website (<http://tinyurl.com/SHSU-CAA>) is used to host and disseminate data collected regarding the effectiveness of the Educator Preparation Programs. All stakeholders, including the public at large, are encouraged to view the available data and offer feedback. Additionally, program faculty, program advisory committees, and the administrative team use these data to analyze performance trends, looking for areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in candidate performance and program quality.

The Unit Assessment System also allows the unit to meet its obligations to accountability agencies such as NCATE/CAEP, the Texas Education Agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Data collected for the NCATE Annual Report are used to compare Educator Preparation Providers across the nation. The Annual Report focuses on eight specific measures used as a means for the unit to monitor as well as demonstrate candidate performance and program quality. Data collected from the Annual Report are reported to the Executive Council and discussed at the Assessment Committee meetings in efforts to facilitate continuous growth. The Unit has successfully submitted all Annual Reports during the past accreditation cycle and assessment data have been easily accessed to respond to other accountability requests.

The Unit Assessment System has figured prominently in reporting for Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). Seventeen SHSU programs are currently recognized by their respective SPAs, the most of any institution in the State of Texas (See National Accreditation and Program Recognition). The Unit Assessment System calls upon performance-based assessments, is founded on direct evidence of student performance, and demonstrates candidates' abilities in subject matter and abilities to teach P-12 students effectively. The Educator Preparation Program is a practitioner-based program. SPA

assessments incorporate artifacts of candidates' teaching, leadership, and skills to ensure the application of knowledge and the acquisition of content that helps improve candidate performance and the quality of the program.

A fundamental concern of the program's faculty as they designed the Unit Assessment System was the ability to aggregate data across all programs in the unit while also offering programs the flexibility to design assessments specific to the unique learning outcomes of their program. The Unit Assessment System is founded upon a number of unit-wide assessments for all candidates (TExES exams, Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies, Graduate/Employer Surveys, Services and Operations Surveys), specific assessments for initial and advanced programs, and program-specific assessments. Each type of key assessment is described below along with an explanation of its impact on candidate performance and program quality.

10000 character limit

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

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

Because of their dedication to continuous improvement, faculty developed a meta-assessment system to evaluate progress in the development of the Unit Assessment System using NCATE standards. The faculty included the twelve elements of Standard 2 in a matrix and included ratings of Unacceptable, Acceptable, and Target. After considerable reflection and dialogue, faculty were able to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the Unit Assessment System. In the initial programs, the unit is performing at target level on ten out of twelve elements for Standard 2. The area identified by faculty as acceptable was 2a.2 Validity. See Initial Certification Target Level Performance Analysis-Standard 2. In the advanced programs, the unit is performing at target level in ten out of twelve elements for Standard 2. The elements that were rated as acceptable were 2a.2 and 2.a.4, both related to examinations of validity, accuracy, and fairness of data processes. Plans for moving these elements to target and maintaining others are discussed below. See Advanced Certification Target Level Performance Analysis-Standard 2.. In these two charts, evidence and reasoning behind faculty members' meta-assessment of the assessment system in initial and advanced programs are explained in greater detail below. The important attachment Examples of Program Specific Assessments and Improvements also outlines fundamental aspects of the Unit Assessment System and examples of improvements made using data.

The unit has made many strides in developing its capacity to evaluate candidate performance in regards to its Conceptual Framework. SHIPS partners have been vital to reflections about the Conceptual Framework and assessment of candidate skills. Beginning in fall 2014, an agenda item was added to each meeting to include breakout, small group discussions about key points, assessments, candidate performance, and program quality. SHIPS members led a conversation centered primarily on their needs in regards to candidates to fill teaching vacancies. This valuable input will give a voice to the partners and allow the EPP to hear and use the input to inform program realignment and decisions. Faculty and

staff have been involved in the Assessment Committee and Data Days. Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes documents target level performance in this element for initial and advanced programs.

For element 2.a.2, the faculty evaluated the Unit Assessment System as operating at the acceptable level for initial and advanced programs. The faculty committee's reflections were guided by a belief that while the unit is currently operating beyond the "acceptable" level on this element, the unit has not necessarily or regularly attained target level performance in this element. The unit makes modifications to assessment systems as noted in Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes. In 2010, the unit reviewed the validity of Teacher Work Sample and Disposition and Diversity Proficiency data after producing a comprehensive validity and reliability report. However, recent (2011-2014) validity studies have not been as comprehensive. The unit has reviewed the percentage of scores in agreement between raters for the TWS regularly, finding in 2014 that 59.3 percent of TWS reviews were in agreement. Moreover, reliability coefficients for the 2014 TWS are above 0.79 and the DDPs had reliability coefficients above 0.82. Pearson coefficients for items on the Graduate/Employer Surveys and the Unit Services and Operations Survey are modest and have appropriate relationships between survey items. However, for the program assessments, such as the lesson plan, several portfolios, and program-specific assessment validity has not yet been examined. This is due to the large number of highly specific assessments and, in some instances, small response sample sizes.

Despite these efforts, an exhaustive review of validity and reliability of data has not been conducted in 2014. For these reasons, faculty rated the unit's performance in initial and advanced programs as acceptable. The Center for Assessment and Accreditation staff will conduct validity and reliability studies throughout the 2015-2016 academic year. A sub-committee of the Assessment Committee, the Reliability and Validity Review committee, will develop a validity study like the former studies it has performed and share it with the Assessment Committee in a fall 2015 meeting. This committee will train all Unit faculty in regards to improving assessments and validity and reliability of assessments through a series of professional development sessions. These sessions and the development of the report which will follow Denner, Norman, Salzman, Panzratz, and Evans' (2004) guidance. The Reliability and Validity Review Committee will also develop policies and timelines (most likely annually) for the analysis of reliability and validity in unit data. With these additions, the unit will be brought to target-level performance. A number of publications are likely to be produced and will document improvements in this standard.

The unit is currently performing on the target level in element 2.a.3. Multiple assessments are used to gauge candidate performance and assessments are situated at critical transition points throughout initial and advanced programs. In addition to unit-wide assessment, program specific assessments are in place and used, especially in advanced programs. This transition point assessment allows faculty to examine pre-college, college, and post-college data on candidates. Overall, candidates have strong positive attitudes toward SHSU and are able to demonstrate strengths through these assessments.

There was considerable dialogue about unit performance on element 2.a.4. Through its Assessment Committee, the unit regularly reviews assessment to ensure they are accurately and fairly examining candidate skills and abilities. This has been a regularly recurring aspect of the Assessment Committee's work, as evidenced by the Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes. Faculty are deeply concerned with fairness, accuracy, and consistency of data and note that data are intended stable (See Statewide and SHSU TExES Pass Rate Comparison, 2011-2012, DDP trend and Profile Data, and TWS Trends Report.) Eighty percent of all initial and advanced candidates indicated, through the 2014 Services and Operations Survey, they viewed the unit's assessments as fair and meaningful. Seventy-eight percent of candidates also indicated assessments were accurate. However, the faculty were not completely comfortable categorizing the unit's efforts as constituting a "thorough [study] to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations." The unit's

leadership have already convened a group [the Principles of Inclusion and Equity Committee] of faculty to review advanced level DDP statements and the TWS Committee is developing recommendations for the TWS that focus on fairness and reducing burden of the assessment on candidates. The Reliability and Validity Review Committee will develop policies and practices for regularly examining the validity and reliability or consistency of results in the fall 2015 semester. The Assessment Committee is currently reviewing the fairness and accuracy of data collection efforts. With the addition of regular validity and reliability analyses, the unit will be performing at the target level in both initial and advanced programs.

As documented in Unit Assessment System Matrix, the system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at transition points throughout and after candidates' experiences (2.b.1). The assessment system includes early assessment efforts (entry admissions materials, novice level DDPs, etc.), progressing DDP and project-based assessments in the middle of curricula, exit-level (Services and Operations Survey) and capstone projects (TWS and portfolios), and post-graduation assessment efforts (Graduate/Employer Survey) for both initial and advanced programs. Clearly, multiple assessments are used for formative feedback to candidates and to inform decision making (2.b.2).

During the last accreditation review, the unit received areas for improvement related to advanced programs' collection, aggregation, and use of data (2.b.3). The unit has made a number of improvements in initial and advanced programs in this area. First, unit-wide assessments are in place and have been fully implemented since 2012. For initial programs this includes assessments such as the TWS, DDP, or the Graduate/Employers survey. For advanced programs, unit-wide assessments include the DDPs and the Graduate/Employer Survey. Certification programs also call upon TExES exams and all programs have program-specific assessments throughout their curriculum. Refinements to these unit-wide assessments have been under way and a strong culture of assessment has taken root. The Unit Assessment System allows for data to be aggregated across the unit as well as disaggregated for program-specific decision making. Program-specific assessments are in place in all programs.

Candidate complaints have been tracked and maintained by the dean's office in accordance with Academic Policy 900823 (2.b.4). The unit's use of Tk20, its information technology solution for managing assessment data, is fully operational and supporting the unit's needs (2.b.5). The reports in this self-study are evidence of Tk20's abilities to support unit assessment efforts. As noted in Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes, the Assessment Committee has reviewed the Unit Assessment System regularly and made improvements to the system (2.c.1).

The unit has enjoyed many successes in using data to make evidence-based improvements. The unit also has tracked these improvements to examine the influences of these changes on candidate performance (2.c.2). Sections 1.3.a, 3.2.b, and 4.2.b of this self-study, outline a number of evidence-based improvements. For example, faculty in Languages, Literacy, and Special Populations developed new coursework (READ 5312: Second Language Literacy) in response to data suggesting candidates needed additional support in predicting difficulties faced by a language learner, strategies to meet needs of second language learners, and the sociocultural factors for pluralistic teaching. These changes will be monitored in the semesters following this implementation. As noted in sections 1.3.a, across 2011-2014, faculty in Instructional Leadership recognized challenges in candidates' abilities to use state accountability data to inform decision making (74.51% rated in the highest level). Faculty implemented the State of Education Report assignment and assessment in EDAD 6372: Practicum in Supervision, which calls upon state data to formulate recommendations. Across this same time frame, candidates completing the School Improvement Project performed strongest in making ethical decisions to sustain their improvement project (90.29% scored in the highest level) while involving parental and community groups in improvement efforts was a challenge for candidates (79.41% ranked in the highest level). As a result, faculty began offering additional course content on this topic in 2012. By 2014, 92.3% of candidates were scored in the highest category on this item. Internship evaluations are based upon ELCC

standards and candidate performance is strong with 94% of candidates performing acceptably on this assessment. There are many examples of faculty across initial and advanced programs using data to improve curricula, courses, or programs and confirming the effects of these influences across time. Faculty see this as a strength of the unit's approach to assessment.

Assessment data are regularly disseminated to faculty and candidates through the Assessment Committee, specific requests for data, and through the unit's website (2.c.3). The unit prides itself on transparency and openness with data and several requests from students have informed TWS submissions, candidate projects, or student organization efforts. Faculty have made extensive use of data to inform course, program, curricular, and institutional improvements.

15000 character limit

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

While the unit is not required to complete section 2.2.b, faculty value the discussions about continuous improvement and look forward to trying new approaches to teaching and learning. As such, faculty opted to complete this section of the self-study offering a brief overview of evidence based-improvements developed throughout the unit. Many of these developments stem from the unit's ongoing, recurring Data Day events. Some examples of continuous improvement are discussed below and in the continuous improvement sections of other standards in this self-study report.

The Unit Assessment System Matrix offers a graphic representation of each assessment in every unit. Please refer to that document for a broad overview of the data system. The sections below offered detailed descriptions of assessment processes and example evidence-based improvements. The following sections include examples of continuous improvement efforts initial and advanced programs. Examples of evidence-based improvements are also described in detail below.

Examples of improvements in Initial Programs.

Graduate/Employer Surveys. In 2011, employers of SHSU initial certification alumni indicated 55% of alumni exhibited weaknesses in communication. This finding allowed faculty to provide additional content and professional development pertaining to communication with colleagues, students, and families. Employers of initial certification alumni also indicated strengths as candidate knowledge of professional skills (67.4%), technology (58.8%), diversity (52.2%), and assessment (34.8%). These data are useful in helping faculty in initial programs understand which learning exercises to continue and in developing professional development efforts such as Bring 'em Back Kats.

TWS Data. Program faculty, program advisory committees, and the administrative team use TWS results each semester to analyze candidate performance, looking for areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in candidate performance and program quality. Examples of the use of data for program improvement often include increasing or refining course content focused on a specific domain in which a number of candidates performed poorly. Faculty have also used TWS data in developing online professional modules to support candidate learning and in offering faculty professional development series.

M.Ed. in Administration (with Associated Principal Certificate)

TEExES Exam #068 for Principals. The M.Ed. program has aligned its curriculum with the TEExES exam #068. This certification exam is taken by the students toward the end of the program and measures nine Principal Competencies related to three primary Principal Domains learned in courses. The results aid in monitoring program quality and student learning in the Educational Administration and Principal Preparation courses. In recent years, faculty in the program have used these data to revise and improve our curriculum (specifically legal concepts in courses), advising, and course content. These changes have seen improvements in already strong pass rates. In 2011, 92% of candidates passed the TEExES Principal Certification. In 2014, 94% of candidates passed the exam. This program also employs a comprehensive exam and Principal Portfolio to assess candidate skills and abilities.

Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (Superintendent Certificate)

In addition to a review of dispositions, comprehensive exam, research competencies, and DDPs, this program also employs a Superintendent Portfolio and candidate performance on the TEExES Exam #195. In 2010, only 62% of superintendent candidates were passing the TEExES #195 certification exam. Faculty began brainstorming reasons for this poor performance and concluded that course content was not aligned to the competencies and domains on the exam. The faculty also set a goal of 95% of candidates passing the exam. Faculty began offering improved coursework that directly aligned with TEExES exam content, ELCC standards, and TEA standards (See Superintendent Content Alignment Matrix). Since 2012, the Superintendent program has maintained a 100 percent pass rate for initial test takers. Additionally, test results have been used to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses in the program. This information was used to modify course content to improve and, now, maintain a quality program.

The Superintendent Portfolio allows faculty to evaluate candidates' field experiences as well as their skills and abilities through reflections as aspiring school leaders. Results aid in monitoring program quality and the need to revise and improve our program, curricula, or course content. Please see Section 3.2.b of the Institutional Report for examples of how these data have informed field placements and experiences in the M.Ed. Program

M.Ed. /M.A. in Instructional Leadership

In addition to the aforementioned unit-wide assessment efforts, a comprehensive exam covering theories and skills from all coursework is given during the last semester of the M.Ed. and M.A. in Instructional Leadership programs. The exam covers candidates' knowledge of campus leadership knowledge and skills gained in the courses. The results aid in monitoring program quality and candidate learning of theories pertaining to instructional leadership. The comprehensive exams have been helpful in refining course content and developing new curricular focuses.

M.Ed. in School Counseling

Across the past 3 years, 98.5% of candidates have passed the TEExES Exam #152 for School Counselors and faculty are pleased with this level of performance. Another key assessment for M.Ed. in School Counseling candidates is successful completion of the Counselor Potential Scale. Candidate performance in the CPS has prompted faculty to role model more examples of counseling situations.

M.Ed. in Special Education with Diagnostician Certification

As documented in the Unit Assessment System Matrix, assessment in this program includes TEExES exam #152, a comprehensive exam, Analysis of Ability to Plan, Internship Evaluation, Functional Behavior Assessment, Family Support Plan, and Portfolios. Across the past two years, 89.5% of candidates pass

the TExES Exam #153. Faculty have used a number of other assessments to examine this pass rate but note that the institutional pass rate is higher than the state-wide pass rate of 84.7%. Candidate performance in the portfolio have prompted faculty to offer new course content on behavior assessments.

M.Ed. in Reading/Language Arts (Reading Specialist Certification)

In the past 2 years, 100% of exam participants have passed the TExES Exam #151. Candidates also complete a Research Synthesis Assessment, Student Case Study, School Literacy Case Study Profile Project, Lesson Plan Assignment, Literacy Coach Project, and Growth/Showcase Portfolio. Each of these assessments aligns to IRA standards. Data have been helpful in refining rubrics for assessment methods, offering increased course content on language acquisition, and developing new coursework (READ 5312: Second Language Literacy) in response to data suggesting candidates needed additional support in predicting difficulties faced by a language learner, strategies to meet needs of second language learners, and the sociocultural factors for pluralistic teaching.

M.Ed. in Library Science

In addition to the TExES 150 exam, Library Science candidates complete an electronic portfolio, Program Administration Project, Internship Evaluations, Collaborative Information Literacy Lesson, and Reaching Youthful Readers assessments. As noted in 1.2.b of the self-study, data have been useful in offering professional development and advising services, connecting candidates with diverse field placements, and increasing course content, particularly in relation to technology.

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology

The M.Ed. in Instructional Technology conducts at least 10 assessments throughout candidates' curricular experiences (See Unit Assessment System Matrix). Data from the Copyright and Fair use assessment have been positive (over 94% of candidates perform acceptably in this assessment). However, candidates struggled with offering sufficient research justifications and citations in this assessment. Therefore, faculty developed an additional annotated bibliography assignment offered in an early class in the curriculum. Initial results from recent data (after this improvement) showed slight (2.4%) increases in rating of candidate skills in the citation element of the Copyright and Fair Use Assignment. Faculty will remain focused on this element

M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction.

Candidates complete a Curriculum Analysis assessment in CIED 5384: Curricular Trends for Classroom Teachers and use a model for curriculum analysis, uploading artifacts of their abilities in 5 elements of this model throughout the semester. Data suggest high levels of candidate performance and familiarity with this model. In completing the Portrait of a Diverse Learner assessment candidate's work with a diverse learner (students with exceptionalities, ethnic or cultural diversity, racial diversity, gender differences, socioeconomic diversity, linguistic/language diversity, etc.) in a tutoring session. In 2014, 88.98% of candidates performed favorably on this assessment. Candidates also complete a research training certification (CITI Training), and Analysis of Learning assessment, and Capstone Research project. Results are positive and suggest candidates have a well-rounded, appropriate capacity to conduct research.

10000 character limit

2.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial

and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

No Areas for Improvement were noted in this standard during the prior accreditation visit.

12000 character limit

2.4 Exhibits for Standard 2

2.4.a	Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.4.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.4.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.4.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.4.e	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.4.f	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.4.g	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

Exhibit 2.4.a: Description of the Unit Assessment System
Exhibit 2.4.b: 2.4.b: Admission criteria and entry data
Exhibit 2.4.c: Policies pertaining to fairness, accuracy, and consistency
Exhibit 2.4.d: Policies for assessment regularity
Exhibit 2.4.e: Management of Candidate Complaints
Exhibit 2.4.f: Candidate Complaint files
Exhibit 2.4.g: Examples of Significant Evidence-Based Changes
Data Management Scheduled
National Accreditation and Program Recognition
Initial Certification Target Level Performance Analysis-Standard 2.
Advanced Certification Target Level Performance Analysis-Standard 2.
Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix
Examples of Program Specific Assessments and Improvements
Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes
Unit Assessment System Matrix

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

Field Experiences in Initial Certification Programs

Initial candidates complete 3 field experiences in schools beginning with 10 hours of classroom observation and gradually adding teaching responsibilities, with guided practice and support, until the completion of a 14-week student teaching experience. Candidates may participate in an international field experience offered each summer for their second internship. Field experiences and candidates' skills are collaboratively evaluated by candidates, professors, mentors, and public school administrators. Field experience requirements are reviewed in Field Experience Overview Chart. These descriptions also apply to the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction candidates seeking initial certification.

Candidates progress through varied levels of field experiences ranging from observations of teaching (Level I), tutoring individual students (Level II), and, during level III field experiences, full instruction guided by a mentor teacher. Field experience levels are more fully described in the important attachment, Description of Field Experiences by Level.

Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools (SHIPS) was established in 1986 with a small number of partner schools. Today, SHIPS includes 55 schools and covers Southeast Texas (See SHIPS Map and Listing). Schools in this region have demographic data almost identical to demographics of the state (See Proximal Zone of Professional Impact). SHIPS representatives and unit faculty, meet each fall and spring to share information and data, make future plans, discuss current state and district issues, and address concerns for each entity (See SHIPS Meeting Agendas and Attendance, Parts 1-3). Meetings provide a means of feedback and dialogue for improvement of field experiences. Formal by-laws document each partner's responsibilities (See SHIPS By-Laws). SHIPS has headquarters in unit's Steele Center for Professional Practice and the Director of Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) shares responsibility for developing meeting agendas with the Associate Dean for Teacher Education.

In addition to partnerships with schools, the unit has entered in the final stages of applying for a university-led, collaborative charter school with 10 to 12 early childhood centers throughout Southeast Texas. This partnership has been reviewed and supported by community leaders, local school district partners, and state and campus leaders. The percentage of students meeting the State's definition of "at-risk" range from 20-79 percent. Minority populations range from 30-89 percent and an average of 11 languages spoken at the partnering centers. Should the charter school be approved, the unit will partner with these centers to continue to offer candidates highly diverse field placements. Additional information about the SHSU Foundation Charter School will be available during the site visit.

Student Teacher Mentors and Mentor Orientation Workshop

The unit partners with schools to offer mentor teacher orientation sessions. The student teaching semester is fully outlined and explained in the attached Guidelines for Student Teaching and reviewed with candidates at a mandatory orientation prior to student teaching (See Student Teaching Orientation Agenda). During this session, Student Teacher Calendar (attached) and important policies are reviewed. The orientation consists of explanations of key evaluations, course content, expectations, activities, classroom management, assessment, legal issues, and ethical behavior. Following application, student teachers are placed under the guidance of a mentor teacher, a university supervisor, school leaders, and the EPP. Candidates are advised to select a diverse setting. As discussed in section 4.2b, candidates currently enjoy high levels of experience with diverse students (See Exhibit 3.4.b).

Mentor teachers are trained through the Mentor Orientation Workshop (MOW), a set of three online modules supporting mentors' understanding and growth of candidates in classroom learning (See Mentor

Orientation Workshop at <http://tinyurl.com/MOW-Training>). The first module addresses stages of teacher development, the second focuses on mentor coaching, and the third stresses the importance of establishing a successful relationship between the mentor and the clinical teacher. The goal of MOW is to ensure a successful student teaching semester (See MOW Trained Mentor List).

University Supervisors

Each student teacher is assigned a university supervisor who is employed as an SHSU adjunct instructor. Most are retired administrators, counselors, librarians, and teachers from SHIPS districts. In 2014, the university employed 37 supervisors. Collectively these educators have over 1,100 years of experience (See Exhibit 3.4.c). Supervisor training is provided by the EPP and covers facilitation of mentor teachers' efforts, performance evaluations, and mentoring candidates (See University Supervisor Training Presentation). At the conclusion of the training, university supervisors meet with student teachers to develop initial growth plans, schedule observations, and discuss expectations, policies, and procedures (See Sample Growth Plan).

Field Experiences in Advanced Programs

All advanced certification programs in the unit address specialized knowledge through field placements. Each program oversees the development, administration, and assessment of candidate skills and abilities in coordination with partnering schools. A detailed review of field experiences is offered in Field Experience Overview Chart.

Masters Programs in LLSP

M.A. and M.Ed. degrees in LLSP carry certifications in Bilingual Education, Educational Diagnosticians, and Reading Specialists. Because of faculty desires to create meaningful partnerships with area schools, these programs engage in a Collaborative School Partnership (CSP) agreement with Reaves Elementary School in Conroe Independent School District (See CSP MOU). The CSP is governed by a ten-member CSP Advisory Board. The Board consists of five representatives from Reaves Elementary School [Principal (Chair of the Board), Assistant Principal, student teaching mentor, teacher liaison, and staff liaison] and five representatives from the unit [Chair of LLSP, professors from Language Arts, Early Childhood, Special Education, and Bilingual Education]. The Board establishes and revises policy, develops a yearly action and data collection plan, and monitors the success of candidates and the action and data plans. One SHSU representative serves as the CSP Coordinator and supports data collection and review. One assignment in the field experience requires candidates to conduct a literacy needs assessment and design a program to meet these needs. In another assessment, candidates create a professional development seminar. These tasks involve the principal, assistant principal, specialists, candidates, and professors. Schools benefit greatly from candidates' work.

Master of Library Science (School Librarian)

M.L.S. candidates are evaluated based on 130 hours aligned to AASL Standards for the Preparation of School Librarians. Candidates identify a school library where they intend to conduct at least 60 hours of their internship and must work with a certified librarian who has 3 or more years of experience. The program is offered online and enjoys a strong partnership with schools in Texas' Rio Grande Valley, a highly diverse region of the state. Section 4.2b details the program's success in exposing candidates to diverse students.

M.Ed. in Ed. Admin. (Principals)

Principal candidates select a school to conduct 150 hours of field supervision with a site supervisor who agrees, via a signed learning contract, to supervise the experience. Candidates often interact with district personnel in various locations. Schools benefit from candidates' recommendations in Curriculum Alignment, Technology Plan, and School Improvement projects. Technology has been a focus of the partnership as Educational Leadership faculty developed technology-based tools.

Ed.D. in Ed. Leadership (Superintendents)

Superintendent candidates select a diverse setting to develop their leadership skills and dispositions across 150 hours of experience guided by an experienced superintendent. Faculty use the DDP diversity profile to ensure candidates are completing diverse field experiences and are exposed to ELCC Standards and Texas Administrative Code. Partnering schools often rely on candidates to introduce new leadership theories and improve programs, among other activities. Each year, program leadership meets with an advisory board of field supervisors and program partners. The board provides feedback on their needs and the quality of the positive partnership.

M.Ed. in School Counseling

COUN 6386: Field Practicum, a required course, provides supervision and study of responsibilities of a school counselor. Candidates select a setting that broadens their experiences across 300 hours of experience in each of two semesters for total 600 hours. In each semester, 120 hours must be face-to-face counseling. Candidates secure liability insurance, a copy of the supervisor's current license, and develop a counseling activity plan. Schools benefit through additional counseling of students and candidates gain valuable experience in counseling.

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology

Candidates complete 100 hours of field experience in CIED 5369: Practicum for Technology Facilitation by selecting a site supervisor to guide their development of assessments [Technology Contextual Factors, a Needs Assessment, a literature review addressing how technology can be best integrated into the learning environment, and a training seminar]. Partner schools benefit in the development of new resources, training sessions, integration of new technology, and from sharing of expertise and research on instructional technology.

10000 character limit

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

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

15000 character limit

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

articulated in this standard.

One of the hallmarks of the unit faculty is their desire to make improvements that will benefit candidates and the schools they will serve. Using data from assessments arranged at transition points throughout curricula, including field placements, improvements have been implemented to support candidate success.

Continuous Improvements in Initial Field Placements

Section 2.2a documents course content improvements implemented as a result of field experience assessments. Most notably, new content and online modules were developed to address less-than-desirable candidate performance in areas of language acquisition. New content in courses earlier in the curriculum have been implemented to address candidate deficiencies in technology. Professional development seminars have been offered as a result of Teacher Work Sample data. In addition to these evidence-based improvements, initial programs have recently improved entrance requirements and resources for modeling excellent teaching.

Curriculum Alignment. Unit faculty initiated a process of aligning degrees and courses with new Texas teaching standards (See Realignment Committee Membership). The process was informed by a summer 2014 survey of faculty and staff indicating a need to realign the curriculum with state and national standards using current research and societal needs. SHIPS partners and partner colleges indicated needs for new certification programs (4-8 Generalist program and a 7-12 Science Composite) to meet teaching demands. The committee determined the theories and concepts needed to be modeled and practiced to ensure candidates demonstrate mastery (See Proposed Teacher Candidate Outcomes Aligned to Standards). Program coordinators met with full-time faculty to ensure all faculty had the opportunity to participate in the process (See Curriculum Realignment Committee Meeting Agendas and Minutes). Next, the committee will develop field experiences and assessments that are aligned to redesigned outcomes and courses. The final step will include a large group evaluation of the proposed curriculum and adjustments as needed. The timeline for completion of the realignment effort is fall 2015. Departments will seek approval of all new or adjusted coursework for implementation in the 2016 academic year. The Assessment Committee will review assessment data annually to adjust and refine the curriculum as needed.

Texas Student Teacher of the Year. SHSU is honored to have alumni who are Texas Student Teachers of the Year [TSTOTY]. (See TSTOTY Press Releases at <http://tinyurl.com/TSTOTY>). Candidates are nominated and produce a video of their instruction which is then reviewed by a panel of Texas Directors of Field Experience using a Score Sheet (attached). The unit has created a library of best practices in student teaching in the Steele Center for Professional Practice. Winners' videos are used in courses, orientations, advising, and in field experiences for candidate growth. The library of teaching examples will promote future nominations and deepen candidates' knowledge of effective classroom instruction.

Admission Interview. The EPP will include an entrance interview to ensure on-going understanding of dispositions at the point of initial candidate entry. Candidates will provide a three minute video focused on three questions and full-time faculty will review the video using a rubric currently under development by the Assessment Committee. Candidates not meeting desired standards will meet with faculty to develop a plan for improving dispositions or concerns noted in the video and faculty will conduct at least one follow-up the first semester. The purpose of implementing the entrance interview is to address concerns in the beginning of the program and plan for guidance and improvement. Videos will also introduce a new data source for assessing candidates' growth throughout the program. Faculty developed the interview questions based on current research and dispositions desired for incoming candidates. This new system is being piloted and full implementation is anticipated in spring 2016.

Continuous Improvement in Advanced Field Placements

Advanced programs develop candidates' skills and abilities through a number of unique field experiences. Detailed descriptions of findings from field placement data can be found in Descriptions of

Advanced Field Placements Data. The unit tracks candidates' field experiences to examine the demographics of school settings (See Exhibit 3.4.b). In summer 2014, a survey of faculty was conducted and many expressed a desire to review the DDP statements in advanced programs. Eight of the 10 advanced DDP statements are also employed in undergraduate programs, limiting their applicability as a graduate-level assessment tool. Unit leadership charged a faculty committee with reviewing and, if desired, revising the DDP statements to represent outcomes expected of all advanced candidates.

Masters Programs in LLSP. Candidates' performance is assessed using the DDPs and a Field Supervisors Assessment of Candidate Skills. Ed. Diagnostic candidates also participate in the Ed. Diag. Portfolio. Faculty noticed challenges with candidates' skills in second language acquisition and technology integration. Additionally, Reading Specialist candidates' performance during READ 5407: Practicum on DDP 7 [knowledge of second language acquisition and adaptation of instruction for diverse learners] and DDP 10 [technology] were areas for improvement. As a result, faculty members developed a new, required course for the first time in summer 2013. BESL/READ 5312: Second Language Literacy supports candidates' abilities to learn about linguistically and culturally diverse learners. The Reading Specialist program also employs a Case Study Assignment in READ 5407. Candidate performance in the six areas measured by this assessment has been strong and faculty will maintain current efforts (See Descriptions of Advanced Field Placements Data, page 1).

Master of Library Science. The M.L.S. employs assessment efforts in field placements to examine candidate performance. The DDP process collects data on candidate performance in LSSL 5366: Library Internship. To further triangulate data, faculty developed 2 assessments of candidates' skills: (a) the supervisor's and (b) professor's assessment of candidate performance. These two assessments are aligned with the AASL's standards. Candidates also complete a portfolio in their internship which has been useful in refining course content. In 2014, the majority (98%) of candidates performed at an acceptable level according to supervising librarians and professors. Faculty are currently satisfied with this level of performance and the internship system.

M.Ed. in Administration (Principalship). The M.Ed. in Administration uses the DDPs to assist candidates with selecting diverse field placements. In EDAD 6362: Campus Leadership Internship candidates also submit a comprehensive Principal Portfolio covering 21 ELCC and Texas Administrative Code standards. School law has been a consistent challenge for candidates, which has also been reported in field supervisors' Candidate Performance Survey. Faculty developed new content in EDAD 5372: Federal, State, and Local School Law, a required course occurring before the internship, and refined content in EDAD 5386: Special Populations and Special Programs to include legal cases studies and theories related to unique learners. By 2014, all candidates were performing at the target level on legal issues in the Principal Portfolio and Candidate Performance Survey. Improvements in TExES scores (from 92% to 94% passing) were also noted.

Ed.D. in Ed. Leadership (Superintendent)

The superintendent certification program within the doctoral degree relies on its internship class to reinforce ELCC standards and Texas Administrative Code. Candidates work with an experienced superintendent to learn and develop skills. DDPs have been helpful in assisting candidates with the selection of diverse field placements and in 2014, three candidates were advised to take on more diverse field placements. Additionally, the program has aligned its curriculum to ELCC standards (See Superintendent Alignment). For the past 3 years 100% of candidates have passed their TExES exams. Because of the observed strengths of the candidates, the faculty will continue the current system of instruction.

M.Ed. in School Counseling. Candidates have extensive field experience in COUN 6374: Practicum in Group Counseling and COUN 6376: Supervised Practice in Counseling, wherein candidates provide evidence of proficiency in 44 CACREP standards. Following feedback from the 2013 CACREP visit, faculty implemented the Counselor Potential Scales (CPS) in all classes, which allows for early, personalized feedback on candidate performance in every class. Faculty noticed in site supervisor's Field Evaluation Forms that performance in question 15 [recognizing and resisting manipulation by the client] and 22 [interpreting client's covert messages] were challenges for candidates. Faculty implemented more role-play demonstrations and viewing of exemplar videos to strengthen candidates' skills. This new

content was implemented in fall 2014 and data will be monitored for improvements.

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology

Candidates complete a Technology Contextual Factors, a Needs Assessment, and a Literature Review assignment in CIED 5369: Practicum for Technology Facilitation. Candidates performed well in each of these assessments and faculty are pleased with current performance (See Descriptions of Advanced Field Placements Data, page 5). However, at fall 2014 Data Day events, faculty learned that alumni expressed a need to be exposed to new technological hardware and learning theories. Faculty recommended professional development series on technology integration, to be implemented by the Professional Development Committee in spring 2015

10000 character limit

3.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

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

No Areas for Improvement are noted in this standard during the prior accreditation cycle.

12000 character limit

3.4 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.4.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.4.b	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery)
3.4.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P-12 school faculty
3.4.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.4.e	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.4.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
3.4.g	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

Compilation of Assessment Committee Minutes
Descriptions of Advanced Field Placements Data
Superintendent Alignment Matrix
Exhibit 3.4.a: Examples of Collaborative Activities
Exhibit 3.4.b: Field Placement Data
Exhibit 3.4.c: Clinical Faculty and University Supervisor Selection and Credentials
Exhibit 3.4.d: Clinical Faculty Support and Evaluation
Exhibit 3.4.e: Handbooks on Field Experiences
Exhibit 3.4.f: Field Experience Assessment Instruments and Scoring Guides
Exhibit 3.4.g: Aggregate Entry and Exit Data

Field Experience Overview Chart
Ships Map and Listing
Proximal Zone of Professional Impact
SHIPS Agendas and Attendance, Part 1
SHIPS Agendas and Attendance, Part 2
SHIPS Agendas and Attendance, Part 3
SHIPS By Laws
Description of Field Experiences by Level
Guidelines for Student Teaching
Student Teaching Orientation Agenda
Student Teacher Calendar
MOW Trained Mentor List
University Supervisor Training Presentation and Agenda
Sample Growth Plan
Unit Assessment System Matrix
TWS Trend Report
Realignment Committee Membership
Proposed Teacher Candidate Outcomes Aligned to Standards
Curriculum Realignment Committee Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Student Teacher of the Year Score Sheet

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty; candidates; and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Diversity

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

The unit has a commitment to equity and service to all learners by offering high quality experiences and opportunities to engage different learners. The unit's commitment to diversity is reflected in its Conceptual Framework (attached) and applied through teaching, curriculum, field experiences, assessment, faculty research, service, and professional development. The unit demonstrates its commitment to diversity by ensuring that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. The unit has also entered into the final application phase of establishing the SHSU Foundation Charter School (see section 3.1.a). The charter school will be a partnership between the unit and 10 to 12 early childhood centers located in high-poverty areas in Southeast Texas. This partnership

will allow the unit to serve Texas families in new, direct ways, as well as increase candidate and faculty access to diverse communities for field placements, research, teaching, and service opportunities.

In 2010 initial and advanced programs integrated into courses the assessment of 10 diversity proficiencies. The Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix (attached) shows how specific diversity elements align with NCATE standards, CAEP Standards, and Conceptual Framework. This philosophy of diversity guides the unit as it exposes candidates to experiences that prepare them to meet the needs of the state's students and their families. Syllabi throughout the unit include the DDPs and Conceptual Framework which emphasize diversity (See Syllabi Template).

Diversity Preparation in Initial Programs

Initial candidates engage diverse learners from varying ethnic, racial, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, religion, language, geographic regions, and sexual orientations. Teacher candidates in the EC-6 and 4-8 programs are prepared to take the ESL supplemental examination as an enhancement to their content certification and must take CIEE 3374: Human Growth and Development, SPED 2301: Introduction to Special Education, CIEE 2333: Becoming a Teacher, BESL 2301: Multicultural Influences on Learning, BESL 3301: Second Language Acquisition, and TESL 3303/TESL 4303: Strategies for Working with English Language Learners (ELLs). The unit has closely tracked the demographics of SHIPS and field placement schools through Exhibits 4.4.f, 3.4.b, and DDP Trends and Profile Report). In addition, candidates can engage in several study abroad experiences during their Level II field placement in order to gain exposure to other cultures.

Diversity Preparation in Advanced Programs

Advanced candidates engage in field experiences that are unique and offer a wide range of diverse experiences. In 2014, 85% of candidates in all programs performed acceptably on all 10 DDPs. The following sections describe the diversity experiences and coursework in each advanced program. Moreover, important attachments include DDP Trend and Profile Data, Exhibits 3.4.b, and 4.4.f.

M.Ed. in Administration (Principalship). The principal program exposes candidates to diverse settings and learners through field experiences in EDAD 6362: Campus Leadership/Internship, in which candidates review school demographic data to analyze trends. EDLD 6385: Cultural Proficiency for School Leaders and EDLD 5386: Special Populations and Special Programs are two required courses addressing diversity content as well. During the internship experience, principal candidates complete their DDP assignment. In each year since 2012, over 95% of principal candidates could identify issues related to diverse students' learning. Faculty also asked candidates to indicate the extent to which they gained experience with (a) ethnically-diverse students, (b) students with exceptionalities, (c) students from varying socio-economic statuses, and (d) linguistic diversity. Each year since 2012, more than 87% of candidates indicate engaging learners in any of these areas during field experiences.

M.A./M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership. In EDAD 6368: Instructional Leadership I candidates are introduced to leadership theories for diverse P-12 students and to honoring diverse styles of teaching. In EDAD 5386: Special Populations and Special Programs candidates learn about 11 different proficiencies related to the history of special student populations, their needs, their unique approaches to learning, state and federal requirements, and placement of special students. In EDAD 6372: Practicum candidates are guided through initial attempts to apply what they have learned in prior coursework.

Ed.D. in Ed. Leadership (Superintendent). Efforts to prepare doctoral candidates in Ed. Leadership to work in diverse learning environments include coursework, DDPs, and a candidate disposition process. Exercises in EDLD 7337: Academic Writing and Research, as well as other courses, introduce candidates to professional standards, expectations, and literature regarding diverse learners. In EDLD 6383 candidates identify a field placement that would expand their experiences with diverse learners. Through superintendent portfolios, over 95% of candidates provide evidence of being respectful and

inclusive of diverse perspectives and in designing programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. Candidates enter the program in a probationary status and as they progress through early coursework, faculty each candidate with feedback on their performance using a Candidate Disposition Form (attached). Additionally, candidates research topics related to improving academic and social success of diverse learners (See Ed.D. Dissertations and Presentation Titles).

M.Ed. in Instructional Technology. The M.Ed. in Instructional Technology program is an online program that prepares candidates to effectively use instructional technology for classroom or professional training environments through professional development, coursework, and field placements. Candidates engage ethnic minorities (95% of candidates), students with exceptionalities (92%), socioeconomically disadvantaged students (100%), and ELLs (85%) at satisfactory levels.

M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. Faculty offer coursework and the DDP process to advance candidates' abilities in regards to diversity. In CIED 5383: Integrating Current Technologies in Teaching candidates use a variety of instructional technologies to reach diverse learners. In CIED 5384: Curriculum Trends for Classroom Teachers candidates complete a Portraiture of Diverse Learners assessment to identify student learning needs for diverse populations and augment instructional media and instruction. In CIED 5085: Current Issues in Education candidates reflect upon pressing issues in instructional technology, with the need to augment instruction for diverse learners being paramount in this reflective process. Finally, in CIED 5398: Internship in Teaching candidates are placed in diverse field assignments to apply what they have learned and reflect upon earlier coursework.

Masters Programs in LLSP. A concerted effort is made to ensure candidates are placed in field placements the offer diverse experiences that broaden their experiences with diverse learners. Coursework is designed to introduce and, later, refine candidates' abilities in working with diverse learners, particularly students with exceptionalities. As documented in the Unit Assessment System Matrix 5 courses cover the DDPs and offer a broad base of content related to diversity, especially linguistic diversity and exceptionalities. For the Reading Specialist candidates, 6 courses address diversity outcomes. Each year since 2012, less than 3.53% of candidates indicated they did not gain exposure to diverse learners.

M.Ed. in School Counseling. As required by CACREP, school counseling candidates must demonstrate multicultural competencies to graduate and pass licensing requirements. Candidates are required to take COUN 5392: Cross Cultural Issues in Counseling which includes experiential learning components in which candidates immerse themselves in an unfamiliar cultural or racial group and reflect upon and discuss these experiences in class assignments. In COUN 5333: School Counseling candidates also conduct Culture Audits using the School-wide Cultural Competence Observation Checklist (SCCOC) (Bustamante & Nelson, 2007) to collect data on how responsive their schools are to diverse groups. Comprehensive school guidance programs are then developed based on strengths and needs identified through the data collection process. Candidates' dispositions in working with diverse groups are also assessed using the Counselor Potential Scale (CPS) discussed in section 3.2b. School counseling candidates use feedback from these assessments in every class to reflect upon their biases and perspectives in counseling diverse learners. If a candidate's score on the CPS is low, he/she cannot move on to candidacy.

Master of Library Science. The online M.L.S. has a strong presence in Texas' Rio Grande Valley, a highly diverse region of the state. Candidates must take LSSL 5370: Instructional Design and Library Media Production, LSSL 5337: School Library Media Center Administration, and LSSL 5366: Library Internship. These courses offer an intense focus on diversity and candidate outcomes include: (a) Developing skills to plan, implement, and assess effective teaching and learning with diverse learners, (b) applying library facility design elements related to diversity (i.e wheelchair accessibility, areas for Spanish language materials, special needs students, or after-hours access to the library), and (c) adapting

instruction or programs to meet diverse learners' needs. Over 98% of school librarian candidates provide evidence of identifying issues of significance related to P-12 student diversity (DDP 10). Candidates also indicate high levels of engagement with diverse learners (See DDP Trend and Profile Data).

10000 character limit

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

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

15000 character limit

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

The unit has implemented several evidence-based diversity improvements. Improvements include (a) a focus on faculty hiring, (b) increased diversity in field experiences, (c) increases in diverse student populations, (d) establishing a Center for International Education, and (e) improving diversity assessment efforts.

A focus on faculty hiring

SHSU operates under an Affirmative Action Plan (attached) and the unit consistently exceeds target hiring goals for gender diversity. The unit has focused on recruiting minority faculty and administrators by sharing the Plan with search committees and disseminating job postings in venues that might attract minority candidates. The effort seems to be improving minority faculty hiring slightly. In 2012, African American faculty accounted for 5.4% of the unit's faculty and Hispanic Americans accounted for 6.9%. In 2014, African American faculty accounted for 6.6% of the unit's workforce and Hispanic Americans accounted for 8.83%. The unit has consistently led the institution in regards to the number of minority faculty hired and percentage of workforce. However, more improvements are possible in attracting, hiring, and retaining minority faculty. The unit will continue its efforts as a means of supporting faculty experiences, innovative scholarship, and collegial environments.

Increases in diverse field experiences

Diversity demographics of schools wherein initial candidates conduct field experiences have become more diverse. SHIPS partner schools with significant populations of economically disadvantaged and ethnic minorities were recruited to the partnership. These efforts influence the unit's overall approach to recruitment of minority candidates discussed below. See Exhibits 4.4.f and 3.4.b, and self-study section

3.2.b.

Targeted Recruitment Practices

The unit initiated recruitment efforts to attract and retain diverse candidates in initial and advanced programs over the past 4 years. In 2011, 73.8% of initial candidates were White, 15.8% were Hispanic, 8.5% were African American, 1.4% were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 0.3% were Asian, and 0.3% listed their race as unknown. Thus, minority candidates accounted for 25.8% of the total population. In 2014, 66.5% of initial candidates were White, and minority candidates accounted for 32.6% of the initial candidate student body. The largest growth was noted in African American (11.4% in 2014, increase of 2.9%) and Hispanic (17.4% in 2014, increase of 1.6%) candidate populations. Across the past 3 years, the unit has seen growth in ethnic minority populations from 26% of the initial candidate student body in 2011 to 34% currently. A similar trend is noted in reviewing advanced candidates. In 2011, ethnic minorities accounted for 46% of the graduate student body. Currently, ethnic minorities account for 53% of the graduate student body. This is attributed to recruitment practices in high-minority communities, culturally-responsive recruitment efforts (See Sample Diversity Insider Recruitment), and increased recruitment in general.

This increase in diverse candidate representation was coupled by remarkable retention rates for minority candidates. In 2011, 72% of the candidates who entered in the fall 2010 semester were retained in the fall 2011 semester. By 2014, the freshman retention rate had increased to 78% of all candidates. In 2014, 76% of SHSU's White candidates, 79% of African American candidates, and 77% of Hispanic candidates were retained in their first year of coursework. Within the unit, the overall retention rate is approximately 10% higher than that of the university, a trend noticed in all minority groups as well.

Center for International Education

In 2013, the unit opened its Center for International Education (CIE), which provides support for researchers and practitioners in comparative and international education. The Center also supports candidate experiences through the coordination of international travel experiences. The Center saw a number of successes in the past year which are thoroughly detailed in CIE Successes. In brief, these successes include growing a global network of partners, developing a student exchange program with Huaiyin Normal University in China, submitting grants, hosting an annual international conference, and participating in university enrollment management conversations. The CIE is also developing an assessment plan as a result of Data Day discussions.

Improvements to Diversity Assessment Efforts

Using DDP data, EC-6 faculty examined candidates' knowledge of second language acquisition pedagogy and ability to adapt instruction or programs to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners (DDP 5), areas that have been relatively lower than any other DDP area across the past three years. To respond to these data, faculty offered new course content on language proficiency and revised lesson plan assignments in Content and Literacy Methods. All candidates now include the State of Texas English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) and teaching strategies for ELLs on their lesson plan assignments. Early feedback from DDP data suggest positive influences from these refinements. In 2014, the percentage of candidates rated as acceptable in these areas increased by two and six percent, respectively, since 2011.

In the 2014 Data Day series, faculty met to review the unit's data pertaining to multiculturalism, linguistic diversity, and candidates' pedagogical preparation for language acquisition. These two groups recommended professional development sessions pertaining to candidates' needs in these areas. The first topic was presented via two sessions in Feb. 2015, and faculty gained excellent information about learning needs of diverse students. Both groups also offered recommendations for further study and these recommendations are under review by the Assessment Committee and Executive Council as of self-study submission.

Initial programs

Services and Operations Survey data indicated initial candidates participating in study abroad programs benefited greatly. Thus, the BESL program offered three undergraduate courses in a study abroad settings in Liberia, Costa Rica, and Italy with the goals of introducing candidates to new countries, cultures, and languages. Candidates taught English as a Foreign Language (applying ELLs strategies) to

public school children who came from low-income families. Content Methods courses have recently added additional international venues in Valencia, Spain and Dublin, Ireland.

In 2011, initial candidates attended field experiences at schools with low percentages of ELL students (ranging from 11 to 39% of the school student body). Therefore, the EPP and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction increased offerings of diverse field experience sites. In 2012, Aldine ISD, a large, urban, highly diverse Title I eligible school district was added to the SHIPS group. Title I eligible schools in Madisonville, Bryan, Willis, and Montgomery have also been added to the SHIPS partnership. The results of these additions have been positive. In 2014, candidates participated in field experiences at schools with between 17% and 60% ELL populations.

Advanced programs

Master's Programs in LLSP

READ 5312: Second Language Literacy was added as a new course in response to data suggesting candidates needed additional support in predicting difficulties faced by a language learner, strategies to meet needs of second language learners, and the sociocultural factors for pluralistic teaching. An audit of all course syllabi in the Reading Master's program was conducted and revealed that the International Reading Association Diversity Standards were met in four or more courses in the Reading Master's program. This standard states that candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.

M.Ed. in Administration (Principal)

This program engaged in a continuous improvement process to infuse effective candidate instruction related to diverse student groups throughout the required course curriculum. A committee of EDAD faculty met throughout the fall 2014 semester to review course syllabi and incorporate and integrate a more practical and social justice perspective into all required courses. Recommendations for course improvements are forthcoming.

Ed.D. in Ed. Leadership (Superintendents)

The Ed.D. has gone through several changes in response to the program's participation in Graduate Program Review, student feedback, and a growing desire by faculty to better align courses to the department mission statement ["To prepare culturally responsive leaders for social change."] Overall, doctoral candidate dispositions have been strong in "respect for diverse viewpoints" from the Candidate Dispositions Review. However, the doctoral program's Graduate Program Review identified the need to reflect upon and review the curriculum. A faculty review team and doctoral director recognized a need to infuse more content related to the instruction of diverse groups of students. This improvement was incorporated into EDLD 7332: Instructional Theory and Applications in spring 2014. (See Ed.D. Grad. Program Review Self-Study, Report, and Action Plan).

M.Ed. in School Counseling

COUN 5392: Cross-Cultural Issues in Counseling is now a required course and is offered to candidates as a face-to-face course in lieu of online. Feedback from students on alumni surveys and from current students indicated concerns in regards to diversity in counseling settings. The program faculty also refined their Counselor Proficiencies and developed their Counselor Potential Scales to highlight the importance of several core competency areas, including the acceptance of diverse ideas and values. This improvement was in response to candidate feedback for more frequent and early feedback on performance.

10000 character limit

4.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

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

During the last NCATE visit, the unit received an Area for Improvement in Standard 4 related to advanced programs. The text of this Area for Improvement reads: "In advanced programs, the

demonstration of diversity proficiencies reflected in graduate course syllabi are assessed inconsistently."

In the years following the NCATE visit, diversity assessment has been a major focus of the unit. First, the unit developed statements of the kinds of outcomes it hopes to see in all candidates represented in the Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies (DDPs) (See DDP Trend and Diversity Profile Data). Next, the unit, with support from the Assessment Committee, developed a Unit Assessment System Matrix which mapped these DDPs throughout the curricula in each program and specific courses. From here, faculty implemented the DDP statements in their courses by creating assignments and learning experiences to support these DDP statements throughout the 2011-2012 academic year. The Assessment Committee also developed rubrics supporting the assessment of diversity-related outcomes. Once faculty developed assignments, candidates in each course were to submit specific assignments in the unit's data management and assessment system, Tk20. Faculty then assess each candidate's assignment using the faculty-developed rubric associated with the DDP mapped to their course. In this way the faculty provide feedback to candidates on their performance and dispositions related to diversity. Evidence of diversity proficiencies related to course syllabi can be found in Exhibit 5.4b which includes a sample of relevant syllabi mentioned in this report. Syllabi across the unit for the past 3 years will be available during the site visit.

Unit faculty have found the diversity profile section of the DDP to be especially helpful in identifying the extent to which candidates have been exposed to different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools while candidates engage in field experiences (See DDP Trend and Profile Data).

A significant facet of the DDP system is the ability to support aggregate data decisions and disaggregation of data for program-level decisions. For example, in 2014, DDP data for advanced programs indicate advanced candidates have strong skills in their thoughtfulness in communication and awareness of varying voices (DDP 4), their understanding of diverse populations (DDP 6), their commitment to literacy, inquiry, and reflection (DDP 8), and adapting instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners (DDP 10) with greater than 91% of candidates performing at the consistently proficient level. In contrast, 2014 data support the idea that candidate performance was the weakest in their use of technology to create an authentic learning environment that promotes problem-solving and decision making for diverse learners (DDP 2) (See DDP Trend and Profile Data). These findings are supported by other data such as the Graduate/Employer Survey and course-specific assessments. Finally, advanced programs often set up experiences for candidates to engage diverse learners through field experiences. As such, the unit began tracking field placements of advanced candidates in the spring 2014 and fall 2014 semesters. Using data from candidates about where they conducted their field experiences, the unit is able to obtain actual demographic data for the schools in which field experiences are conducted. This allows the unit to engage in conversations about the kinds of diversity it hopes candidates are engaging and whether a threshold level of diversity exposure is met. Consequently, this allows the unit to recommend the addition of more or fewer specific kinds of schools to partner with for field experiences (See Field Experience Demographic Data). Advanced program candidates continue to work in highly diverse environments, and online programs have opened new regions for programs to connect with diverse learners. These aggregate data have supported the Unit's efforts to improve diversity-related educational efforts for all candidates and disaggregated data inform program-level decisions.

Based upon 2014 data, the Professional Development committee determined that faculty would benefit from additional training and support of faculty's abilities to teach candidates from ethnically-diverse backgrounds. The unit offered a diversity professional development seminars for faculty on January 16, and Feb. 6, 2015, led by internationally-renowned scholars, Dr. Kelli-Peck-Parrot (generational diversity) and Dr. James Anderson (globalization and internationalization). The Assessment Committee will continue to review DDP data to determine specific changes or improvements in candidates' performance related to diversity.

DDP data have also been very beneficial to a number of programs. As previously mentioned, program faculty have found the DDP assessment process useful in examining the extent to which candidates were exposed to students of different backgrounds in field experiences. Specific examples of how number of advanced programs have improved based upon DDP data are reviewed under section 4.2b of this report. The unit has taken a number of steps to improve its application of the DDPs and, through them, its support of candidates' abilities related to diversity.

The unit's renewed commitment to candidates' skills and abilities related to diversity was affirmed in the spring 2015 semester when members of the Assessment Committee recommended that a committee of faculty regularly review DDP content to ensure that the language in the DDPs accurately reflects the desired outcomes for advanced programs. This was done because of the faculty's commitment to offering innovative and relevant content to candidates and the introduction of new programs since the original development of the DDPs in 2011. After faculty recognized that the technical abilities for collecting data were sufficiently implemented, they began to reflect upon the content of the advanced-level DDPs and sought differentiation from the initial-level DDP statements for all DDPs. A committee consisting of faculty from all advanced programs has been convened and is chaired by Dr. Rebecca Bustamante, Associate Professor and past chair of the NCATE Standard 4 committee that originally drafted the DDP statements. If the committee determines refinements are needed, new DDP statements and additional documentation and rubrics will be available during the site visit. The system of data collection administered through Tk20 has been beneficial to program level and unit level changes and it is anticipated that, if any DDP content changes are developed, the course-based system of data collection and assessment will be retained as it is a strength of the Unit.

The unit has made numerous improvements in assessing advanced candidates' abilities and augmenting curriculum and instruction based upon assessment data. This is due to the faculty commitment to diversity, candidate recognitions of the importance of diversity to their professional skillset, and administrative support of diversity assessment efforts

12000 character limit

4.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

4.4.a	Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning
4.4.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.4.c	Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.4.d	Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)
4.4.e	Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)
4.4.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)
4.4.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.4.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.4.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

Exhibit 4.4.b: Diversity Curriculum Components

Exhibit 4.4.c: DDP Assessment Instruments (See also Exhibit 1.4.e)

Exhibit 4.4.d: Faculty Demographics

Exhibit 4.4.e: Candidate Demographics Chart
Exhibit 4.4.g: Faculty Recruiting Policies
Exhibit 4.4.h: Candidate Recruitment Policies
Exhibit 4.4.i: Candidate Support Policies
Student Catalogs
Conceptual Framework
Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies Matrix
Syllabi Template
Description of Field Experiences by Level
Exhibit 4.4.f: Field Placement Diversity Demographics
DDP Trend and Profile Data
Unit Assessment System Matrix
Candidate Disposition Form
Affirmative Action Plan
Sample Diversity Insider Recruitment
Ed.D. Grad. Program Review Self-Study, Report, and Action Plan
Ed. D. Dissertations and Presentation Titles
Exhibit 4.4.a: Aggregate DDP Data
CIE Successes

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

The faculty in the unit represent a productive, innovative, passionate body of scholars committed to improving education and society through their teaching, research, and service. The unit seeks highly qualified candidates to join the faculty and searches have been successful in attracting innovative scholars from diverse ethnicities, doctoral programs, regions, and backgrounds.

The unit considers faculty experience, qualifications, teaching effectiveness, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, and honors, awards, and scholarly work in its selection of new faculty and evaluation of currently employed faculty. The unit employs 100 full-time faculty at the ranks of full professor (22), associate professor (29), assistant professor (47), and clinical professor (2), all of whom hold the terminal degree in their field of employment. In 2014, the unit

employed 63 adjunct instructors most of whom also held the terminal degree in their field. A few adjunct instructors hold master's degree with extensive experience in school settings. Adjunct instructors are hired on an as needed basis and often teach one or two courses in select areas. They bring a richness of practical experience as superintendents, principals, counselors, or school and agency leaders. In 2014, 4 doctoral teaching assistants were also employed in the unit.

Evaluation of Faculty Impact on Learning and Knowledge

Adjunct and clinical faculty are evaluated via their annually-reviewed contracts. Teaching evaluations are considered by department chairs in renewing adjunct or clinical faculty members' contracts. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated through the SHSU Promotion and Tenure Process (See Academic Policy 900417) and the Faculty Evaluation System. Each year, full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty submit dossiers for review by their Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPTC). Faculty are expected to submit documentation of effectiveness in teaching, research and publication, and service. As noted in Academic Policy 820317, teaching effectiveness accounts for 40% percent of the weight in the faculty evaluation system, research and scholarly productivity accounts for 40%, and service accounts for 20% of the weight in determining overall faculty effectiveness.

Teaching

Faculty in the unit are among the most innovative instructors in their disciplines, the university, and the nation. Each fall and spring, SHSU participates in the IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment), a nationally-normed instrument for use when candidates evaluate teaching effectiveness in individual courses (See IDEA Form). Data from the 2014 unit-wide IDEA evaluation indicate that candidates rank 74% of COE classes higher than the SHSU average in all areas of the IDEA evaluation (See 2014 IDEA COE Report). Sixty-six percent of COE faculty are rated above average compared to colleagues at SHSU.

Through the Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion System (Academic Policy 900417) process, faculty must submit a Faculty Evaluation System Form 1 and Faculty Evaluation System Form 2. Note: FES Form 2 is a faculty members' vitae. These forms include sections related to IDEA Teaching Effectiveness scores, a self-reflection of teaching activities, evidence from course-specific teaching effectiveness evaluations, and narrative descriptions of teaching effectiveness. DPTCs review these data and recommend improvements for faculty needing support in teaching improvements. Department Chairs provide this feedback to all faculty, and as needed, develop an improvement plan in specific areas of concern.

Research and Scholarly Endeavors

Beyond hiring qualified, passionate instructors, the unit also values faculty contributions to knowledge and society through research and scholarly endeavors. Each year, faculty submit a vita and a self-reflection of research productivity and impact via Faculty Evaluation System Form 3 (attached). This form, along with artifacts of research impact, are reviewed each year by DPTCs, and professors needing additional guidance are offered feedback via Department Chairs in annual Faculty Evaluation System meetings.

Scholarly and/or creative accomplishments are integral to the university's mission and one of the three categories for evaluating faculty. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, production of basic and applied research, writing and publications, scholarly grant development, scholarly grant acquisition, presentations to professional and learned societies, and professional development directly related to scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. The unit actively promotes scholarship for all classifications of faculty. As stated in Academic Policy Statement 820317.4.04 (attached), each college determines specific performance standards related to scholarship with input of respective faculty members at the department/school and/or program level.

The unit tracks faculty credentials and scholarly productivity through a database called SEDONA. Over the course of their careers, full professors have published 1,617 scholarly articles and 389 books, Associate Professors have published 631 articles and 175 books, Assistant Professors have published 464 articles and 90 books, and adjunct instructors have published 125 articles and 130 books. Full time, tenured or tenure-track faculty have produced a total of 2,712 articles and 654 books over the course of their careers. Including adjunct instructors increases the total number of articles to 2,855 articles and books to 801. Across the course of their careers, Full Professors participated in 2,967 conference presentations, Associate Professors have participated in 1,550 presentations, Assistant Professors participated in 1,117 presentations, and adjunct professors participated in 203 presentations for a total of 5,858 presentations. Unit faculty have clearly demonstrated outstanding scholarly and creative accomplishments in the past accreditation cycle. In 2014, the 98 full-time tenured or tenure track faculty published 189 articles and 28 books, a ratio of 2.21 publications for every faculty member. Grant funding has been a concerted, focused effort and faculty have many examples of successes with additional grant proposals currently in development.

The unit's faculty and affiliated Educator Preparation Program faculty have a demonstrated commitment to scholarship at the state, national, regional, and international level. Between 2011 and 2015 faculty were awarded \$2,970,713.78 in grant funding for 28 research and educational projects. Moreover, a number of faculty have obtained specific research awards worth mentioning. A listing of professional organization service and awards is found in Exhibits 5.4.a and 5.4.e.

A measure of a life is its service.

As a community of scholars, SHSU abides by its motto: "A measure of a life is its service." Each year, DPTCs review tenured and tenure-track faculty involvement in service related activities, including service to the department, college, university, profession, and society. Service activities are evaluated using Faculty Evaluation System Form 4 and include numerous opportunities for faculty to engage in departmental, college, and institutional service. In regards to professional service, faculty have a broad reach and influence a number of important professional organizations and policy areas. A sample of service efforts can be found in COE Committees, and detailed descriptions of faculty service are offered in Exhibits 5.4.a and 5.4.e.

Finally, SHSU faculty have participated in research and service activities in a number of international venues. The Center for International Education has already enjoyed tremendous service success connecting candidates and faculty with learners in unique learning environments around the globe. Faculty and candidates have supported learning, educational development, and sustainability in Uganda, Costa Rica, Turkey, Israel, Russia, the United Kingdom, Ireland, China, Hungary, Egypt, Brazil. As the Center for International Education has recently been established, efforts have been initialized and were formalized at recent Data Day events to develop a system for evaluating and assessing the impact of international experiences on student and candidate learning and education in visited regions.

Each year colleagues are awarded college-level excellence awards for teaching, research, service, and community engagement. Many faculty within the unit have won prestigious university-wide or professional organization teaching awards (See College and University Excellence Award Winners).

10000 character limit

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

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

15000 character limit

5.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

During the last accreditation cycle, a number of changes have been implemented as a result of data collected on Standard 5. First, the institution has developed an affirmative action and targeted recruitment plan (Please Affirmative Action Plan and Policy 800114.4 Commitment to Diversity). When faculty and administrators are hired, special attention is paid to attracting diverse candidates. Additionally, faculty search committee chairs have made a concerted, deliberate effort to attract qualified faculty in their field. As evidenced by the fact that all faculty hold a terminal degree, the unit has maintained a firm commitment to hiring highly qualified faculty and anticipates doing so in the foreseeable future.

Significant improvements have been made in terms of acculturating new tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as adjunct faculty into the unit's approach to assessment. Adjunct faculty were offered the opportunity to participate in an Adjunct Training session and were given a newly developed Adjunct Handbook and Orientation (<http://tinyurl.com/q4xro5x>). A number of programs have established experienced, full-time tenured or tenure-track mentors for adjunct faculty. Beginning in the spring 2015 semester, the Assistant Dean of Assessment also began meeting with new adjunct and full-time faculty in person and online to sustain their development and support of the Unit Assessment System and the course-based assessment practices as well.

Retaining Highly Qualified Faculty

The system of collegiality, support, and freedom afforded our highly qualified faculty has led to a work environment many faculty say they thoroughly enjoy. SHSU has been named A Great College to Work For by the Chronicle of Higher Education an unprecedented 5 years in a row. The unit has enjoyed stable success in retaining qualified, effective faculty through a commitment to mentorship; annual, formative evaluation of faculty efforts; and a culture of collegiality. We envision sustaining this approach in the foreseeable future.

10000 character limit

5.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

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

Given the unit's commitment to hiring, developing, and retaining highly qualified, effective faculty, no areas for improvement were noted in this area in prior accreditation visits.

12000 character limit

Exhibit 5.4.a - Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled below from data submitted in the Manage Faculty section of AIMS or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit.

5.4 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.4.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.)
5.4.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P-12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.4.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.4.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.4.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.4.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.4.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

Exhibit 5.4.a: Full Time Faculty Qualifications Table
Exhibit 5.4.b: Clinical Faculty Qualifications Table
Exhibit 5.4.c: Policies for Clinical Faculty
Exhibit 5.4.d: Policies and Samples of faculty scholarly activities
Exhibit 5.4.e: Summary of Service and Collaborative Activities in Schools
Exhibit 5.4.f: Faculty Evaluation Results
Exhibit 5.4.g: Professional Development Resources
Academic Policy 900417
Academic Policy 820317
IDEA Form
2014 IDEA COE Report
Faculty Evaluation System Form 1
Faculty Evaluation System Form 3
Faculty Evaluation System Form 4
COE Committees
College and University Excellence Award Winners
Affirmative Action Plan
Academic Policy 800114.4 Commitment to Diversity
Academic Policy Statement 820317

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1 Unit Governance and Resources

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

At SHSU, the governance system is structured in a way to make the best use of resources allocated to the unit. The Dean of the COE serves as the head of the unit and has the authority to make budgetary and programmatic decisions within and for the unit. She does so from the perspective of collaborative leadership and with a commitment to shared governance. Because of her view of collaborative leadership, there are many COE members involved in the direction the unit chooses to take. The Dean works effectively with Deans from other colleges, the Associate Deans and Assistant Dean, Department Chairs, and faculty within the unit and from other colleges with programs that serve candidates. The Associate/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, and administrative support staff comprise the Executive Council. These individuals ensure that professional, state and institutional standards are met and that the resources needed to address the successful implantation of programs are available. The COE has two full time associate deans and one half-time assistant dean, as well as a director of accountability and accreditation services, a director of the EPP, coordinators of teacher certification and assessment, a transfer adviser, administrative support staff, graduate assistants, and student workers. An organizational chart (Exhibit 6.4.b) provides an overview of the structure within the unit including the five departments and support offices. This structure gives us the most latitude and the expertise to address standards and use of available resources.

The unit makes use of committees comprised of faculty and staff, within the unit and partner colleges on campus, to address program planning, resource sharing/allocation, and other issues related to our mission of providing quality professionals dedicated to serving students in P-12 settings. Faculty from the COE, College of Humanities and Social Sciences (COHS), College of Sciences (CS), College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication (CFAMC), and the College of Allied and Health Sciences (CAHS) comprise an advisory committee that meets to discuss program issues and to provide support and guidance to the educator preparation program. Representatives from these colleges serve on accreditation committees, assessment committees, and dispositions and professional concerns committees in order to provide ongoing evaluation needed for continuous improvement.

SHSU recently dedicated the Steele Center for Professional Practice. Funding provided by the Steele family endowment allowed the unit to equip a center dedicated to providing the staff the resources needed to coordinate field experiences, maintain a professional relationship with the approximately 55 independent school districts in our professional partnership, and facilitate the process of moving from an entry level educator preparation candidate to certified teacher.

Dedication to a well-conceptualized curriculum is a university wide initiative. Curriculum decisions and changes are initiated at the program and or department level, but must then be vetted by department, college, and university level curriculum committees before courses are added or subtracted from a program. This process ensures that adequate thought has gone into such changes and that resources are

available for optimum implementation. The formal charge and membership of the curriculum committee can be found online at <http://tinyurl.com/k7ohmry>.

The Dean of Graduate Studies works closely with the unit to support programs at the advanced level. Several graduate programs in the unit lead to professional certificates qualifying educators to work in various capacities in the P-12 setting. The Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Programs works with the Graduate Council at the university level and with advisers and program coordinators within the unit to ensure coordination and effectiveness. The Steele Center for Professional Practice provides support for field experiences, certification, and TExES Certification Exams for the unit. Additionally, the Office of Graduate Studies supports the unit with funding to assist with graduate faculty travel when presenting at educational conferences. Faculty can request this funding that is in addition to the funding they receive at the department level, thus allowing them to attend a conference they might otherwise have to miss. The unit also receives funding to support graduate candidate travel if a candidate is presenting. This funding source is a fairly rare occurrence for graduate programs and helps to set the graduate programs at SHSU apart from many others.

SHSU is committed to providing the funding colleges need to hire faculty and staff needed to make sure programs meet the standards required of their accrediting agencies. Funding is generally perceived as adequate. The percentage of funding provided to the university from the state continues to decline; thus increases in tuition fill the gap. However, the unit has maintained a fiscally conservative budgetary philosophy and, thus, currently enjoys strong levels of financial support. Facilities in the unit include the Eleanor and Charles Garrett Teacher Education Center, the SHSU Woodlands Center, the SHSU University Park Center, and sites in several partner schools. Facilities offer first-rate technology and adequate classroom space to support the unit's mission and conceptual framework. The unit is adequately funded to support its mission and Exhibit 6.4.f documents the unit's budget in relation to other colleges on campus. The unit has a longstanding commitment to maintaining high levels of travel funds for faculty. Faculty currently have between \$1500 and \$2000 annually to support professional travel. The unit is well funded and highly supported by campus leaders to accomplish its mission and goals.

The typical tuition and fees for full-time undergraduate candidates are approximately \$3,511, which is still below the statewide average of \$3,933 measured by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating board. SHSU has consistently received the second lowest percentage of funds from the State of Texas compared to all other Texas colleges or universities. However, SHSU is able to accomplish high levels of candidate retention, participate in international experiences, develop new programs, support research, and engage other areas of innovation because of a fiscally conservative philosophy of faculty and administrators on campus. Recently the university has gone to a strategic planning model to ensure that initiatives are funded and that colleges get as much support as possible. The financial history of SHSU demonstrates financial stability. Close to 48% of all university monies are funneled to academic affairs and campus leaders have pointed out that the university operates with a "lean administration." However, this lean administration often puts pressures on services (i.e. advising, registration, student affairs, etc.), and the amount of work staff are expected to complete is high. The Unit Services and Operations Survey has offered excellent data for improvement within the unit, but the "lean administration" philosophy on campus sees staff doing all they do when other universities of comparable enrollments often have more staff to support candidate needs. The University has maintained a low candidate to faculty ratio (24:1) by focusing funding and strategic planning efforts on academic affairs, a commitment reiterated by Provost Jaime Hebert in the last round of strategic planning efforts.

Another area of need within the unit directly tied to funding is our reliance on adjunct faculty to cover many of our course offerings. The growing dependence on adjuncts is a national issue, not just a SHSU issue. However, the unit values the practical experience, innovation, and connections adjunct instructors bring to their positions and candidate learning in the unit. The unit does not have a goal to be completely "adjunct free." Instead, Executive Council and the Dean's Office are examining how reductions in

adjunct instructors would influence budgets, course offerings, and the possibilities of securing more full time loads. This is a particular issue of concern for this unit as faculty and staff continue to try to do more with less.

10000 character limit

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

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

15000 character limit

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

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

The unit has a distinguished history of using data to make changes and continuous improvement of candidate performance and unit efficiency. College and university leaders have a documented commitment to evidence-based decision making and change. The following are a sample of changes made to improve unit efficiency:

As of 2011 Academic Affairs has adopted an institutional budget planning process that is connected to the institution's strategic planning process. As faculty and staff in individual departments engage in strategic planning each year, they are asked to also prioritize their budgetary requests and support these requests with data. Previous requests have included additions of faculty lines in fast-growing programs, physical building renovation requests, and additions of staff positions for advising.

The unit has begun an ongoing, long-term review of the current overreliance on adjunct instructors. Executive Council members are in the process of discussing program needs to determine an optimum level of course needs so that the Council can reflect upon the possibility of adding full-time faculty lines or maintaining current adjunct levels.

The Executive Council implemented a new approach to budgetary requests in 2014. Departments were not seen as competing against each other but advocating for departmental needs as a part of larger unit contexts. Calling upon enrollment data, strategic planning initiatives, and this new approach, the

Executive Council developed budgetary requests that supported candidate enrollment, new faculty and administrative positions, and physical renovations. Members of the Executive Council commented that they enjoyed the opportunity to share input with the Dean and found the process to be collegial and to highlight areas for current and future needs.

Most of these changes were initiated by faculty and supported by administrative leaders. Changes such as these document the unit's leadership, budgetary solvency, commitment to shared governance, and commitment to offering candidates quality experiences.

10000 character limit

6.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

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

No Areas for Improvement were noted for this Standard in the prior accreditation visit.

12000 character limit

6.4 Exhibits for Standard 6

6.4.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.4.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.4.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.4.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.4.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.4.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable
6.4.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.4.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.4.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.4.j	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable

Exhibit 6.4.a: Governance Policies
Exhibit 6.a.b: Organizational chart
Exhibit 6.4.c: Services policies
Exhibit 6.4.d: Recruitment Policies and Samples
Exhibit 6.4.e: Calendars, Catalogs, etc.
Exhibits 6.4.f and 6.4.g: Unit and Comparable Unit Budget
Exhibit 6.4.h: Faculty Workload Policies and Report
Exhibit 6.4.i: Policies on Physical Access
Exhibit 6.4.j: Policies on Virtual Access

See **Attachment** panel below.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to submit.