

BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

N C A T E

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

ACCREDITATION VISIT TO:

Webster University
Webster Groves, Missouri
October 28 – November 1, 2006

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Ronald P. Colbert, Chair

Linda S. Buyer
Carol Doll
Michael Plumley
Kathryn E. Turning
Xiaodan Huang
Judith Walker

State Consultant:

J. Michael Lucas

Type of Visit

First **XXX**
Continuing ___
Combination ___
Probation ___
Focused ___

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	4
II. Conceptual Framework	16
III. Findings for Each Standard	
Standard 1	20
Standard 2	36
Standard 3	46
Standard 4	51
Standard 5	59
Standard 6	68
IV. Sources of Evidence	78
V. Corrections to the Institutional Report	

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution: Webster University

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	NM	NM
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	NM	NM
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4	Diversity	M	M
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6	Unit Governance and Resources	M	M

M = Standard Met
NM = Standard Not Met

INTRODUCTION

A. The Institution

Webster University, Webster Groves, Missouri gets its early history from the Sisters of Loretta, who were catholic pioneers in 1915. Webster College, as the institution was then known, became an independent and coeducational graduate institution in 1967. In 1983 the name was changed to Webster University. The university is a private nonprofit, accredited international university offering undergraduate and graduate degree programs in liberal arts and sciences, fine and performing arts, business and technology, communication and education. It identifies itself with a wide range of academic programs at its home campus in Webster Groves (suburban St. Louis) and four other metropolitan St. Louis locations. It has locations on military bases across the United States and at metropolitan sites in 28 other cities. International campuses include Europe, Bermuda, China and Thailand. There are 106 campuses worldwide.

The University currently enrolls approximately 20,500 students worldwide who range in age from traditional college age to adult learners, and represent over 100 nationalities. Webster lies in the greater St. Louis metropolitan area with a population of more than 200 million people. The university offers many opportunities for students to be enriched by the St. Louis social and cultural attractions.

President Richard Meyers who is the chief executive officer of the worldwide institution leads Webster University. Teacher Education occupies a primary position within the University. Teacher education has received priority attention in the mission and strategic planning of the institution since its founding. Deans report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Deans head the schools and colleges including the School of Business and Technology, The Leigh Gardiner College of Fine Arts, the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Communications and the School of Education.

The Webster Groves campus has extensive facilities including a University Center, Business and Technology Complex, Performing Arts Center and a recently completed five-story library (2003). The Webster Groves campus has student residences and numerous instructional classroom buildings and offices. A new business and technology building is in the planning stage and construction is scheduled for 2008.

In the fall 2005, the University enrolled 7,395 students at the Webster Groves, St. Louis Campus. Of those 3,549 were undergraduate and 3,846 graduates. In the overall enrollment of the worldwide campus system are 20,296 with the undergraduate enrollment of 4,899 and a graduate enrollment of 15,397. The Webster Groves enrollment trends shows 2,781 were men, 4,614 women. The spring 2006 enrollment reports 3,259 undergraduate and 11,494 graduate students.

The university offers 57 baccalaureate majors in the arts and sciences, business and technology, communications, education and fine arts. The university maintains graduate

programs that span the spectrum of disciplines to include 42 at the master’s level, one Education Specialist, and 1 doctoral program in Management.

The Higher Learning Commission, formally the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools accredits the University. In 1997 the Commission acted to accept the Periodic Review Report submitted by Webster University and to reaffirm accreditation. The Accreditation includes undergraduate and graduate levels at all locations where the university offers programs.

In addition, the University has accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music, the National League for Nursing, the National Board for Certified Counselors, and the American Bar Association (paralegal program). The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has responsibility for accrediting all teacher preparation programs.

B. The Unit

The Dean of the School of Education is delegated full responsibility by the President and Vice President for administering the policies for all initial and advanced education programs offered at the university. The unit is organized in three departments: Multidisciplinary Studies; Communication Arts, Reading, and Early Childhood; and Teacher Education.

In spring 2006, 1150 candidates were enrolled in the professional education programs. This number included 198 undergraduates and 954 graduate candidates across all programs.

The unit offers B.A. in Education with initial teacher certification, B.A. in Education, without initial certification, initial certification in conjunction with a B.A. in other fields, M.A.T. degrees, initial certification at the post-baccalaureate level, advanced certifications, and an Ed.S. Degree. Table 1.1 summarizes program data for each program and the state and professional association reviews

Table IN.1 Award, Level, and State/ SPA Review Decisions of School of Education Programs

Program Name	Award Level	Program level	Grade/Age Level	Number of candidates Spring 2006	Association reviewing program (SPA)	Status of Program Reports (DESE)
General Non-Certification	B.A.	N/A	N/A	2	NA	State Approved
Early Childhood	B.A.	Initial	Birth-3	33	NA	State Approved

Program Name	Award Level	Program level	Grade/Age Level	Number of candidates Spring 2006	Association reviewing program (SPA)	Status of Program Reports (DESE)
Elementary	B.A.	Initial	1-6	75	NA	State Approved
Middle Language Arts	B.A.	Initial	5-9	6	NA	State Approved
Middle Mathematics	B.A.	Initial	5-9	5	NA	State Approved
Middle Science	B.A.	Initial	5-9	2	NA	State Approved
Middle Social Studies	B.A.	Initial	5-9	3	NA	State Approved
Secondary Art	B.A.	Initial	K-12	6	NA	State Approved
Secondary English	B.A.	Initial	9-12	6	NA	State Approved
Secondary Foreign Language	B.A.	Initial	K-12	2	NA	State Approved
Secondary Journalism	B.A.	Initial	9-12	0	NA	State Approved
Secondary Mathematics	B.A.	Initial	9-12	2	NA	State Approved
Secondary Music: Choral	B.A.	Initial	K-12	24	NA	State Approved
Secondary Music: Instrumental	B.A.	Initial	K-12			
Secondary Social Studies	B.A.	Initial	9-12	29	NA	State Approved
Secondary Unified Science	B.A.	Initial	9-12	2	NA	State Approved
Special Education Mild/Moderate	B.A.	Initial	K-12	19	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Early Childhood Certification	N/A.	Initial	Birth-3	M.A.T. 19 PBC 1	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Early Childhood Special Education Certification	N/A.	Initial	Birth-3	M.A.T.1 PBC 1	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Elementary Certification	N/A.	Initial	1-6	M.A.T. 31 PBC 5	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Middle Level Certification	N/A.	Initial	5-9	M.A.T. 15 PBC 2	NA	State Approved

Program Name	Award Level	Program level	Grade/Age Level	Number of candidates Spring 2006	Association reviewing program (SPA)	Status of Program Reports (DESE)
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Art	N/A	Initial	K-12	M.A.T. 15 PBC 3	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary English	N/A.	Initial	9-12	M.A.T. 16 PBC 3	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Foreign Language	N/A	Initial	K-12	M.A.T. 4 PBC 0	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Journalism	N/A	Initial		M.A.T. 0 PBC 0	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Mathematics	N/A	Initial	9-12	M.A.T. 12 PBC 3	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Music K-12	N/A	Initial	K-12	M.A.T. 4 PBC 2	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Science	N/A	Initial	9-12	M.A.T. 2 PBC 0	NA	State Approved
Graduate Students Seeking Secondary Social Studies	N/A	Initial	9-12	M.A.T. 21 PBC 2	NA	State Approved
Graduate Seeking Special Education	N/A	Initial	K-12	M.A.T. 30 PBC 3	NA	State Approved
ESOL Certification	N/A	Advanced	K-12	M.A.T. 3 PBC 2	NA	State Approved
Gifted Certification	N/A.	Advanced	K-12	M.A.T. 0 PBC 0	NA	State Approved
Reading Certification	N/A	Advanced	K-12	M.A.T. 14 PBC 4	IRA Nationally Recognized	State Approved
Severe Developmental Disabilities	N/A.	Advanced	B-12	M.A.T. 2 PBC 0	NA	State Approved
Communication Arts	M.A.T.	Advanced	No	147	NA	State

Program Name	Award Level	Program level	Grade/Age Level	Number of candidates Spring 2006	Association reviewing program (SPA)	Status of Program Reports (DESE)
			Certification			Approved
Early Childhood	M.A.T	Advanced	No Certification	62	NA	State Approved
Educational Technology	M.A.T.	Advanced	No Certification	98	NA	State Approved
Multidisciplinary	M.A.T.	Advanced	No Certification	36173 STL 41 CRY 150 KC	NA	State Approved
Social Science	M.A.T.	Advanced	No Certification	49	NA	State Approved
Special Education	M.A.T.	Advanced	No Certification	98	NA	State Approved
Educational Specialist (Majors: LEAD or SSSL) Certification Areas: Principal/Director/Superintendent	Ed.S.	Advanced	Ed.S Degree without Certification or Principal, K-8 Principal, 7-12; Director K-12 Director, or Superintendent K-12	59	NA	State Approved

NA= Non Applicable STL = St. Louis Campus CRY= Crystal Lake Campus KC= Kansas City Campus
MAT= Master of Arts PBC = Post Baccalaureate

The advanced programs including the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degrees in Communication Arts, Early Childhood, Educational Technology, Mathematics, Multidisciplinary Studies, Social Science, and Special Education candidates are differentiated from initial teacher preparation programs because they were designed to promote the professional development of practicing teachers seeking enrichment in content fields. The unit stopped accepting candidates to the M.A.T. in Science in 2004. They have an unmistakable alignment to the vision outlined in the Webster University Mission Statement. The variety of the M.A.T. advanced programs includes:

1. The Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) in Communication Arts is designed around areas in aesthetic education, educational technology, communication arts, foreign language and literature, general communication, inclusive education, language arts, reading, storytelling and drama, and teaching English as foreign language

2. The M.A.T. In Early Childhood Education is designed to support candidates in studying young children and their families from an ecological perspective. The emphasis is on the integration of knowledge of child development, relationships with families and community, developmentally appropriate practice, and the curriculum content areas.
3. The M.A.T. in Educational Technology is a theoretical and practical program designed for application and integration of technologies.
4. The M.A.T. in Mathematics is designed for the classroom Mathematics teacher at the middle or secondary levels. The M.A.T. in Science is designed for elementary and junior high school teachers without extensive background in science.
5. The M.A.T. in Multidisciplinary Studies emphasizes elementary content mastery, curriculum development and instruction. The candidates may select a specialization in a content area, technology or humane and character education.
6. The M.A.T. in Social Science is designed to provide knowledge of the current developments in the social and behavioral sciences as applied to education. Candidates may select emphasis in educational technology, immigrant and refugee studies, inclusive education, middle school, secondary, humane education and character development, and gifted education.
7. The M.A.T. in Special Education is designed for the teachers in specialized educational practices that are appropriate for special needs students. Candidates may select emphasis in emotional and behavioral disorders, inclusive education, severe developmental disabilities, and learning and academic disorders.

The Education Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in continuing studies beyond a master's level is designed for candidates seeking a certification program as an elementary, middle, or high school principal, special education director or Superintendent of school systems. In some cases both the M.A.T. and the Ed.S. are degrees used to enhance the current skills of practicing teachers. Communication Arts, Early Childhood, Multidisciplinary, Social Science and the Ed.S. Program candidates are expected to apply their experiences as practitioners in approaching learning and are expected to be able to understand, conduct, apply, and use research. This was confirmed through a review of the program descriptions, examination of the program assessments and criteria in these programs, and interviews with candidates and faculty.

All certification programs in the unit have met the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) regulations and are currently registered and approved. The International Reading Association nationally recognizes the reading teacher preparation programs.

The unit employs 20 full-time faculty members: eight Professors, 4 associate professors and 8 assistant professors. One of the assistant professors is a visiting professor and not in the tenure or status track.

The unit has undergone numerous program review, curricular, and structural changes to meet the NCATE 2002 performance-based standards and the (DESI) regulations while proceeding towards national recognition by NCATE. Most notably, there have been additions in administrative, faculty and staff personnel prior to the visit including a visiting scholar (minority status) and creation of data personnel.

Distance Learning

The Unit offers graduate courses and degree programs at several of Webster University's Extended Campuses and by special contract in school districts in Illinois and Missouri. Extended campus and school district courses and degree programs have been offered at the following locations:

- Webster University-Kansas City (MO): Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.
- Webster University-Crystal Lake (IL): Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.
- Pattonville School District (MO) PDS: Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.
- Teach for America (St. Louis, MO): Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.
- Woodstock (IL) Community Unit School District 200: Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.
- Community High School District 155, (Crystal Lake, IL): Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T.

All extended campus programs apply the same conceptual framework, program requirements, course contents, and assessment procedures as the home campus Multidisciplinary Studies M.A.T. program.

The Unit has offered 100 percent online courses and online degree programs since 1999. Online courses have been offered in most M.A.T. major areas, and Ed. S. (Education Specialist) majors. The following majors and emphasis areas are currently available as 100 percent online programs:

- Educational Technology
- Multidisciplinary Studies
- Multidisciplinary Studies with Emphasis in humane education and character development
- Multidisciplinary Studies with Emphasis in educational technology
- Multidisciplinary Studies with Emphasis in teaching English as a foreign language
- Multidisciplinary Studies with Emphasis in teaching English as a second language
- School System Superintendency and Leadership (Ed.S.)

Courses and programs delivered online are consistent with the mission of the university and unit. All support the conceptual framework themes. These online programs work to

meet the same challenges of providing conceptual framework data as on-campus programs.

C. The Visit

The NCATE first accreditation visit to the Webster University was concurrent. The NCATE/State protocol for Missouri stipulates the professional education unit will be evaluated according to NCATE standards, while the individual programs for certification will be evaluated according to the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP).

A brief overview of the state of Missouri standards (MoSTEP) that initial certification candidates must meet in order to complete their programs was provided. The school of education (SOE) uses these standards as the criteria for evaluating candidate performance in methods courses, practicum, apprentice (student) teaching and with regard to the professional portfolio. There are 11 MoSTEP standards. These standards and the indicators that support them are shown below:

MoSTEP Standard 1: The pre-service teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

1. knows the discipline applicable to the certification area(s);
2. presents the subject matter in multiple ways;
3. uses students' prior knowledge;
4. engages students in the methods of inquiry used in the discipline;
5. creates interdisciplinary learning.

MoSTEP Standard 2: The pre-service teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of all students.

1. knows and identifies child/adolescent development;
2. strengthens prior knowledge with new ideas;
3. encourages student responsibility;
4. knows theories of learning.

MoSTEP Standard 3: The pre-service teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

1. identifies prior experience, learning styles, strengths, and needs;
2. designs and implements individualized instruction based on prior experience, learning styles, strengths, and needs;
3. knows when and how to access specialized services to meet students' needs;

4. connects instruction to students' prior experiences and family, culture, and community.

MoSTEP Standard 4: The pre-service teacher recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon student, district, and state performance standards.

1. selects and creates learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, relevant to learners, and based upon principles of effective instruction (e.g., encourages exploration and problem solving, building new skills from those previously acquired);
2. creates lessons and activities that recognize individual needs of diverse learners and variations in learning styles and performance;
3. evaluates plans relative to long and short-term goals and adjusts them to meet student needs and to enhance learning.

MoSTEP Standard 5: The pre-service teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development and critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

1. selects alternative teaching strategies, materials, and technology to achieve multiple instructional purposes and to meet student needs;
2. engages students in active learning that promotes the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance capabilities.

MoSTEP Standard 6: The pre-service teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

1. knows motivation theories and behavior management strategies and techniques;
2. manages time, space, transitions, and activities effectively; (lesson)
3. engages students in decision making.

MoSTEP Standard 7: The pre-service teacher models effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

1. models effective verbal/non-verbal communication skills;
2. demonstrates sensitivity to cultural, gender, intellectual, and physical ability differences in classroom communication and in responses to students' communications;
3. supports and expands learner expression in speaking, writing, listening, and other media;
4. uses a variety of media communication tools.

MoSTEP Standard 8: The pre-service teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

1. employs a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques (e.g., observation, portfolios of student work, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, projects, student self-assessments, authentic assessments, and standardized tests) to enhance and monitor her or his knowledge of learning, to evaluate student progress and performances, and to modify instructional approaches and learning strategies;
2. uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities, to help them become aware of their learning behaviors, strengths, needs and progress, and to encourage them to set personal goals for learning;
3. evaluates the effect of class activities on both individual and the class as a whole, collecting information through observation of classroom interactions, questioning, and analysis of student work;
4. maintains useful records of student work and performances and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly, based on appropriate indicators, to student, parents, and other colleagues.

MoSTEP Standard 9: The pre-service teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others. This reflective practitioner actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes the assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more students.

1. applies a variety of self-assessment and problem-solving strategies for reflecting on practice, their influences on students' growth and learning, and the complex interactions between them;
2. uses resources available for professional development;
3. practices professional ethical standards.

MoSTEP Standard 10: The pre-service teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and well-being.

1. participates in collegial activities designed to make the entire school a productive learning environment;
2. talks with and listens to students, is sensitive and responsive to signs of distress, and seeks appropriate help as needed to solve students' problems;
3. seeks opportunities to develop relationships with the parents and guardians of students, and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in support of student learning and well-being;
4. identifies and uses the appropriate school personnel and community resources to help students reach their full potential.

MoSTEP Standard 11: The pre-service teacher understands the theory and application of technology in educational settings and has adequate technological skills to create meaningful learning opportunities for all students.

1. demonstrates an understanding of technology operations and concepts.
2. plans and designs effective learning environments and experiences supported by informational and instructional technology.
3. implements curriculum plans that include methods and strategies for applying informational and instructional technology to maximize student learning.
4. applies technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies.
5. uses technology to enhance personal productivity and professional practice.
6. demonstrates an understanding of the social, ethical, legal and human issues surrounding the use of technology in PK-12 schools and applies that understanding in practice.

The state relies on several sources of information to verify the viability of programs, including both quantifiable and anecdotal data. These sources include: the Institutional Report; candidate portfolios; assessments (CBASE, Praxis II, etc.); curriculum matrices indicating that state-adopted competencies (subject knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge) are addressed; curriculum Matrices indicating that specific requirements (courses, hours, etc.) for certification are present; surveys of graduates and employers; and interviews conducted during the site visit. These data points carry equal value in the evaluation of the individual programs.

Where program matrix data are considered, MoSTEP does not necessarily require the number of assessments or specificity of data that may be required by NCATE's standards. For example, the state team will verify candidate knowledge and skills by examining candidate portfolios randomly selected from programs within the unit. It is not unusual that only one portfolio per program is examined, except in areas where there is a significant number of program completers. The aggregated portfolio data can be an indicator of candidate proficiency across the unit as a whole, but the proficiency of all candidates within a program cannot be determined on the basis of a single candidate's portfolio. Furthermore, as is sometimes the case in smaller programs, candidate performance data may not even be available due to the fact that no candidates may have completed the program in recent years. Sometimes, little or no Praxis II data is available to determine pass rates for candidates in a program, because there have been no recent program completers. Thus, programs may be approved by the Missouri State Board of Education upon the basis of meeting the other criteria (appropriate curriculum, faculty qualifications, etc.) without necessarily having specific candidate performance data.

The individual programs are not required to submit reports to NCATE's specialty professional associations, but this option is available if the program is seeking national recognition. Some unit programs have aligned their programs and candidate proficiencies with specialty associations (e.g. NAEYC, CEC). State members made approval decisions recommending accreditation for each of the programs leading to

licensure. All certification programs in the unit have aligned their programs and candidate proficiencies with Missouri Standards and were approved.

There were seven NCATE Board of Examiners members and five state representatives. Missouri does not require teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities to be NCATE-accredited. The BOE team operated concurrently and relied on interview support and documentation review from the state team. All team members reviewed course syllabi, portfolios, student work, assessments and rubrics. They jointly observed in classes and fieldwork settings. They interviewed faculty, candidates, graduates, employers and constituents. The BOE team reviewed the individual program areas, in addition to the education unit standards. All documentation and data on all degree programs that was provided was examined at the time of the visit. There was a time limit to the accepting of electronic exhibits and hard copy documentation. No data was accepted after 6:20 pm on Tuesday evening. This request was made to maintain the integrity of the review and allow the team to make decisions.

Conceptual Framework

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

A. Introduction

The Webster University faculty and administrators have worked in collaboration with other university faculty and staff and area educators to update common belief statements about the desired characteristics of the program graduates. It appears that the Webster University general education goals and the goals of the School of Education mission impacts many aspects of this campus and its culture. As an institution, the university is committed to combining the cultural and intellectual legacies of the past with meeting the challenges of the present and future. “The university educates diverse populations locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. It strives to create a student centered environment accessible to individuals of diverse ages, cultures, and socioeconomic backgrounds; sustains personalized approaches to education; develops programs that integrate theory with practice; encourages creativity, scholarship, and individual enterprise with students and faculty; and fosters life-long learning and strengthens world wide communities. “

Mission: The School of Education at the university “provides its students with the knowledge, experiences and practical tools that enable them to guide both themselves and others toward lifelong learning. The School is a community of teacher scholars who apply critical reflection and creative energies to enhance learning in schools and other educational settings. The faculty strives to do this by modeling effective teaching practices based on sound theory and research. The personalized approaches make for a challenging, yet supportive environment that permits the risk taking necessary for learning and growth. The School encourages its faculty and students to work actively toward this end, keeping in mind that that the actions must be rooted in visionary yet realistic goals. This thought and action process, underscores the development of an inner-directed self understanding, an outer directed global perspective, and an appreciation of human diversity that arise from both “

Vision: The unit's conceptual framework is encapsulated in its vision: “We all must work to make this world worthy of its children.” (Casals, 1970) and the conceptual framework theme “Developing a world of learners through knowledge, leadership, and life-long learning.”

Goals: Interviews and documentation provided support the premise that faculty is dedicated to developing a world of learners through knowledge, leadership and life-long learning. The school has four goals: 1) to develop knowledgeable learners, 2) informed

instructors, 3) reflective collaborators, and 4) responsive educators. The unit's expectations are that candidates demonstrate;

- knowledge of the subject matter, knowledge of the learner, and knowledge of pedagogy.
- incorporate multiple assessment and instructional strategies based upon research and theory
- reflect on the roles of educators as leaders through collaboration
- demonstrate respect for diversity through responsive teaching.

Webster University has continuously refined the School of Education goals and learner outcomes. Efforts to present candidate proficiencies as aligned to performance outcomes, Department of Education Standards, INTASC Standards and the NCATE accreditation standards have been ongoing. There was limited evidence that the graduate programs for experienced teachers had alignment to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Unit efforts have been made to map competencies from the school of education goals to dispositions and identify performance assessments that will measure the dispositions in field experiences, apprentice teaching, and undergraduate or graduate courses. At the time of the visit, performance assessments are still under refinement and implementation. Faculty is working with standards related to their preparation program and are negotiating the complexities of these standards within the unit. BOE members reviewed the quality of course based assessments in the undergraduate degree program, 19 undergraduate initial certification programs, 19 post baccalaureate initial certification programs, 7 advanced certification programs, 7 M.A.T. programs, and 2 Ed.S. Programs. Anecdotal data indicated that the framework exists within programs but may not be systematically assessed in the unit

Refinement of the conceptual framework has been continuous since 1991 in response to the changes made in the accreditation requirements made by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The conceptual framework structure was outlined in a requested topical presentation on Saturday, via document and in lengthy interviews. The team found that the theory that guides the conceptual framework had limited empirical research cited.

Dispositions: The dispositions, values or commitments of the unit have been broadly outlined and aligned to School of Education Goals and the Missouri Standards. The unit has outlined dispositions that the faculty value in teachers and other school personnel. The dispositions and the proposed components to be assessed in each disposition include;

1. Understands and Respects Self

- Understands and respects that he/she may be different from others
- Embraces and openness to change (adaptability, flexibility)
- Exhibits curiosity
- Engages in reflection

2. Understands and Respects Others

- Understands, respects and responds appropriately to diversity in a variety of settings
- Exhibits empathy
- Commits to fairness and honesty
- Listens respectfully to other points of view

3. Understands and Respects Professional Communities

- Commits to professional behavior in university and school cultures
- Practices informed decision making in university and school cultures
- Communicates and collaborates in university and school cultures
- Accepts academic rigor (willingness to work/high expectations)
- Affects change with courage and confidence.

B. Shared Vision:

Members of the faculty in all educator preparation and advanced programs were able to identify the conceptual framework principles and describe the influence of the conceptual framework in their various programs. All school partners and liberal arts and science colleagues defined these conceptual framework premises. It was evident that constituent members included both college faculty and public school partners.

In forming a conceptual framework design and the accountability factor, the School of Education provides great flexibility in the procedures used by faculty responsible for each program to develop course-based assessments and disposition tools. These course based assessments are expected to be linked to the conceptual framework and involve a combination of coursework products and extensive observation in clinical or field experiences, thus giving candidates opportunities to demonstrate unique capabilities and provide evidence that they have the capacity to “develop a world of learners through knowledge, leadership, and life-long learning.”

C. Coherence

The various program faculty continually review the spirit of the conceptual framework that is embedded in their specific programs at the initial and advanced levels. In preparation for the BOE visit, the unit has documented evidence that the conceptual framework in the various courses is aligned with state standards, and that greater emphasis is now being placed on how to assess dispositions. There was an abundance of professional education coursework that involved reflection that was grounded in conceptual framework practice. The coursework assessments had scoring guides that evaluate the candidate’s development of professional knowledge and skills for their teaching specialty. These scoring guides had a connection to the unit philosophy and had some alignment to the conceptual framework. The same is true for advanced programs that prepare educators for their professions. The desire to deliver content and pedagogy with coherence is typically evidenced by consistency in curriculum and instruction, field

experiences, clinical practices and assessment within programs. Anecdotal data indicated that the framework exists but is not systematically assessed.

D. Commitment to Diversity

Diversity describes the university's service area and mission and makes it a natural component of the conceptual framework. Webster is not comprised of a diverse faculty. However, the faculty in the School of Education has rich, contemporary personal and professional experiences working with diverse, ethnic, racial, language and gender populations. The richness of their experiences is highlighted in their teaching, scholarship and service. The commitment to serve the St. Louis schools is evidenced in all unit programs. Many undergraduate candidates serve and interact with a diverse constituency in their field experiences. Course assignments reflect the preparation of candidates to generally work with diverse populations. Courses provide general understanding and appreciation for differences and serve as the basis for candidate learning (especially special education initiatives). The conceptual framework dispositions generally reflect the unit's obligation to diversity. Although the unit appears committed to diversity it has not fully articulated what candidates are supposed to know and be able to do with regard to diversity. The unit has not clearly identified diversity proficiencies.

F. Commitment to Technology

The unit has strong technology resources available to students, faculty and staff. The team found that the campus supports online courses and degrees. Technology as a communication and learning tool is both evident and fully utilized. Technology use and application was threaded throughout the curriculum. The conceptual framework included the appropriate use of technology to enhance the learning for students. Technology was integrated throughout the curriculum, instruction and field experiences. The extended campus and online programs follow the unit's conceptual framework.

G. Alignment of Proficiencies with Professional and State Standards

The team noted that the coursework and field work are aligned to NCATE standards, institutional standards, MoSTEP standards, and INTASC standards. That undergraduate program faculty clearly integrated the alignment of the conceptual framework to standards is evidenced in individual course syllabi. The knowledge base of the programs was consistent with the learned societies in their discipline. The empirical studies that support the unit themes were not consistently presented.

Courses and programs delivered at the extended campuses and via online are consistent with the mission of the university and unit. These programs work to meet the same challenges of providing conceptual framework data as on-campus programs.

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

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

Level: Initial

A. Content knowledge for teacher candidates

At the initial level, undergraduate candidates must pass the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE) to complete transition point 1 (Admission to Teacher Certification). This is a Missouri State requirement. CBASE is a criterion-referenced examination designed to evaluate academic achievement in core college curriculum: English, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies. It provides a means of determining and tracking student strengths and weaknesses in content. CBASE data compiled from 1999-2005 indicate that 69% of all applicants (1,536) to Webster's School of Education (SOE) passed all sections of the CBASE on their first attempt (cumulative through 10/23/2006.) State passing rate is 66%.

The team collaborated with the DESE team on the results of the MoSTEP indicators (described in the introduction). The indicators supporting each MoSTEP standard are evaluated on four-point Likert scales where 1 = Unsatisfactory, 2 = Nearing Proficiency, 3 = Proficient and 4 = Advanced (although the initial certification faculty have agreed that "4" is to be used exceedingly sparingly). The definition of proficient is "Demonstrates skills and knowledge appropriate for a student completing this key assessment. Meets the targeted standard of the rubric for this assessment." Thus, for each assessment, a score of 3 indicates that the candidate is performing appropriately for his/her level in the program. Candidates are assigned an overall score for each standard that corresponds to the majority evaluation they receive on the indicators. For example, a candidate who was evaluated to be at proficiency ("3") on three of the five indicators for MoSTEP Standard 1 would be assigned an overall score of 3 for that standard regardless of the candidate's score on the other indicators.

The BOE members accepted the findings of the state (DESE) team. The state (DESE) team selected a random sample of 14 candidate portfolios (1 from each program) and scored them on each MoSTEP standard themselves. The DESE results were as follows:

Table DESE 1.1 Portfolio Results

MoSTEP Standard	DESE team evaluation of Professional Portfolios		
	MET	NOT MET	Insufficient Evidence
1	12 (86%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)

2	9 (64%)	5 (36%)	0
3	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0
4	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	0
5	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	0
6	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0
7	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	0
8	8 (57%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)
9	11 (79%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
10	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0
11	14 (100%)	0	0

According to the DESE team, only one MoSTEP standard (#11) was met by 100% of the candidates. An additional seven (7) of the 11 MoSTEP standards were met by between three-quarters and 86% of the candidates. The remaining three (3) MoSTEP standards were met by fewer than two-thirds of the candidates (standards 2, 4, and 8). The DESE team report indicated that they had “no specific concerns” about candidate proficiency on MoSTEP standards 6, 9 and 10. Their concerns about the evidence for the other standards are listed below:

Table 1.2 DESE Questions/Concerns

MoSTEP Standard	DESE team Questions/Concerns
1	Portfolios were weak on linking theorists to practice; candidates do not articulate philosophy in reflections linking artifacts to competencies
2	Theories not linked to lesson plans, methodologies
3	Portfolios lacked documentation of how candidates learn to address racial and other diversity issues; where in curriculum are learning styles addressed; where do candidates learn about accessing services for children with special needs.
4	Little, if any, reference to K-12 standards (including grade level expectations – GLEs); no references to knowledge of district standards
5	No student work samples are included in portfolio artifacts
6	No specific concerns
7	Team notices several cases of misspelled words in writing (reflections; other pieces) among several portfolios examined
8	Majority of portfolios include a minimum of quality artifacts to exemplify various types of assessments (teacher made, standardized, etc.); one portfolio mentioned the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP); no evidence of having to interpret data from

	assessments
9	No specific concerns
10	No specific concerns
11	All portfolios contained good examples of knowledge and use of instructional technology; however, there were no examples of knowledge of ethical practices in the use of technology

The SOE’s evaluation of these same portfolios indicates that all candidates were at least “nearing proficiency” on all MoSTEP indicators (there were a few scores of “2” – nearing proficient – on a couple of indicators – all other indicator scores were 3s). Every single candidate received a rating of proficient (score of 3) on every single MoSTEP standard. Thus, the DESE team and the unit do not agree about how proficient the candidates are with regard to the MoSTEP standards as evidenced by the candidates’ portfolios.

The SOE uses MoSTEP Standards 1 and 4 to evaluate content knowledge during the methods courses, practicum experience and apprentice teaching as well as the professional portfolio. The unit reports the following results (M = mean):

Table 1.3 MoSTEP Content Knowledge Data

Source	Semester(s)	Measure	UG: Initial	PBC: Initial
Methods Sequence	Spring 2006	MoSTEP 1	$M = 2.75, N = 44$	$M = 3, N = 21$
Practicum	Spring 2006	MoSTEP 1	$M = 2.8, N = 21$	$M = 2.8, N = 15$
Practicum	Spring 2006	MoSTEP 4	$M = 2.8, N = 21$	$M = 2.8, N = 15$
Apprentice Teaching	Spring 2005	MoSTEP 1	$M = 3.0, N = 18$	$M = 3.0, N = 8$
	Fall 2006		$M = 2.8, N = 21$	$M = 2.8, N = 13$
	Spring 2006		$M = 2.8, N = 26$	$M = 2.8, N = 19$
Apprentice Teaching	Spring 2005	MoSTEP 4	$M = 3.0, N = 18$	$M = 3.0, N = 8$
	Fall 2006		$M = 2.7, N = 21$	$M = 2.9, N = 13$
	Spring 2006		$M = 2.8, N = 26$	$M = 2.8, N = 19$
Professional Portfolio	2003 – 2006	MoSTEP 1	$M = 3, N = 146$	$M = 3, N = 119$

As can be seen from review of the common rubric scale (IR page 16: Figure 1), *scores of 2.5 do not indicate proficiency; rather they indicate something between “nearing proficiency” and “proficient.”* Thus, in each instance where the mean is below 3.0 that there were candidates whose performance was rated less than proficient.

There was also evidence that the unit is assigning scores of “proficient” to portfolios too readily. As mentioned earlier, the DESE team evaluated a sample of the candidates’ professional portfolios. Every candidate portfolio was scored as proficient on every one of the MoSTEP standards by the unit. The DESE team’s evaluation indicated that not all

of the reviewed portfolios indicated that the candidates were proficient. For example, the results for the two MoSTEP standards that speak to content knowledge and the DESE team's concerns are shown below:

Table 1.4 DESE Team Portfolio Data

MoSTEP Standard	DESE team evaluation of Professional Portfolios		
	MET	NOT MET	Insufficient Evidence
1	12 (86%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
4	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	0

Table 1.5 DESE Results

MoSTEP Standard	DESE team Questions/Concerns
1	Portfolios were weak on linking theorists to practice; candidates do not articulate philosophy in reflections linking artifacts to competencies
4	Little, if any, reference to K-12 standards (including grade level expectations – GLEs); no references to knowledge of district standards

Because of the discrepancy between the DESE scoring of the candidates' performance and the unit's assessment of their performance on the same measures, it is not clear what is known about the candidate's performance with regard to MoSTEP standards 1 and 4.

Data from additional semesters of practicum and methods sequences were requested early in the visit (Sunday morning). They were not made available.

To complete transition point 4 (Program Completion), the initial candidates must pass the appropriate PRAXIS test. In 2004-2005, all programs had pass rates greater than 80% (almost all had 100% pass rates).

Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) approved all of the initial certification programs during their last accreditation cycle. The current DESE team made a recommendation that all of them be approved again. None of the initial certification programs have been submitted for national recognition.

Other content knowledge key assessments include grades in specified courses, meeting a minimum GPA requirement, and numerous course-embedded assessments (for example, lesson and unit plans, and philosophy papers). See Standard 2 of the IR for a complete list of the key assessments. The Program Reports for the undergraduate initial certification programs consistently contain data regarding program completers' Praxis scores, their departmental and overall GPAs, and the results of the portfolio evaluation. The post-baccalaureate initial certification program reports are less comprehensive, they all contain the Praxis scores but only some of them contain the GPAs and portfolio data.

Those that don't present the aggregated data contain links to the raw data maintained by the University Assessment office. Program Report data and analysis of the raw data by the NCATE team indicate that all programs' completers have average GPAs that are above the minimum requirement. Because of the way the unit's database is constructed, they cannot report GPAs for the other transition points.

Data related to the other key assessments of content knowledge was requested early on Sunday morning. The only data related to the other key assessments that had been provided by Monday evening were aggregated data for the five (5) sections of EDUC 3150 (this course provides two key admissions assessments: a grade of B- or better and a philosophy paper that is scored as at least proficient) that were offered in Fall 2005 (3 sections) and Spring 2006 (2 sections). For Fall 2005, 41 candidates were enrolled in EDUC 3150. All except one candidate earned a grade of B- or above (the minimum for this key assessment). Of the 40 candidates who attained a grade of B- or better, 36 were evaluated as proficient on the philosophy paper and four (4) were evaluated as nearing proficiency. The one candidate who scored below B- was evaluated as unsatisfactory on the philosophy paper. In Spring 2006, 22 candidates were enrolled in EDUC 3150. Twenty of them received grades of B- or better and all of them were rated as proficient on the philosophy paper. Two candidates received grades of less than B- and one was evaluated as near proficient and the other as unsatisfactory on the philosophy paper. During an interview with all of the persons involved in admitting undergraduate certification candidates to the School of Education, the team was informed that although the philosophy papers are listed as a key assessment for admission to all of the initial certification programs they are not used to make the admission decisions. This raised a concern about the extent to which the unit is utilizing the key assessments. On Tuesday morning the dean, members of the SOE assessment office (including its director) and members of the NCATE team working on standards 1 and 2 met to discuss the data requests that had not been fulfilled. At that time, two things became very clear. First, the members of the SOE who were in attendance didn't understand that the key assessments that they had listed as associated with specific transition points were to be evaluated before a candidate was allowed to transition to the next stage of the program. For example, the lack of a B- or better in EDUC 3150 will only stop a candidate from entering apprentice teaching: it will not stop a candidate from being admitted to a program, as one would expect given that the course is associated with transition point 1 (admission to the program). Thus, as reported by the unit on Tuesday afternoon, there are undergraduate initial candidates who have been admitted to the Elementary (3%) and Secondary Education (12%) programs that have not yet earned grades of B- or better in EDUC 3150. Second, the only key assessments that are actually used to determine whether an initial candidate transitions from one stage of the program to the next are course grades, completion of appropriate courses, and GPAs. Thus, there are candidates in all of the undergraduate initial programs except Special Education (all of whose candidates were deemed proficient) who have not yet earned scores of proficient on the philosophy paper (Early Childhood: 25%, Elementary: 6%, Middle School: 67%, Secondary: 12%) that is part of transition point 1.

Interviews with three (3) principals indicate that they are very satisfied with the SOE's candidates and that they only host apprentice teachers from Webster. All members of both the DESE and NCATE teams reported back after the interviews that they had heard only glowing reports about the quality of Webster's initial certification candidates and graduates. Candidates in the initial certification programs feel very secure about their knowledge base. Many of the initial certification candidates have either a previous bachelor's degree in their content area (most of the post-baccalaureate initial candidates) or are working concurrently on a double major (many of the undergraduates).

All candidates who graduated from initial certification programs in the last three years were surveyed in AY0506. These data appeared in various program reports. The initial certification alumni from the last three years were asked to rate the extent to which the SOE developed their MoSTEP proficiencies using a 5-point Likert Scale where 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Fair, 2 = Poor and 1 = Very Poor. The average rating for MoSTEP 1 = 4.0 and for MoSTEP 4 was 3.9. Clearly the alumni believe they were well prepared with regard to content knowledge.

Employers were surveyed in AY04-05 and again in AY05-06. Employers were asked to use a 3-point Likert scale where 3 = Meets the Standard, 2 = Sometimes Meets the Standard, and 1 = Does Not Meet the Standard. Employers were asked to rate the SOE goals and dispositions rather than the MoSTEP standards. Thirty-six employers responded in 04/05 and 23 responded in 05/06. The average rating from the employers on the unit standards that align with MoSTEP 1 was 2.55 in 04/05 and was 2.8 in 05/06. The average rating on the unit standard that aligns with MoSTEP 4 was 2.6 in both 04/05 and 05/06.

It is a little difficult to tell how well aligned the alumni survey and the employer survey are in their content knowledge evaluations because of the difference in the scales used to evaluate the proficiencies but it is clear that the employers do not feel that all employees meet MoSTEP Standards 1 and 4.

On the whole it appears that the Praxis, the CBASE and the interview data support the unit's assertion that its initial certification candidates have the necessary content knowledge to teach and explain concepts delineated in professional, state and institutional standards.

The Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) program offers advanced degrees in Communication Arts, Early Childhood, Educational Technology, Mathematics, Multidisciplinary Studies, Science, Social Science, and Special Education. These graduate teacher programs are aligned with the MoSTEP performance standards. In addition, the Communication Arts Department has made efforts to align its programs with standards from the varied specialized associations including the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), National Art Education Association (NAEA), American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), International Reading Association (IRA), and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The Early Childhood

Education program is aligned with both the CEC standards and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards. The Educational Technology program is aligned with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS) Standards. The Mathematics program is aligned with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards. The Special Education program is aligned with the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards and Social Science with National Council of Social Studies. Internal alignment is not to be mistaken for external recognition but speaks well for the various program coordinators. There is little alignment of common performance assessments i.e. Licensure Exams, Content Knowledge, Field Experience, Planning, Impact on Learning, etc. in the various programs.

The M.A.T. degree is not designed as an initial certification program, but rather was originally developed to provide professional development opportunities for educators seeking enrichment in content fields. However, some students enrolled in the M.A.T. programs concurrently seek initial certification, but the large majority of candidates enrolled in the M.A.T. programs are in-service teachers already holding teaching certificates.

There are three state approved programs offering certification to graduate students seeking English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Gifted, or Remedial Reading licensure. The Special Education program was submitted to the Council for Exceptional Children for review but was not approved because of the inadequacies with their assessment system, specifically; there was an inordinate reliance on grades for evaluating candidate competencies.

All graduate programs for teachers consist of three transition points:

- Admission to graduate program
- Course-based key assessments and advancement to candidacy
- Program completion

Every program requires a transcript review GPA of 2.5. All prior coursework and background are reviewed and an initial interview conducted with the application. The coursework review and initial interview are required transition points in the assessment system. Although requested, no data related to these transition points was provided.

The limited data provided in the Institutional Report and obtained via interviews within the unit indicates that graduate teacher candidates in all programs can demonstrate proficiencies in content knowledge through (a) successful completion of course-based projects, (b) through the Advancement to Candidacy requirements in which candidates present narratives and artifacts to demonstrate their progress towards program goals, and (c) through the completion of the required curriculum, optional case studies, possible research projects, practica, and a portfolio. Evidence in department generated program reports were reviewed at the time of the visit. Each program had a separate program report on-line. They were all formatted similarly with approximately 15 sections that included among them a section that contained program completer's data. In every

instance, data related to completers' GPAs at graduation and to their portfolio evaluations was available. Sometimes this information was contained in aggregated form in a program report and other times the report contained a link to the raw data maintained by the university assessment office and the team was able to compute the average GPAs or portfolio scores for themselves. Aggregated data for other key assessments was not included in the program reports nor did the reports, which were electronic, contain links to raw data files related to these key assessments maintained by the university assessment office. Thus, it is not possible to know what performance on the other key assessments looks like.

The team did find that data collected during the past two years in the required core courses of the Communication Arts program show that ninety-five percent of candidates were given a rating of 3.0 on a Webster developed performance rating scale. A rating of three from this Webster rubric demonstrates proficiency on any given assessment. Data accumulated during the fall 2005 through summer 2006 from candidates in the Special Education program show an average cumulative GPA of 3.85 taken from program key assessments of candidates. A review of all portfolios submitted by candidates who were program completers in fall 2005 and spring 2006 from graduate studies in Communication Arts, Reading, and Early Childhood, and the Multidisciplinary Studies department showed a proficiency rate of 91 percent on first submission of the portfolios. Additionally, the cumulative GPA for core courses in the Multidisciplinary Studies for summer 2006 was 3.43.

Program Report data and analysis of the raw data by the NCATE team indicate that all programs' completers have better than average GPAs at the time of graduation. Because of the way the unit's database is constructed, these advanced programs cannot report GPAs for earlier transition points.

Anecdotal support from school administrators from the Webster University service area indicated the graduate teacher candidates with whom they have observed and interacted in their schools demonstrate competency in content knowledge.

Interviews with prospective program completers in the M.A.T., Early Childhood and Special Education programs reveal additional anecdotal data supporting the preparation they have received from their course of study in the unit. They recognize growth within themselves in both content knowledge and pedagogical skill. As current practitioners, they have been anxious to return to their respective schools to implement new materials and strategies they have gained from their studies in the unit.

Course-based key assessments exist in graduate teacher programs and are designed to deliver and increase content knowledge, pedagogical skill and professional skill. Specific content dispositions are embedded in the coursework of most programs and are self assessed within the program. All of these graduate programs evaluate the common SOE goals and dispositions as part of the advancement to candidacy process. Each program has distinct Advancement to Candidacy requirements that the candidates must successfully address after the candidates have successfully completed nine hours of

coursework. The data that would support these transitions and performance on these course-based key assessments was limited and mostly anecdotal.

However, data from summer and fall of 2006 indicate a combined 234 holds placed on candidates' advancement to the next transition point across all advanced programs. The reason for the holds was not included in the available data. Thus, the number of candidates being held back at the second transition point was not disclosed. The second transition point requires that some advanced certification seeking candidates complete practica and portfolios. The final transitional point in all advanced programs is that of program completion and petition to graduate.

B. Content knowledge of other school personnel

All advanced programs for other school personnel consist of three transitional points:

- Admission to graduate program
- Course-based key assessments and advancement to candidacy
- Program completion

The Educational Specialist degree program requires a transcript review GPA of 3.0. All prior coursework and background are reviewed and an initial interview conducted with the application. The coursework review and initial interview are required as a transition point in the assessment system. No data on these factors was provided.

The Education Specialist (Ed.S.) degree, aligned with Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC), offers two majors: Educational Leadership and School System Superintendency and Leadership. The Educational Leadership degree includes both the school principalship and special education director. The Education Specialist degree leading to superintendency, principalship or special education director licensures have state approved status.

At the completion of the Education Specialist certification programs the candidates are required to take the state mandated licensure exam (School Leaders Licensure Assessment). Data collected indicate that all program graduates who have taken the exam have passed. Candidates pursuing the degree only may choose not to take the exam and are not licensed.

The Remedial Reading Program is a nationally recognized program that is approved by the International Reading Association. IRA performance based key assessments are delineated in the specialized association report and are implemented during the second transition point during course delivery. Aggregated data was reviewed from course assessments were provided through the specialized association report.

C. Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

The data provided by the institution indicate that initial certification (undergraduate and graduate) candidates have good pedagogical content knowledge. The review by the

DESE team indicated that all of the sampled candidate portfolios met the MoSTEP technology standard (#11) and that 86% of the portfolios demonstrated knowledge of effective teaching strategies (MoSTEP 5) but that only 64% of the portfolios indicated knowledge of learners (MoSTEP 2). These data were not disaggregated for the different degree levels.

The SOE evaluates initial certification candidates' proficiencies in developing knowledge of learner characteristics, effective instructional strategies, and technological skills through course-based assessments. The team learned that each program typically uses different courses and different assignments to make these evaluations. Data were requested for each program, for each key assessment. Those data were incomplete or not provided or not all instructors consistently reported these data. The following data provided to the BOE team were from the AY0506 methods sequence. The initial candidates averaged 2.7 ($N = 91$) on MoSTEP 2 (Knowledge of Learners), 2.7 on MoSTEP 5 (Knowledge of Effective Instructional Strategies; $N = 73$) and 2.9 on MoSTEP 11 (Knowledge of Technology; $N = 38$). Although the IR indicates that all initial candidates must successfully create and teach a unit plan during their practicum (usually the semester prior to apprentice teaching) and that both cooperating teachers and university supervisors assess candidates' accurate application of content knowledge and reliance on state and national standards in instructional planning, no summary data from the Spring 06 practicum were provided.

Aggregate data were available from the apprentice teaching experiences of the initial certification candidates in Spring 05, Fall 06, Spring 2006. University supervisors evaluated 57 candidates at midterm (N s for the individual indicators range from 47 to 57) and 86 were evaluated at the end of the apprentice teaching experience (N s range from 76 to 86). The unit explained the discrepancies between the midterm and final N s by reporting that (a) some programs do not use midterm assessments and (b) the 51 students who participated in practicum had 64 placements and 70 cooperating teachers and thus, some students were evaluated more than once. The average score on the final evaluations was 2.9 for MoSTEP 2, MoSTEP 5 and MoSTEP 11. One additional Excel spreadsheet with data for 38 candidates was provided in a folder labeled FA05 University Supervisors. All 11 of the MoStep standards and the three (3) dispositions were evaluated. Although the SOE was asked to clarify the source of the data, it is not clear whether these data are from a practicum or apprentice teaching experience. However, the data indicate that average scores of 2.8 were assigned to MoSTEP standards 2, 5 and 11.

Performance in methods courses, practica and apprentice teaching is used to assess initial certification candidates' ability to integrate technology into their teaching by applying MoSTEP 11. Data are described above.

As described above, all team members concurred that the interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers and principals indicated that the candidates are well prepared with pedagogical content knowledge to begin teaching. In fact, several of the ECE apprentice teachers commented that they had either attended school-wide training at their placement sites to learn techniques they had already learned in their classes or that

they had been excused from attending such sessions because they already knew the material.

The results of an initial certification alumni survey from the last three years indicate that the graduates rate the preparation they received from Webster as good (using a 5-point scale where 4 = good; mean ratings were 4.2 for MoSTEP 2, 3.8 for MoSTEP 5 and 3.9 for MoSTEP 11). The results indicate that alumni feel that the unit did a good job in preparing them in terms of pedagogical content knowledge.

The results of an employer survey, using a 3-point scale where 3 = meets standard and 2 = sometimes meets standard, gave MoSTEP 2 average ratings of 2.5 in AY04-05 and 2.7 in AY05-06, MoSTEP 5 averages of 2.6 in AY04-05 and 2.7 in AY05-06 and MoSTEP 11 averages of 2.6 in AY04-05 and 2.8 in AY05-06. It appears that the employers are indicating that not all employees regularly meet these standards of pedagogical content knowledge.

Even though the anecdotal evidence strongly indicates that the candidates have and can apply the appropriate pedagogical content knowledge, there is not enough data from the key assessments to support the assertion that all candidates are prepared with the knowledge of instructional strategies in their content area to help all students learn, for example, there's only one semester of the MoSTEP practicum data.

Unit faculty disclosed that candidates must demonstrate proficiency in using multiple instructional delivery modes, including technology, during course assignments. Advanced non-certification seeking candidates demonstrate proficiency in assessments of pedagogical knowledge through the development of various projects appropriate for their program goals. The mean EGF (expanded grade form) scores all curriculum design courses at 3.2 with an $n=159$ compiled from spring 2006. Apart from anecdotal evidence, limited data was available.

D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

The unit uses MoSTEP standards 4 (application of standards in curriculum development), 5 (application of effective instructional strategies), 6 (application of motivational strategies), 7 (effective communication skills), 10 (relationships with colleagues, families and community) and 11 (application of technology) to evaluate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The unit presented data from Spring 2006 practica (transition point 2) that indicate that candidates in the special education initial certification program averaged 3.0 (proficient) on the five MoSTEP standards (4, 5, 6, 7 and 11) used to determine whether candidates are eligible to begin apprentice teaching. All other initial certification candidates who completed their practica during the spring 2006 semester averaged between 2.6 and 2.9 on these five standards. Thus, it is clear that not all candidates are evaluated as proficient during the practicum experience.

Data from three semesters of apprentice teaching evaluations were provided (spring 05, fall 05 and spring 06) for MoSTEP standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11. The average

scores range from 2.5 to 3.0). All of the 3s occurred in spring 2005. Thus, not all candidates are evaluated as proficient during their apprentice teaching experience

Data (2003-2006) from portfolio reviews indicate that all candidates were evaluated as proficient (all averages = 3) on MoSTEP standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11. Again, it is important to note that the DESE team's evaluation of a sample of portfolios indicated that only 64% presented evidence that MoSTEP 2 was met and only 57% that MoSTEP 4 was met, while 79% provided evidence that MoSTEP standards 3, 6, and 10 were met, 86% that MoSTEP 10 was met, and 100% that MoSTEP 11 was met.

Interviewees were unanimous in stating that Webster's initial certification candidates and alumni exhibit professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. One principal indicated that the candidates from Webster, unlike any others she had experience with, knew how to set up and break down classrooms and expected to do so as a normal part of their duties. One of the current apprentice teachers was extremely excited about the model classroom she had helped a classmate construct and about how the organization/presence of the items in a room can affect the learning process.

Alumni surveys indicate that the initial certification graduates feel that Webster did a "good" job in preparing them to meet MoSTEP standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11. The employer survey using a 3-point scale where 3 = meets standard and 2 = sometimes meets standard, gave

- MoSTEPS 2 and 6 (both measured with the same unit goal) average ratings of 2.5 in AY04-05 and 2.7 in AY05-06,
- MoSTEP 3 average ratings of 2.6 in AY04-05 and 2.65 in AY05-06,
- MoSTEP 4 average ratings of 2.6 in both AY04-05 and AY05-06,
- MoSTEP 5 averages of 2.6 in AY04-05 and 2.7 in AY05-06
- MoSTEP 7 and 11 (both measured with the same unit goal) averages of 2.6 in AY04-05 and 2.8 in AY05-06

As with the other components of this standard it appears that the employers are not convinced that all unit prepared candidates consistently exhibit the required professional pedagogical knowledge and skills.

As with the pedagogical content knowledge element, even though the anecdotal evidence supports the fact that the candidates have appropriate professional pedagogical knowledge and skills, because there is virtually no data for the key assessments the team cannot conclude that Webster knows that all of its candidates can apply the knowledge and skills delineated in the professional, state and institutional standards to facilitate learning.

Interviews with school administrators disclosed that Webster candidates' command of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skill is readily and competently demonstrated. They further state that the candidates, as well as graduates they have hired, come well prepared with pedagogical skills necessary to accommodate diverse learners

and impact student learning in productive measures. One interviewee states that the M.A.T. candidates are more “in tune” with the students they serve as a result of completed course work and show growth both professionally and in their teaching abilities.

E. Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel

Included in the narrative at the beginning of Standard 1 is a specific delineation of the MoSTEP standards. MoSTEP standards apply to initial teacher preparation (1.2), and the advanced programs leading to initial licensure in administrator preparation (1.3), counselor preparation (1.4) and library media specialist preparation (1.5). These standards address such issues as content knowledge, knowledge of learners, responsiveness to diversity, curriculum development, application of effective instructional strategies, application of motivational strategies, effective communication skills, and relationships with colleagues, families, and community members, application of technology. It was reported that advanced candidates are assessed according to these standards. Data compiled from spring 2006 showed these results with regard to the professional knowledge and skill as demonstrated by advanced candidates, a mean score on the EGF of 3.1 on a 4.0 scale with $n=274$ across representative required courses. In the Education Specialist degree program, with regard to professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions, the average proficiency rate was three on a 4.0 scale. Data related to the MoStep standards to support the content knowledge of other school personnel was limited.

F. Dispositions

Candidates are expected to demonstrate self-knowledge (Disposition 1), respect for others (Disposition 2), professionalism (Disposition 3) and to exhibit reflective practice (MoSTEP standard 9).

The unit has created a dispositions self-assessment form to address the dispositions derived from the conceptual framework. Initial certification candidates are asked to fill out this survey at the time they enter the program. Only eight (8) of the approximately 200 undergraduate surveys that have been returned have been entered into the CARS database. A cursory review of these few surveys indicates that the initial certification candidates gave themselves all 2s and 3s (mostly 3s) on the measures (on a three-point scale where 3 = proficient). More of the post-baccalaureate surveys that have been sent out have been returned. The summary data were not listed on the Excel printout that was provided. Again, a cursory review of the responses indicates that the candidates gave themselves all 2s and 3s (again, mostly 3s). The initial certification candidates are evaluated a minimum of three times during their tenure at Webster. The second and third evaluations are conducted in a triangulated fashion by both their cooperating teachers and their university supervisors and by the candidates themselves during their practicum and apprentice teaching experiences. The unit has provided data from two semesters of practicum (fall 05 and spring 06) and two semesters of apprentice teaching (same two semesters) regarding the unit’s dispositions. For fall 05, the average disposition scores

range between 2.8 and 3.0. For spring 06, the range is from 2.8 to 2.9. The unit also provided three semesters of data for the MoSTEP 9 evaluations (spring 05, fall 05 and spring 06). For the initial certification candidates, the averages range from 2.8 to 3.0.

Similarly, the M.A.T. candidates are asked to complete the self-evaluation as a key assessment for transition point 2 (Communication Arts, Early Childhood, Educational Leadership, Multidisciplinary Studies, Social Sciences and Special Education). The data that were provided (for the main campus only) consisted of lists of unaggregated responses to the survey As with the initial certification candidates, the few responses entered into the data base are all 2s and 3s. The data for the M.A.T. programs at the extended campuses in Crystal Lake and Kansas City indicate that 18 surveys have been entered into the database and that the average scores range from 2.67 to 2.94 on the 10 dispositions indicators. Two of the M.A.T. programs (Math and Educational Technology) do not use the unit-wide self-survey instrument to evaluate dispositions and appear not to have program-specific alternative measures.

All interviews confirmed that the initial certification candidates and graduates of Webster have the expected dispositions. When asked to describe them, candidates, cooperating teachers and even members of the dean's advisory council were all able to enumerate the unit's desired dispositions.

Surveys of initial certification alumni indicate that they feel that the unit did a "good" job of preparing them to meet MoSTEP standard 9. Their employers indicated that they value reflection (average rating of 2.6 in AY0405 and of 2.7 in AY0506). When the employers were asked to address the 10 indicators of the 3 dispositions they rated the initial certification alumni as between 2.5 and 3.0 on all measures.

The unit has also created a dispositions concern form that any faculty member can fill out and give to both a candidate and the candidate's advisor if a candidate is observed to exhibit an undesirable disposition outside of the normal evaluation process for the dispositions.

It is clear that the unit is making a concerted effort to address the question of candidate dispositions in a consistent fashion and that the candidates by and large demonstrate the desired dispositions.

G. Student learning for teacher candidates

The unit uses MoSTEP standard 8 to evaluate the initial certification candidate's ability to assess student learning during the practicum and apprentice teaching experiences as well as from the professional portfolio. The data presented are as follows:

Table 1.6 MoSTEP Data Student Learning

Source	Semester(s)	Measure	UG: Initial	PBC: Initial	Special Ed: UG and PBC:
Practicum	Spring 2006	MoSTEP 8	$M = 2.7, N = 21$	$M = 2.8, N = 15$	$M = 3, N = 3$
Apprentice Teaching	Spring 2005 Fall 2006 Spring 2006	MoSTEP 8	$M = 2.8, N = 18$ $M = 2.7, N = 21$ $M = 2.7, N = 26$	$M = 2.7, N = 8$ $M = 2.7, N = 13$ $M = 2.8, N = 19$	
Professional Portfolio	2003 – 2006	MoSTEP 8	$M = 3, N = 146$	$M = 3, N = 119$	

As with content knowledge, there is a large discrepancy between the unit’s evaluation of its candidates’ portfolios and the DESE team’s. The DESE team rated only 57% of the sample portfolios they evaluated as reflecting a candidate’s ability to assess student learning.

Candidates, alumni and cooperating teachers all indicate that initial certification candidates are well equipped to assess student learning both formally and informally.

Initial certification alumni indicate that Webster did a “good” job of preparing them to evaluate student learning. Their employers’ average ratings for MoSTEP 8 were 2.6 for AY04-05 and 3.0 for AY05-06.

Student learning for advanced teacher candidates

Candidates across all program levels use individual student assessments, action research projects, and reflective essays about their effectiveness to demonstrate proficient ability to positively impact student outcomes. No single unit wide assessment such as a teacher work sample was utilized to measure candidate’s meaningful learning experiences for students based upon developmental levels. However, unit faculty strongly indicated that candidates’ ability to impact student learning was a consistent goal of the unit. Advanced candidates ($n=143$) across programs rated themselves a proficiency rating of 3.1 on a 4-point scale on their ability to assess student learning.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Webster University has demonstrated that its initial and advanced certification candidates have the content knowledge to be effective teachers or other school personnel. It is unclear whether the candidates are equally well prepared with regard to either pedagogical content knowledge or professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills or dispositions. Although the anecdotal data provided suggested that Webster’s candidates demonstrate all elements on all dimensions, the lack of aggregated data for all candidates over at least two semesters for all key assessments and the reliance on grades in specific

courses and GPAs to monitor candidate progress through the program means the team cannot verify that all of the candidates that complete programs at Webster are appropriately qualified.

Recommendation: Not Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

The unit does not have sufficient evidence or data demonstrating that candidates have pedagogical content knowledge, professional/ pedagogical knowledge, dispositions, and student learning.

Rationale: Sufficient assessment data based and aligned with the Unit Assessment System was not in evidence during the on-site visit that would indicate candidates have developed the proficiencies in the elements of standard one.

Continued

Rationale:

Corrected

Rationale:

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.

A. Assessment system

The unit assessment system (UAS) is in its infancy. The programs within the unit developed it over a period of time beginning in spring 2004. The departmental structure in the unit's early years created an organizational process whereby programs independently developed conceptual frameworks, visions, program goals, outcomes and assessments. The development of these guiding ideas and measures involved many stakeholders, including program advisory boards, adjunct faculty, and field experience supervisors. It was not until 1995 that reorganization established the School of Education and the unit's structure. The Unit Assessment system developed from the work of these autonomous programs and leadership from within programs. The unit embraces the differences and challenges associated with developing comprehensive measures to provide information on candidate performance and managing and improving operations and programs. Through a series of program retreats and monthly meetings the unit obtained input from program leaders, faculty and constituents and aligned School of Education goals, program goals, and state and some national standards into the development of the Unit Assessment System (UAS) scheme and developed the conceptual framework and dispositions. The unit used institutional program standards, professional standards, and Missouri State Standards as reference for the development of formative and summative assessments and aligned these with elements of NCATE Standard I.

Webster University and the School of Education realize the process of assessment is data driven and have taken steps to provide resources for the implementation of their system. This includes the appointment of a University Director of Academic Assessment (2004) to support the School of Education in designing the system and coordinating university resources (technology) to support the unit's vision. In 2006, an Office of Academic Assessment within the School of Education was established and a director appointed. The unit developed a data warehouse in which individual student records were merged and output reports from candidate profiles could be reported for undergraduate, post baccalaureate and graduate Programs. The Director of Academic Assessment and staff formed a newly designed Office of Assessment in the School of Education (Summer 2006). This office coordinates the collection of the unit wide and program candidate assessment data. The Office of Assessment staff, the University Director of Academic Assessment, the School of Education Director of Assessment meets regularly but do not have broad authority for implementation of the Assessment System. The office of assessment may influence assessment decision making of program chairs, coordinators and faculty. The current full assessment system which includes EGF data began fall 2005. All are working to improve the process of data entry and data extraction as the system matures.

The unit also reached out to PK-12 faculty for input into the development of the system. Cooperating teachers and clinical field experience supervisors regularly provide guidance in the revision of the evaluation forms used to assess candidate performance relative to School of Education goals and dispositions.

The unit faculty continues to be involved in the implementation, evaluation, and refinement of this evolving assessment system. Through evidence provided and delineated in interviews and presentations, the assessment system reflects desired candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, Missouri standards, and professional association standards (such as National Association for the Education of Young Children NAEYC, Council for Exceptional Children CEC, International Reading Association IRA, Education Constituent Leadership Council ELC).

The assessments in the system have been designed to reflect a mixture of direct student indicators/ outcomes and indirect indicators such as surveys and self-report. The UAS currently includes a myriad of course based key assessments (direct indicators) from the varied undergraduate, post baccalaureate, M.A.T. and Ed.S. Programs. In addition, the evaluation of candidate performance in clinical settings for licensure purposes includes apprentice-teaching evaluations by cooperating practitioners and college supervisors. Indirect data from multiple stakeholder surveys from P-12 educators, employers, faculty and alumni is also being acquired. The unit continues to investigate ways to streamline the varied and numerous course-based assessments aligned to Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP), relevant national standards and School of Education goals. The Board of Examiners observed the unique complexities of the performance assessments developed and collected in conjunction with courses/programs. The multifarious course-based assessments throughout all programs are encouraged by the culture and history of the institution. This permits strong programmatic identities and has explicit expectations that programs monitor candidate performance and progress while providing data to the unit for summarization.

It was evident that the unit has a system in place to collect and store candidate performance data across all programs. Webster's unit assessment system is in the implementation stage. It provides some data on candidate qualifications and performance, faculty performance, program quality and unit operations. The Board of Examiners believe the goal to collect, analyze, and use data to make informed decisions will be attainable within the mature version of the unit assessment system.

Interviews with faculty members, administrators, and candidates, and review of candidate records, confirmed that performance assessment measures are in transition to high stakes evaluations that will determine admission and continuation in and completion of the initial and advanced programs. The unit defined the multiple decision points for undergraduate and graduate. The variety of assessments and the transition points appears as a series of twenty tables in the Webster Institutional Report (pp .34 - 50). These tables outline the variation in performance assessments and the transitions among programs. During the on-site review, the team was made aware of discrepancies between

the course based key assessments outlined in the institutional report and those being implemented, i.e. Special Education, Leadership. For example, the list included in the IR for Special Education is an exhaustive list of all assessments made by the program and not a list of the program's key assessments. Inconsistencies between the Institutional Report and interview data indicate there are some implementation errors in the plan related to deadline issues. Steps outlined to stop candidates from progressing through transition points to candidacy are not always subject to rigorous enforcement. Conflict in the decision making process as outlined for the continuation in and completion of the programs, i.e. philosophy paper, C-Base requirements, disposition assessments, minimum GPA, portfolios were being reinterpreted at the time of the visit. Conflict in the decision making process as outlined for the continuation and completion of the graduate programs with minimum GPA, prior background, and the initial interview were being reinterpreted at the time of the visit.

Based on evidence provided, the proposed and implemented UAS demonstrated the following core components in their complex system. The UAS at the undergraduate level and post baccalaureate initial program has four reported transition points at the 1) Admission to Teacher Certification, 2) Transition to Clinical Practice, 3) Exit from Clinical Practice, and 4) Program Completion. The Advanced Programs (M.A.T and Ed.S.) have three reported transition points including 1) Admission to the Graduate Program, 2) Course-based Key Assessments and Advancement to Candidacy, 3) Program Completion.

All initial undergraduate programs and post-baccalaureate programs in the School of Education have programmatic Assessment Systems that monitor candidate performance that include;

1. Course Based Key Assignments (CBK Assignments)
2. C-Base Scores
3. PRAXIS Scores
4. Candidate Portfolios (Evidence of Impact on Children's Learning and Reflection)
5. Cooperating Teacher Practicum Evaluations
6. University Supervisor Practicum Evaluations
7. Cooperating Teachers Apprentice Teaching Evaluations
8. University Supervisor Apprentice Teaching Evaluations
9. Dispositions Assessment

Advanced programs in the School of Education have programmatic Assessment systems that monitor candidate performance that include;

1. Course Based Key Assignments including, class projects, reflective journals, essays, curriculum units, action research projects and dispositions assessment.
2. Prior coursework background review
3. Application
4. Entrance essay (M.A.T. Mathematics, M.A.T. Educational Technology, M.A.T. Social Science)
5. Initial Interview

6. Letters of recommendation
7. The Advanced Program in Leadership Examination. (Ed.S only)

At the initial and advanced levels in the School of Education the assessment of the quality of programs includes;

1. Course Evaluations by student
2. Sample Course Surveys
3. Post Graduation surveys of Graduates
4. Post Graduation surveys of Employers
5. Alumni Surveys
6. Cooperating Teacher Evaluations
7. Adjunct Faculty Program Improvement Meetings

The components of the Standard 2 NCATE unit operations prescribe reviews of the unit governance system, the admissions process, advising, recruitment, retention, program administration, assessment technology, and faculty evaluations. The University's Office of Academic Assessment, School of Education Assessment Office, Dean's Office, Departments, and coordinators collect and provide data for the examination of unit wide operations. The unit operations data and anecdotal reports will include;

1. Advising studies
2. Candidate complaints
3. Quality of Field Experiences
4. Faculty Performance
5. Candidate Dispositions
6. Faculty Development
7. Human and Fiscal Resources

Candidate records and candidate progress in meeting requirements at each transition are monitored by the department chairs for each undergraduate or post baccalaureate program and by the program coordinators of graduate programs. Candidates reported that they are notified prior to entrance to clinical practice when they do not meet program or unit requirements.

There is no formal process for appealing the denial for admission or continuation in the initial and advanced education programs as outlined in the assessment system. Candidates and faculty indicate that continuation typically occurs because a candidate makes multiple attempts to meet the transition point requirements. The CBase, Praxis, or course-based assessments are resubmitted. Informal records of appeals related to outcomes were found with department chairs, coordinators and advisors but the number of appeals and substance of the appeals did not appear significant.

Historically, the chairs or program coordinators or advisors monitored the progress of candidates through programs of study. The School of Education Office of Assessment is transitioning into authority and is beginning to have unit-wide data discussion at the monthly unit meetings. The assessment office is beginning to examine unit and program data. If patterns emerge around the types of difficulties candidates encounter in meeting

admission requirements, that office will work with department chairs, program coordinators and faculty to plan ways to improve candidates' ability to meet the requirements.

In order to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias, the unit has taken preliminary steps;

- Common discussions at the undergraduate level related to the course EDUC 3150 Education in a Diverse Society lead to consistency in instruction and assessment in the multiple sections of that course.
- The faculty developed a common rating scale for assessing candidate proficiencies on all key assessments. Each program has fleshed out the common rubric, and applied it to individual and program assessments.
- On site training to faculty at the extended campus locations by Assessment Director, Dean and coordinators to share and monitor alignment of tools with unit's requirements.
- The completion of a Portfolio Scoring Inter-rater-Reliability Study (Spring 2006). The structure of Webster portfolio review requires multiple faculty review of artifacts but only one official critique by one reviewer. The unit now plans to implement a multiple reviewer policy. Undergraduate candidates will have multiple reviewers beginning Dec. 2006. Graduate initial certification portfolios will continue with the one reviewer policy.
- The Utilization of existing campus software enabling the unit to readily generate various measures of reliability (this has been particularly used in reviewing the reliability of the exit portfolio ratings and in other assessments).

It was evident that the numerous programmatic assessments (course based) are deliberated for purpose and design. Course based assessments define the criteria for evaluation, or specify levels of performance along appropriate continuums. The use of rubrics to score student work occurs at the course level. It is at this point that individual faculty transfer the course based assessment score to a unit wide proficiency level. The unit adopted common rubric headings and their definitions. The proficiency ratings are from 1-4 (unsatisfactory defined as a score of 1, Nearing Proficiency as a score of 2, Proficiency as a score of 3 and Advanced as a score of 4). This transferal of course based assessment results to a unit wide a faculty member conducts proficiency level rating. Unit faculty have not yet been trained in the complexities of the rating system, and calibration reliability study has not been conducted..

It was not evident that the utility of course based assessments are examined annually or on a regular basis through a program assessment process or department or program committee. Assessment instruments and processes for administering the assessments are

modified based on what faculty members learn from their assessments. It was evident that the unit has discovered that some course based assessments or indicators are not consistent predictors, and has begun to re-think a less expansive (and more feasible) set of assessments.

All initial certification candidates prepare a summative portfolio. This portfolio is required for the purposes of program completion and is aligned to the Missouri Standards. During the visit, candidate portfolios are randomly selected from programs within the unit and examined by the state team to verify candidate knowledge and skills. The aggregated portfolio data can be an indicator of candidate proficiency across the unit as a whole, but the proficiency of all candidates within a program cannot be determined on the basis of a single candidate's portfolio. The state is in the process of revising its standards to require units to provide more, as well as more specific, performance data for all candidates for certification.

The Unit Assessment System is complex and cumbersome but it is becoming a seamless part of the university's assessment activities. At this time, faculty in professional education programs are transitioning along with the larger Webster campus to a culture of collecting, compiling, analyzing, reporting and using data in order to improve candidate performance, programs, and unit operations.

The Education Office of Assessment, in conjunction with the university, will eventually review data relevant to all the School of Education program goals and dispositions.

B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

The unit has developed numerous course based key assessments (CBK) from varied programmatic sources, and has unit wide internal and external sources. Programmatic assessments are tied to courses and are aligned to state and local standards. Typically, at the end of each semester, instructors enter scores from course based key assessments in the individual candidate profiles that are house in the university CARS system. The CARS (Jenzabar CX System) has a degree audit function that has been programmed to offer fixed fields with data. The unit faculty did collaborate at monthly meetings to design and implement the current system. The unit used institutional program standards, professional standards, and Missouri State Standards as references for the development of formative and summative assessments. The Webster IT division developed this system to include an expanded grading form (EGF) for entry of course based assessment proficiency levels. Individual programs identify when key assessments must be administered, when data is compiled and reported to various constituencies, and how and when and by whom results are reviewed for program review and program improvement. The program faculty coordinates times when they can meet so they can complete assessment activities and report data to departments.

The unit has outlined a series of key unit wide assessments that encompasses key activities including the review of data on individual candidate performance, aggregate

candidate performance, and program and unit success. The unit wide assessment system seeks data from instructors' ratings of candidate performance, clinical field evaluations, and advancement to candidacy evaluations, GPA, and varied surveys. These non-course based assessments are entered through teleform technology by the unit wide Office of Assessment. Annual calendars of assessment activities have been established by the unit and include faculty retreats each fall and spring.

The University's Office of Academic Assessment and the School of Education Office of Assessment are the major sources of data collection, entry and analysis. The dean shares the responsibility for summarizing, analyzing and disseminating data to the unit. Technologies have been used to manage and maintain the unit's assessment system. The data are compiled, analyzed, and reported through the use of such technologies as TrakDat. Individual candidate performance data is housed in candidate profiles and can be analyzed within the university TrakDat system. Undergraduate candidate results of C-Base, Praxis, candidate portfolios, cooperating teacher practicum evaluations, cooperating teacher and apprentice teaching evaluations are available to unit faculty. Graduate performance assessments from courses are collected similarly. The office also reports updates on unit operation data that may come from graduate or employer surveys. Both offices help manage the submission of program assessment plans, data and reporting.

Formal candidate complaints and their resolutions follow a process that begins with a discussion between the student and the faculty member. If a resolution cannot be reached between student and faculty, the student submits the complaint to the department chair or program coordinator (graduate) who reviews student complaints and works to resolve them. The next level of appeal is to the dean.

C. Use of data for program improvement

Program faculty and administrators in the unit presented evidence that data collection is in progress and will initiate change on a regular basis. Limited evidence that faculty and administrators discuss data and program changes was provided (meeting minutes). Interviews of faculty members and administrators show that these discussions occur at several levels informally, and that the discussions include applying the results of assessments to improving candidate performance, programs, and unit operations.

Because this is the first year of the unit-wide assessment system the practice of sharing results of formative key assessments varies by program. The unit has identified how, to whom and by whom certain data or reports should be collected and disseminated. Data and reports at this time are disseminated through unit meetings. ? However, it was not consistently evident that faculty members or programs are systematically monitoring the data and making changes while monitoring the impact of the changes.

It was evident that the program faculty are searching for ways to determine which course based assessments will be summative, to establish stronger scoring criteria and to design

alternative assessment methods. Faculty in the unit are beginning to review data on their performance and develop plans for improvement.

Candidates receive information regarding their progress through the program, and they also receive feedback directly from course instructors and field experience supervisors. Candidates indicate in interviews that they feel fully informed about program expectations and that they have ample opportunities for feedback and support from faculty and teachers with whom they work.

Candidates use feedback and counsel regarding their performance to improve. For example, feedback they receive on various course-based assessments enables them to improve, if necessary, until it is proficient. Candidates receive on-going feedback during internships and report that this feedback provides useful suggestions for improving their performance.

However, the BOE learned that the unit does not provide candidates with summative proficiency scores that are entered into the assessment system. Candidates, at present, are not aware that they are being evaluated outside of the “normal” grading process. As the assessment system matures, the unit intends to ensure full transparency of proficiency ratings. The EGF data are in the pilot phase and instructors do not inform candidates about these grades or provide feedback even though the grades are entered into the assessment system.

Evaluation information from the Peer Review Process and other processes associated with annual faculty review are used by faculty to develop their annual plans, including steps to take to improve (e.g., make changes to the courses they teach; attend professional development; etc.).

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit, in collaboration with faculty and constituents is implementing and simultaneously revising their unit assessment system. The system includes a set direct and indirect indicators administered at decision points. The assessments of both teacher preparation programs and programs preparing school personnel are designed to align with Missouri Teaching Standards. Faculty have collected some candidate data but have not fully examined the utility of the data to make data driven decisions, modifications and changes within the unit programs and operations. Unit operations heavily utilize survey data. Technologies are used to manage the system and complement the efforts of faculty as they implement UAS. The assessment of dispositions to reflect and monitor the unit’s conceptual framework is not evidenced in detail. It is not fully summarized by programs.

Recommendation: Initial and Advanced NOT MET

Areas for Improvement:

New

1. The unit has not comprehensively compiled, analyzed or summarized data for two semesters worth of data on the *candidate performance* as outlined in Webster UAS at both initial and advanced levels.
2. The unit has not comprehensively compiled, analyzed or summarized data for two semesters worth of data on the *unit programs* as outlined in Webster UAS at both initial and advanced levels.
3. The unit has not comprehensively compiled, analyzed or summarized data for two semesters worth of data on the *unit operations* as outlined in Webster UAS at both initial and advanced levels.

Rationale:

The unit has a fully designed assessment system that is being implemented that does not meet each of the three elements of standard 2 at a minimally acceptable level. Not all scoring guides for performances listed at transition points are fully developed and in use; data from the assessments and other measures of program quality are collected but not consistently summarized or analyzed; and evidence does not indicate that data are being fully utilized to make course, program, or unit improvements.

New

4. Candidates are not fully provided with feedback on the unit proficiency results for performance assessments that are entered as key assessments into the unit system.

Rationale:

The faculty provides candidates with formative and summative feedback on course-based key assessments. The unit does inform candidates that summative proficiency scores are entered into the assessment system. The unit intends not to let candidates see these data related to their performance.

New

5. The unit does not adhere to its own established decision point data collection at the multiple decision points in the assessment system.
6. The unit often permits the advancement of candidates through established decision points without ensuring that all requirements for advancement have been met.

Rationale:

The unit has developed multiple decision points in the assessment system, e.g. at entry, prior to clinical and completion. It reports the use of multiple measures at these decision points. Data is not always collected at these decision points and gates to continue in the programs are not applied consistently. Steps outlined to stop less than proficient candidates from progressing through transition points to graduation are not always subject to rigorous enforcement.

New

7. The unit has not taken effective steps to promote credibility of unit assessments: fairness, consistency and accuracy.

Rationale:

The unit has not yet trained faculty in the rating system or conducted calibration studies for assessments.

New

8. The unit does not consistently assess the dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework nor consistently aggregate or summarize dispositions data.

9. There is a lack of alignment/assessment of the conceptual framework in all programs.

Rationale:

Not all programs in the unit assess dispositions, and available dispositions data are not consistently aggregated or summarized.

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Collaboration between unit and school partners

Candidates in the initial program are placed in school districts in the St. Louis City and St. Louis County regions and in the Fox and Francis Howell School Districts. The unit is in the eleventh year of a collaborative partnership with the Pattonville School District in St. Louis County. University classes are held in district schools where candidates are accepted as part of the school community. Teachers who participate in the partnership activities attend informational meetings and contribute suggestions for improvement. They also act as mentors to Webster candidates. Established school and university liaisons maintain a continual exchange of ideas as to how the partnership and programs can improve. The unit also actively participates in the Professional Development Schools Collaborative (PDSC) an organization supporting P-12 and university partnerships within the St. Louis metropolitan area. The unit's relationship with schools used for placements is one of long standing with an established open channel of two-way communication.

During the field experiences and clinical practice, the university supervisor and cooperating teacher work closely together to ensure a successful experience for the candidate. Programs and length of time in the school determine the frequency of site visits but both school principals and cooperating teachers indicated supervisors are readily available by phone or email if needed. As a result, school personnel agree changes in placement or perceived problems are taken care of with expediency. Problems or concerns of a less personal nature are communicated by evaluations. An example of such a concern revealed by cooperating teachers working with apprentice teachers is an inconsistency in knowledge and use of lesson plans. The concern resulted in a letter to all instructors of methods courses for certification to use the official lesson plan and unit plan format based on the MoSTEP Standards. The lesson plan and unit plan formats are included in both the Practicum Handbook and the Apprentice Teacher Handbook. Interviews with candidates, principals and cooperating teachers and committee minutes on display in the exhibit room substantiate the unit's openness to input resulting in change.

To enroll in apprentice teaching, an initial candidate is required to make a formal application to the Office of Apprentice Teaching and Field Experience at least one semester prior to the semester in which they plan to practice teach. At this time, a candidate can request particular schools and may request to revisit a school previously

used for a field or practicum experience. The team met students that self-selected their locations. The Coordinator of Field Placements contacts the district and requests placement. The district can refuse placement or request the placement to be with a cooperating teacher other than the one requested. If the change is not satisfactory to the Unit, the placement is declined and the Coordinator will contact another district. Principals and cooperating teachers interviewed all indicated they welcomed Webster candidates because of positive past experiences. It is noted that because candidates are allowed to request self-select school sites for practicum and clinical teaching, it is possible to not be placed in a diverse field placement. Unit faculty and staff voice their awareness of this matter and the plan of using the new data system to track individual candidate's field placements for a better monitoring system to guarantee diverse placements.

Course work requirements at the advanced level are fairly structured, and candidates' field and clinical experiences are often based on their present assignments and locations. In advanced programs, collaborative efforts with schools focus primarily on the schools that employ the candidate. Those candidates who are not employed by school districts receive their placement through the Office of Apprentice Teaching and Field Experience. Unit faculty supervises both placements.

B. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

All candidates pursuing initial or advanced certification complete practicum experiences in conjunction with the professional education and methods courses. The sequence is as follows:

- 2000 Level Beginning Practicum: These experiences are embedded in methods classes and other coursework. Candidates have an opportunity to analyze pedagogical competencies and begin to build their own personal strategies for teaching and learning. Reflective thought, observation, discussion, and some co-teaching may be used to expand skills.
- 3000 Level Intermediate Practicum: This practicum provides supervised field experience for students to be taken concurrently with methods coursework. Undergraduate candidates are required to take EDUC 3150: Education in a Diverse Society as a first step in preparation for apprentice teaching. Twenty hours of early field experience in diverse school settings are embedded in EDUC 3150. Post-baccalaureate initial candidates take EDUC 5220, Contemporary Educational Issues or COMM 5670: Teaching in a Diverse Society with no field experience.
- 4000/5000 Level Advanced Practicum: This practicum gives candidates an opportunity to analyze pedagogical competencies and to build their own strategies for teaching and learning, and to experience an intensive teaching period equaling one fourth of the total apprentice experience. Reflective thought, observation, discussion, and actual teaching are used to expand the candidate's skills.

- 6000 Level Education Specialist (Ed.S): This is a clinical experience that is supervised, supported, individualized, advanced professional study. It offers opportunities for interns to integrate practice with philosophy, theory, and research. There is additional internship opportunities with more specialized focus offered.

The syllabus template used unit-wide includes the conceptual framework and dispositions information. The Practicum and Apprentice Teaching Handbooks include The School of Education Dispositions Proficiencies and Rubric. While participating in practicum experiences, candidates are required to plan lessons addressing the standards and are assessed based on a MoStep Standards Rubric. Although when interviewed, apprentice teachers present were not able to specifically identify the conceptual framework and dispositions, they know and indicate they apply the principles of a knowledgeable learner, informed instructor, reflective collaborator and responsive educator. Principals and cooperating teachers indicated that candidates' dispositions are what make them such good candidates for their programs. They appreciate Webster's candidates being so prepared in content, knowledgeable in current best practice, grounded in assessment and focused on student success.

Instruction in the use of technology is embedded in methods courses. During practicum experiences, candidates are expected to utilize technology in lesson planning. During at least one institutional supervisor observation, candidates are required to present a lesson incorporating technology. The evaluation form included in the Practicum and Apprentice Teaching Handbooks has a technology component based on MoSTEP Standards and School of Education Goals.

Cooperating teachers must be certified in the area they teach and have at least three years of teaching experience. They are either selected by the unit or the school administration to work with Webster candidates. In either case, they are chosen because they have previously received positive evaluations from university supervisors and field experience and/or apprentice candidates or because their district recognizes excellence in teaching. In some cases, the cooperating teachers are Webster graduates or Webster graduate students.

Each fall and spring, the unit invites cooperating teachers to campus to meet with candidates and university supervisors. The purpose of the meeting is to review the handbook, go over evaluation forms, explain the "Webster Way", and make appointments for the first visit. The benefit of the meeting is to begin to build the relationship so critical to successful partnering. The numbers at the meeting have fallen off in recent years due to the earlier starting day for area schools and the repeated use of proven cooperating teachers. Evaluations done during and after placements indicate satisfaction with the preparation and support received from the unit.

University supervisors visit the placement classrooms to observe practicum students at least one time per credit hour. Each visit includes a conference with the student to discuss progress. University supervisors may visit the practicum student as often as once

a week as needed. Apprentice candidates are observed at least six times during 16-week placements. Each visit should be at least 40 minutes long including a conference with the candidate to discuss progress. Supervisors from the unit go to observe Education Specialist interns at least twice. During the observations, the cooperating teacher has access to the supervisor to discuss concerns and receive assistance from the unit. Supervisors are also available by email or phone if the need arises. Evaluations have indicated support from the unit to be satisfactory and timely.

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

Apprentice teaching is a requirement for all initial certifications and in some instances, for additional certification. To enroll in apprentice teaching, students must make formal application to the Office of Apprentice Teaching and Field Experience at least one semester prior to the semester in which they plan to practice teach. Upon successful completion of apprentice teaching, which is determined by evaluation, candidates are required to present a portfolio demonstrating competency in teaching as identified by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Further, candidates must achieve the Missouri minimum score on the PRAXIS II before applying for certification.

When it becomes apparent a candidate is having difficulty during apprentice teaching, the unit steps in with remedial measures. The university supervisor, in consultation with the candidate and the cooperating teacher, may develop a plan of assistance or may recommend termination of the apprentice teaching. The candidate may be required to do additional work. The unit reserves the right to extend or terminate an apprentice-teaching placement. Interviews with those who place and supervise candidates indicated Webster candidates who exhibit lack of essential knowledge, poorly developed skills or inappropriate dispositions are identified and either remediated or counseled out prior to apprentice teaching. Remediation or counseling out of the program begins before it becomes a concern during apprentice placement.

The portfolio is the final capstone to certification. It is a collection of projects, reflections, and assorted materials that substantiate fulfillment of MoSTEP Standards 1.2.1-1.2.11. The reflections are in the form of narratives that communicate how the candidate has changed and grown as a professional. The candidate is given three opportunities to submit the portfolio as a completed assessment. All candidates' portfolios pass the rubric.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit and school partners collaboratively design and implement field experiences and apprentice teaching. Clinical practice is sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate proficiencies in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for which they are preparing. Assessments used in clinical practice are linked to candidate competencies in state and institutional standards. Aggregated data on the clinical practice assessments was limited.

Recommendation: MET (initial and advanced)

Areas for Improvement:

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

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

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

The unit's goal of "Responsive Educators," described in the conceptual framework, reflects the emphasis that the unit places on preparing its graduates to become culturally sensitive and competent educators. The goal articulates that education candidates will "demonstrate respect for diversity through responsive teaching and learning that values individual differences." Candidates are expected to obtain the proficiencies related to diversity as follows:

- understand and respond appropriately to issues of diversity
- acknowledge social and cultural contents to create effective teaching and learning environments
- adapt instruction to the learner's knowledge, ability, and background experience, and
- identify resources for specialized services when needed

The unit-based disposition, "Understands and Respects Others," also articulates the following expectations for candidates at initial and advanced levels to acquire and demonstrate:

- understand, respect, and respond appropriately to diversity in a variety of settings,
- exhibit empathy
- commit to fairness and honesty
- listen respectfully to other points of view

The unit goal and disposition related to diversity also reflect the unit's effort to meet the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) program standards related to diversity. A clear alignment is evident between the unit conceptual framework and expected proficiencies in diversity, DESE program review requirements, and a limited number of specialty professional association (SPA) standards in respective program areas.

Diversity issues are integrated throughout the curriculum at both the initial and advanced levels. The unit reported that over 70 percent of all education courses address explicit diversity topics of some kind. Review of a sample of course syllabi at both levels shows that a variety of instructional activities are evident in many courses to help candidates

understand the importance of and raise awareness of diversity, and develop skills needed to work with diverse PK-12 students.

Required coursework focusing on diversity issues varies by program. Initial programs at the undergraduate level require all candidates to take an entry-level education course, Education in a Diverse Society, emphasizing diversity awareness. Candidates attend this course on a school site and must complete a field experience in a diverse school setting. Evaluation of this course is used as one of the criteria for candidate transition. Post-Baccalaureate and M.A.T. initial candidates are required to take one of the two education foundations courses, Teaching in a Diverse Society or Contemporary Educational Issues, that have a comparable component of cultural diversity. Initial candidates demonstrate their diversity awareness through a number of activities, including case study, role-play, reading and reflection. They demonstrate their ability to integrate diversity in their teaching through lesson planning, project design, lesson adaptation, field experience and clinical teaching.

Advanced M.A.T. programs address diversity issues differently for each program. Some programs, for example, Social Science, Special Education and Communication Arts, include courses with a clearly identifiable focus on diversity. Other programs do not have a required course focusing on diversity. Instead diverse issues related to the program area are embedded in the coursework. The same approach is taken by the Educational Specialist advanced programs, M.A.T. programs on extended campuses and online programs. Examples of candidate diversity experiences include student case study, research project, literary work analysis, and internship portfolio.

Candidates, both initial and advanced, are provided with many other opportunities to learn about and experience diversity beyond the required coursework and assignments. Endowment and grant support a variety of activities to enrich candidate diverse and global experiences. Examples include studying on Webster international sites, international tour courses, literacy institute, reading corps tutoring, Teach for America, and service learning. Data indicating candidate levels of participation in these experiences were not available.

Diversity experiences embedded in the course work in both the initial and advanced programs enable the unit to assess candidate level of awareness of and proficiencies related to diversity. Individual faculty members assess and maintain the assessment results. Some program level assessment instruments for the initial programs have been revised to allow data on diversity to be collected for analysis. For example, the university supervisor practicum evaluation form includes questions on candidate's understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities for diverse learners, and rating on the "Respect Others" disposition traits. The program-prescribed lesson plan template specifies a requirement of "a description of how the unit takes into consideration the cultural diversity of the students." The clinical teaching evaluation form also includes a section of "Awareness of Diversity" with six specific questions related to aspects of teaching diverse learners.

Data indicating candidate proficiencies in diversity are available from the unit's self studies. The unit reports a study on faculty supervisors' rating of the six questions related to diversity on the clinical evaluation for 46 student teachers and found a positive growth in their proficiencies on all indicators over the Spring 2006 semester. Another survey was conducted involving all enrolled candidates, both initial and advanced, to ask for their self-perception about their learning experiences in diversity. These results are also positive, with most candidates replying that they have worked with diverse students, and they have applied their knowledge of diversity in schools. The unit also reports a diversity survey was conducted among 60 student teachers in Spring 2005 (33 undergraduate and 27 post-baccalaureate, all initial candidates). Candidates were asked about the extent to which they were prepared to teach responsively students with varying cultural backgrounds, based on their student teacher experiences. Candidate responses reveal that they feel prepared to work with students with lower SES family background (4), racial minority (8) and disabilities (8), but less prepared to teach students with language (38) and ethnicity (18) minority groups.

Despite the above studies, it is not evident that the faculty understanding of candidate proficiencies related to diversity is informed by data systematically collected, maintained, and analyzed, at both initial and advanced levels. Many quality assignments on diversity and candidate work samples were available for review, positive comments were heard from faculty, candidates, school partners, and graduates during interviews. Data documentation of the result, however, is sporadic, or lacks discerning quality. For example, review of a sample of initial candidate portfolios reveals that although all candidates in question had passed the portfolio evaluation, their artifacts for meeting the diversity requirement are mostly related to disabilities or behavioral needs, much fewer related to racial, ethnic, and language diversity.

B. Experiences working with diverse faculty

The following chart shows the ethnic background of professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and part-time faculty in the unit in comparison with the counterparts on the Webster St. Louis campus. School faculty data are not available for review.

Table 4.1 Faculty Diversity

	Full-time in Unit	Full-time Institution: Part-time Unit	Part-time Unit and Institution	Part-time St. Louis Campus Total	Full-time St. Louis Campus Total
Total	20 100 %	8 100 %	232 100 %	1715 100 %	169 100 %
White, Not Hispanic	19 95%	8 100 %	202 87.1 %	1360 79.3 %	159 94.1 %
African American, Not	0	0	5 2.2%	175 10.2	2 1.2

Hispanic				%	%	
Hispanic	0	0	2	0.9%	51	3%
						1
						0.6
						%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0		8	0.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	5%	0	2	0.9%	32
						1.9%
						7
						4.1
						%
Non-Resident Aliens	0	0	4	1.7%	4	0.2%
Data Unavailable	0	0	17	7.3%	85	5%
						0

A self study on diversity experiences among the unit full-time faculty (with 60% response rate) reveals that most faculty members have experiences working with diverse PK-12 students and in diverse settings through a variety of ways, including international living and work-related traveling, engagement in research, community and school projects. Review of exhibits and interviews with faculty and advisory board members attests to the observation that the unit provides support to encourage faculty development, so to enable them to better prepare candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and students with exceptionalities. Examples include supporting faculty to attend workshops focusing on social justice issues and inviting well-known minority authors and scholars to provide training.

The unit actively addresses its concern about the lack of minority faculty. Using endowment funds, the unit hired two minority visiting professors this year. Interviews with the university affirmative action and personnel officials reveal that faculty position advertisement is routinely placed in *The St. Louis American*, an African American newspaper, and the unit is actively reaching out to the minority communities for potential faculty candidates to fill a possible faculty vacancy.

C. Experiences working with diverse candidates

The following charts show the ethnic background and gender of unit candidates in the context of the university and St. Louis County.

Table 4.2 Undergraduate Diversity Enrollment Fall 2005

	Unit		Webster St. Louis Campus		St. Louis County General Population (2000 Census)	
	#	%	#	%		
White	192	85.7%	2614	73.7%	n/a	75%
African American	13	5.8%	419	11.8%	n/a	20.8%
Hispanic	3	1.3%	80	2.3%	n/a	1.7%

Asian	1	0.4%	40	1.1%	n/a	2.8%
Native American	N/a	n/a	4	0.1%	n/a	0.2%
Nonresident Alien	1	0.4%	109	3.1%	n/a	n/a
Other	14	6.3%	283	8.0%	n/a	n/a
Total	224	100%	3549	100%	n/a	100%

Table 4.3 Graduate Diversity Enrollment Fall 2005

	M.A.T.		Educational Specialist*		Extended Campuses		Webster St. Louis Campus	
White	694	75.0%	41	63.1%	202	90.2%	2364	61.5%
African American	161	17.4%	22	33.8%	13	5.8%	917	23.8%
Hispanic	13	1.4%	0		0		82	2.1%
Asian	10	1.1%	0		0		79	2.1%
Native American	2	0.2%	0		1	0.45%	10	0.3%
Nonresident Alien	8	0.9%	1	1.5%	1	0.45%	112	2.9%
Other	37	4.0%	1	1.5%	7	3.13%	282	7.3%
Total	925	100%	65	100%	224	100%	3846	100%

*Data including candidates enrolled in the online programs. Separate data for online programs not available.

Table 4.4 Education Unit Candidate Gender data Fall 2005

Programs	Male		Female	
	#	%	#	%
Undergraduate Initial*	17	34.69%	32	65.31%
Post-Baccalaureate/M.A.T. Initial*	46	14.6%	269	85.4%
M.A.T. (advanced)**	100	15.46%	547	84.54%
Ed.S (advanced)**	18	32.73%	37	67.27%
Off-campus programs	31	13.66%	196	86.34%
Online programs	23	18.55%	101	81.45%
Webster St. Louis Campus	2781	37.60%	4614	62.40%

* First enrolled in summer or fall 2005

** First enrolled in 6/12005. Data source: Webster Office of Registrar, Fall Headcount Enrollment Reports 2001-2005 (Opening Headcounts), provided onsite, and data submitted by Institutional Research Office.

Data indicate that unit candidates at both initial and advanced level are not as ethnically diverse as the general student body on campus. Evidence is in place demonstrating the unit's effort to recruit and retain diverse candidates. Faculty participates in the university admission's office recruitment activities targeted to minority groups. A diversity focus

group in the summer 2006 brought faculty, candidates, and university staff together to brainstorm strategies, resulting in a list of prioritized recommendations. The unit has yet to develop a specific action plan to increase the minority candidates and faculty presence, as well as increasing opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse candidates.

D. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

The service region of the unit is ethnically diverse. Data from the 2000 Census for the St. Louis city show 55 percent of its population as non-white, and St. Louis county is 25 percent non-white. The unit's self study on the field placement diversity concludes that most (83%) candidates in initial programs had been placed in the school where at least 20 percent of the student population are non-white and language minority for their field experience. The majority of initial candidates (78%) did clinical teaching in schools where at least 20 percent of the population consist of racial and racial and language minority. Review of the most "frequently used school" data (schools accepting at least five candidates in the past two years) reveals that almost all of these schools have a good mix of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds, home languages, and socioeconomic status.

All candidates in the advanced ESOL program and remedial reading program, and most candidates in the advanced gifted education program, were placed in the school with 20 percent racial and language minority students (including at least 10 percent of language minority students) for their field experience. Candidates in the advanced special education program in Severe Developmental Disabilities each carry a caseload of students with disabilities as the field-based practice; their experience with students with diverse disabilities is considered more important than working with students from diverse racial and language backgrounds. Most internship placements (87%) for Educational Specialist program candidates in educational administration were in school districts with over 20 percent racial and language minority students, including over 10 percent of students with IEPs.

It is noted that because candidates are allowed to request (self-select) school sites for practicum and clinical teaching, they may not be getting diverse field and clinical experiences for the sake of convenience. Unit faculty and staff voice their awareness of this matter and plan to use the new data system to track individual candidate's field placements for a better monitoring system.

The unit evaluates candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical teaching for the initial programs. The practicum evaluation form and clinical teaching evaluation form each contain items on diversity. Faculty supervisors and cooperating teachers observe and conduct the evaluation. The candidate portfolio typically includes a lesson plan that is required to contain a section on teaching adaptation for a diverse student (typically special education). The portfolio evaluation is usually done after the clinical teaching period. For the advanced programs, the internship portfolio contains candidates' work samples indicating their ability to work with diverse students (typically special education) related

in their program area. The faculty supervisor typically does evaluation of the portfolio with input from the site-based mentor.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Diversity issues are identified in the unit's conceptual framework and are addressed throughout the curriculum at both the initial and advanced levels. The unit provides candidates a variety of diversity experiences through creative means. However, candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty and peer candidates. Assessments are used to measure the proficiencies but data are not systematically collected and managed to inform the unit of a candidate's achievement level.

Recommendation: MET (initial and advanced)

Areas for Improvement:

New

1. The unit does not systematically collect and manage assessment data cross the unit that identify for candidate proficiencies to help all student learn (initial and advanced).

Rationale:

The conceptual framework reflects the unit's obligation to diversity. The aligned curriculum, faculty instruction and field experiences support the premise of preparing candidates to teach and lead all students. However, the unit does not systematically collect maintain and analyze explicit data to address candidate proficiencies related to diversity.

2. Programs are not consistently assessing all of the diversity proficiencies that the unit outlines.

Rationale: Candidate portfolio artifacts intended to demonstrate meeting the diversity requirement are mostly related to disabilities or behavioral needs, much fewer related to racial, ethnic, and language diversity.

3. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty members from diverse backgrounds.

Rationale: The unit faculty lacks ethnic, cultural, and language diversity necessary to effectively prepare candidates to work with PK-12 students with diverse backgrounds and needs.

4. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other candidates from diverse backgrounds (Initial and Advanced).

Rationale: The unit's candidates lack ethnic, cultural, and language diversity in comparison with students on the Webster St. Louis campus (Initial and Advanced).

5. The unit does not guarantee placement in a diverse apprentice teaching or /practicum setting at the initial and advanced levels.

Rationale: A tracking system to ensure candidates have an exposure to a full range of diverse settings is not in place. When candidates are permitted to return to previous clinical experiences, there is a possibility that candidates will have a limited exposure to diversity.

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.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Qualified faculty

The Unit lists twenty (table 2) full time faculty in the School of Education in the Faculty Data Table. All but one full-time faculty in the School of Education hold earned doctorates. Examination of full-time and adjunct faculty vitae shows that faculty are licensed in the areas they teach or supervise, and that they have multiple years of experience as classroom teachers, administrators, or other appropriate areas.

The culture at Webster University values faculty involvement in the P-12 schools. Examination of faculty vitae show many faculty are formally involved with research studies and other programs supported by grants. One principal shared that the dean spent time in her school observing and interviewing faculty to understand the school culture before successfully obtaining funding for the Reggio Emilia Professional Development Project. Also, full-time School of Education faculty indicated they are actively involved in the following types of projects in the P-12 community schools:

- Teaching classes to P-12 students
- Matching Webster undergraduate candidates in reading to Webster graduate candidates in reading for embedded field experiences to enrich the experiences of undergraduate candidates
- Providing in-service on literacy for P-12 teachers
- Conducting research on the effects of in-service on literacy for classroom teachers
- Working on a summer reading program with teachers in a local school district
- Providing workshops in local schools for classroom teachers
- Working on a literacy coaching model with two local schools
- Teaching university level courses in local P-12 school buildings
- Presenting at a local educational technology conference
- Working through the board of a local theatre to provide experience for P-12 students

In short, it is expected that faculty be involved in the local P-12 community, and they are.

There are 98 adjunct faculty listed in the faculty data table, and it is very clear that the culture of the unit and of the university as a whole values the ‘real world’ experience that adjunct faculty bring to the educational experience. The team believed this to be a significant number of adjunct. “In 1963, the School of Education pursued a Ford Foundation grant to establish the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degree program. At that time, the college determined the “single most crucial factor in the establishment of this M.A.T. program is the recruitment of college and K-12 teachers who are capable of teaching in the mode in which we want the teachers to teach.”” (*Adjunct Position Paper*, exhibit V3) Therefore, it is not surprising that over seventy percent of classes have been taught by adjuncts since the spring of 2005, inclusive.

Fifty-one of the adjunct faculty holds masters degrees, and 45 have earned doctorates. Full-time faculty states that they value the contributions adjuncts provide through the blend of real world experience with advanced educational training. Only two adjunct faculty for SOE do not have advanced degrees.

Adjunct faculty members are well supported and have the opportunity to participate in faculty development and international travel activities. The university has two separate teaching awards given annually – the Messing Award and the Kemper Award. The team learned that one adjunct and one full-time faculty member are honored each year for each of these awards The Office of Academic Affairs issues an Adjunct Faculty Handbook for each academic year. Information on university policies on grading, course attendance, support services, exam schedules, and academic resources are among the things included. Data in the Faculty Data Table show that the majority of adjunct faculty members hold certification in appropriate areas, and well over half of them write grants, give presentations and have published in the last five years.

Table 5.1 Certification and Productivity for Adjunct Faculty

Topic	0	1	2	3 or More
Certifications	32	30	14	22
Grants/Awards	-	13	11	20
Presentations	-	6	13	39
Publications	-	14	7	8

Interviews with adjunct faculty indicate that only one full-time faculty member supervises each of the following programs: educational leadership, educational technology, and Kansas City M.A.T. In educational leadership, most classes are taught by adjuncts. These adjuncts are experienced administrators, and hold certification in areas such as superintendent or elementary principalship. The adjuncts meet several times a year to discuss and resolve issues involved in the educational leadership program. As is true for all courses, student evaluations are given at the end of the semester, and the full-time faculty advisor for education leadership meets with and evaluates each of the adjuncts annually.

The program coordinator for educational technology meets with adjuncts teaching in his programs a couple of times a semester. His adjunct faculty indicates that he is readily available to them via e-mail. Adjuncts in educational technology said there is need for a second full-time faculty member, noting that the amount of time and effort needed to supervise the program necessitated more full-time faculty support.

B. Modeling best professional practices in teaching

Examination of course syllabi indicates that elements of the conceptual framework are mapped to course content consistently throughout the undergraduate syllabi for the major. Conversations with both full-time and adjunct faculty indicate they frequently update their classes, and conversations with candidates indicate they are familiar with current research in various pedagogical areas.

Course syllabi also reveal elements of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and dispositions. Reflections are a deeply entrenched part of instruction in the School of Education. Both candidates and teachers recognize the value of this personal introspection and evaluation to teaching. For example, one of the course objectives for COMM 5199:01 states, “Students will assess and evaluate themselves as writers and writing teachers.” Candidates are explicitly told they will be evaluated on their professional behavior and ethics in ECED 5010.01 Foundations of Early Childhood Education. In EDTC 5010 Introduction to Technology for Educators, candidates are expected to create and present a lesson to P-12 students using a technology introduced in the class. The candidates must apply advanced thinking skills in order to create an effective lesson. In EDUC 3150 Education in a Diverse Society candidates must design individualized instruction based on prior experience, learning styles, strengths, and needs.

Information from a faculty survey indicates that faculty utilize a variety of teaching strategies, including:

- lecture
- large group discussion facilitated by the teacher
- small group discussions
- role play
- manipulative
- storytelling
- power point presentations
- simulations
- writing workshop
- scientific experiments
- webquests
- shadowing with journal
- reflections
- observations
- writing to learn
- graphic organizers/learning strategies
- interviews

Conversations with full-time faculty indicate diversity is integrated throughout courses in a variety of ways. For example, in a technology course, candidates search the Internet for case law and interventions that are used in special education classes. For reading intervention, candidates go to schools districts in the summer where they work with students who are African American, Native American or who speak English as a second language. All undergraduates must take EDUC 3150 Education in a Diverse Society. Children's and young adult literature courses include literature created by authors and illustrators of various ethnic groups.

A survey technology use of full-time and adjunct faculty was conducted in the fall of 2005. Eight full-time and four adjunct faculty returned the survey.

Table 5.2 Percent of Faculty Reporting Always or Frequently Use

Type of Technology Use	Full-time Faculty (N=8)	Adjunct Faculty (N=4)
Use smart board	50%	100%
Use digital projector	75%	75%
Use Connections/WebCT to communicate	37.5%	50%
Use Connections/WebCT to share resources	37.5%	0%
Use Connections/WebCT to maintain calendar	50%	0%
Use Connections/WebCT support online discussion	25%	0%
Use power point in classroom	50%	75%
Require student use web-based resources	50%	50%
Require students use technological tools in project or presentations	50%	25%
Require students use technological tools in instructional planning	75%	25%
Introduce technology resources for content area	62.5%	50%
Help students evaluate quality of technology resources	37.5%	25%
Model use of technology for professional productivity	25%	75%
Help students apply ethical and legal principles to technology use	50%	50%

In spite of the low response rate, discussions with both full-time and adjunct faculty indicate that education technology is integrated throughout the curriculum and throughout teaching, although the degree and type of involvement vary from individual to individual.

Candidates regularly evaluate courses in the School of Education. Several questions ask about faculty knowledge of subject, class preparation, and teaching methodologies, and then ask for an overall rating of instructor quality. Data for each class taught in the Spring 2006 semester were provided on site. Examination of course evaluation summaries for several classes indicate that most candidate responses cluster in the highest

two ratings on a five-point Lickert scale. However, no summative or average data were available across the unit.

A survey of M.A.T. graduates from 1997 – 2005 was conducted. With a 24 percent response rate, 38.9 percent of respondents to an open question indicated that the teachers/professors were strength of the program. Later, 14.7 percent said the quality of the teachers/professors would be the reason they would recommend the program to someone else.

Course evaluations from the Kansas City M.A.T. candidates show an almost universal ranking of 1 (highest rank on the scale) for their instructors. Anecdotal comments say, “Instructor is very knowledgeable and easy to work with,” the instructor “...is very knowledgeable on how to teach teachers,” and the instructor “...is very well organized and informed.”

In interviews, full-time faculty shared a number of ways they practice self-assessment of their teaching. Among these were:

- using course evaluations to redesign course content
- polling candidates weekly for feedback on course activities or materials
- using class breaks for candidates to write notes on how the class is going that night
- doing midterm evaluation to identify issues while they can still be addressed
- asking candidates to write down expectations for the class the first night, and then revisiting those initial expectations during the semester
- observing candidates throughout the semester to identify what they have and are learning so the class can be modified as needed
- encouraging candidates to reply to questions about the course on the on-line bulletin board throughout the semester

Examination of faculty portfolios compiled for review or promotion revealed more comments about self-assessment:

“Student comments about disorganization led me to be more selective about the content I included in the class.”

As I listened to my students’ feedback during class checkpoints and read my course evaluations this past year, I realized that I need to focus on the structure of the small groups I use in class. They promote greater participation by quieter members of the class, but the groups tend to finish their work at different times, leaving some students unengaged with course material for ten to fifteen minutes. One way to handle this would be for me to join the group that has moved ahead more quickly. Another option would be to have additional questions that expand on the work the students have already completed.”

C. Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

The primary emphasis at Webster University is on faculty teaching and advising. In the bylaws of the Multidisciplinary Studies Department, “Professional Development” is the term, which is operationally defined as: presentations, publications, research grants, professional organizations, professional accomplishments and recognition. This approach is used throughout the School of Education.

Examination of faculty vitae shows that all full-time SOE faculty, most full-time non-SOE faculty, and many adjuncts are involved, at least minimally, in professional presentations and publication. Webster university faculty scholarship is related to members’ fields of specialization. The following table shows the faculty, as a group, is active professionally.

Table 5.3 Professional Activities of Faculty

Category	Full-time SOE Faculty	Full-time Non-SOE faculty	Adjunct SOE Faculty	Total
Books	3	4	44	51
Chapter in books	11	2	98	111
Book reviews	19	10	41	70
Refereed articles	42	11	52	105
Non-refereed articles	33	3	144	180
National/International conference presentation	112	61	267	440
State/Regional conference presentation	79	8	392	479
Grants	40	3	133	176
Webster awards	13	5	4	22
Non-Webster awards	6	6	72	84

D. Modeling best professional practices in service

As indicated above, presentations and activities in professional organizations are viewed with scholarship. The SOE faculty is active in professional organizations.

A 2004 self-reporting survey documents that School of Education faculty hold a total of 447 faculty memberships in 240 professional organizations. Furthermore, faculty serves on committees within their departments, within the School of Education, and on the university level. Examination of faculty vitae shows that all full-time faculty are actively involved in committee assignments within the department, the school, the university and the P-12 community.

E. Collaboration

As documented above, the full-time faculty is all connected to the P-12 community in various ways. Faculty indicates that such involvement informs and guides the content of their classes. Discussions with classroom teachers can result in a workshop at the school. And observations of candidates in classroom settings can change the course content on campus as faculty notice skills and/or dispositions that need to be further discussed in the classroom environment.

The School of Education faculty is also active across campus. For example, the Dean of Communications identified the “incredible depth of interconnectivity across campus” achieved by the School of Education as a major strength. She believes that the Dean of the School of Education models collaboration with other units on campus, and this filters down to individual faculty members. Specifically, one full-time SOE faculty member became very interested in how storytelling relates to film or video. This initial interest led to her election to the publication board, which advises the student newspaper. The Dean of Communications believes this cross-fertilization strengthened both schools and also the university itself.

F. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

There are several mechanisms in place for faculty evaluation. Each School of Education full-time faculty member files an annual faculty activity report. These reports are the foundation for a conversation with the department chair, who summarizes the discussions in a report to the dean. The faculty member summarizes activities for the previous year (teaching and advising, professional development, and service), goals and objectives for the next year (what they hope to do, what they might change, what they will do next), and a reflection on the past year. In Teacher Education the whole faculty gathers to review and discuss the Faculty Annual Report.

Faculty who are hired without tenure are considered probationary. There is a critical, in-depth review of these faculty in their first, second and third years. All faculty in the department are involved in the discussions about the probationer’s file. The fifth year is the decision year for full-time faculty. According to the Webster University Policy Handbook,

The CRF [Committee to Review Faculty] will use the following criteria in making the initial status determination and for continuing status periodic reviews.

- a. classroom teaching and advising
- b. professional development appropriate to the individual's discipline
- c. service to the University, academic and professional communities.

In the 1960s Webster University changed from a religious university to a secular one. Business professionals consulted on the change were opposed to having more than thirty

percent of the faculty tenured. Eventually, the policy limiting the percentage of tenured faculty challenged the university to come up with an alternative. This has led to two different tracks for faculty at Webster University. One track leads to traditional tenure, and the second is the Faculty Development Leave (FDL). The same criteria are used to evaluate faculty in both tracks. Assistant professors must select a track in their fifth year. If the tenure track is selected, and they are successful in earning tenure, there is no post-tenure review, and faculty are eligible for sabbatical leave every seventh year. If FDL is selected, faculty members are reviewed every five years, and are eligible for faculty development leave every fifth year. Five School of Education faculty are tenured, and 10 are in the FDL track.

At the time of the fifth year review, faculty members who are currently on the FDL track (or faculty who elect the FDL track for the first time) are expected to prepare a plan for profitable use of the leave. The expectation (and indeed the current reality) is that faculty will successfully pass the review, and the plan for their leave is submitted at that time. There does not appear to be any anxiety about non-renewal of contract among School of Education faculty on the FDL track.

Conversations with Webster University deans revealed universal support for FDL. One dean indicated that the FDL provided an opportunity for professional development of all faculty, through brown bag lunches, creation of multimedia materials, and other means of sharing the learning that occurred during the leave.

Copies of the course evaluations are sent to each department chair, who reviews them. These evaluations are included in the first, second, third and fifth year reviews. Also, they are part of the annual review of faculty. For new adjunct faculty and in cases of poor course evaluations for established adjunct faculty, the chair will meet with individual faculty to review and discuss the evaluations.

G. Unit facilitation of professional development

Professional development activities are available to full-time and adjunct faculty both through the School of Education and through the university as a whole. The Faculty Development Center resides in the university library and offers many in-service activities for faculty. Many of these offerings are designed to help faculty integrate technology into their classes. The SOE faculty has participated in technology training offered through the Faculty Development Center. There was no data available indicating the participation of the large adjunct pool in professional development initiatives. Full-time and adjunct faculty competed for and received 4 grants in this area in the last 2 years for course development and revamping of courses. This is proportionate to their 10 % presence on campus. The recipients are then required to share their learning with others in their home department.

Webster University actively promotes international study and/or teaching for faculty. Under one mobility program, both full-time and adjunct faculty are eligible for a 4 to 8

week competitive program which includes transportation, housing and a stipend. Pictures in the School of Education building show numerous faculty in international locations. Faculty who have returned from a sabbatical or a trip abroad often present information about their travel or results of their research at casual seminars. Annual faculty institutes of the entire faculty university-wide are held in the fall and spring. Topics such as white privilege and assessment are the focus of such sessions.

Up to \$2,450 are available annually for each full-time faculty member's travel and professional activities. Faculty can be directed to use those funds to improve performance. Visiting scholars and workshops on diversity have been developed to meet the perceived need. Also, the School of Education has a full-time instructional technology advisor who works with faculty on an individual basis to update their skills or integrate technology into their teaching.

A mentor is assigned to each new faculty member for the first 2 or 3 years to help him/her acclimate to the academic environment at Webster University. Mentors may observe in class, share resources, or direct new faculty to professional development on campus, or offer other guidance as needed.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The full-time School of Education faculty members are knowledgeable and reflective teachers who are dedicated to providing quality education for tomorrow's teachers. They are active in the P-12 community; frequently give presentations at local, regional and national conferences.

Recommendation: MET (initial and advanced)

Areas for Improvement:

New

1. The unit does not provide evidence that all faculty are engaged in professional development activities.

Rationale:

The concepts of performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practice, as well as other concepts and ideas from the conceptual framework are to be facilitated by the unit to engage all full-time and adjunct faculty in professional development.

Continued

Rationale:

Corrected

Rationale:

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.

Level: (Initial and/or Advanced)

A. Unit leadership and authority

Because of Webster University’s historical roots as a Catholic women’s college established by the sisters of Loretto in 1915 and its commitment to liberal arts teaching, the governance structure and culture of the university is somewhat unique. Until the mid 1990s the university had a ‘one university’ structure with many departments and programs but no schools or colleges. Even after the creation of a more traditional governance structure, important decisions regarding academic curricula, policies and procedures are still made at the department and program levels.

The university also believes if they are to provide a quality education for their candidates, the candidates need to be exposed to professional practitioners. So, the School of Education actively seeks out a large number of part-time faculty who are current practitioners in their field of expertise.

The School of Education (SOE) provides the leadership and authority for all programs preparing teachers to work in P-12 schools regardless of whether the program is being delivered on-campus or at an extended campus. The School of Education coordinates all programs to meet state, regional, and national accreditation and oversees all curricular and program policies for teacher education programs. In June of 2006 the unit reorganized into three departments:

Table 6.1 Organization

Department	Degree	Program Responsibility
Teacher Education	Bachelor of Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor of Arts in Education with initial certification • Bachelor of Arts in Education without initial certification • Initial teacher certification (with B.A. or B.S. other than education)

Communication Arts, Reading and Early Childhood	Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.A.T. degrees • Post-baccalaureate initial certification • Post baccalaureate advanced certification
Multidisciplinary Studies	Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Education Specialist (Ed.S.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.A.T. degrees • Post-baccalaureate initial certification • Post baccalaureate advanced certification • Ed.S. Degrees

The Dean of the School of Education is the head of the professional unit and has ultimate authority over programs and operations. A leadership team comprised of the three department chairs and two staff directors work with the Dean to provide leadership for the unit to plan, deliver and operate coherent programs. This team meets on a weekly basis.

The entire full-time faculty and staff meet monthly. This meeting serves as a forum for making decisions in regard to major curriculum proposals/changes, governance issues, unit assessment procedures, and committee appointments. In the fall and spring the faculty also participated in daylong retreats to review candidate data and develop strategies for responding to the data. The unit also uses these retreats to provide professional development for the faculty.

At the departmental level faculty meet regularly to review assessment, develop curricular proposals and/or changes, review faculty evaluations and discuss other operational procedures and governance issues. Graduate program coordinators are responsible for the curriculum, faculty and advisement in their respective areas and report to the chair of the department in which the program resides. They also meet with adjunct and full-time faculty associated with their programs to review assessment data, address curriculum issues and propose new curricula.

The Discipline Evaluation & Assessment Review (DEAR) teams were created in 2006 to encourage dialogue among faculty the in SOE who are in different departments and to make connections between the SOE faculty and faculty in other schools and colleges who are integral to the unit's middle and secondary program offerings. The eleven DEAR teams are organized around the following discipline areas: foundations, reading, language arts, art and music, foreign language, early childhood, special education, mathematics, social studies, science and technology. The teams are encouraged to meet often to discuss issues related to curricula content, program development and assessment and other related academic policies and procedures.

Curricular proposals for all programs regardless of whether they are delivered on the main campus or at a one of the extended campuses originate at the departmental level. Major curricular changes, such as new degrees, majors, or emphasis areas approved at the department level must be approved by the entire SOE. Curricular issues approved by the SOE then go to the appropriate university level curriculum committee (undergraduate or graduate) for approval.

The Kansas City, MO and Crystal Lake, IL extended campuses have a program coordinator and faculty coordinator respectively that provide leadership to adjunct faculty, evaluate faculty performance and oversee operations at the extended campus. This person reports directly to the Dean of the School of Education. Adjuncts at both the St. Louis campus and the extended campuses are consulted on curriculum issues and can make recommendations regarding curriculum proposals and changes.

One way for the professional community to provide input regarding program design, implementation and evaluation is through an Advisory Board that was established in 2003. Membership on the board includes superintendents, district level personnel, and informal educators in science, mathematics and literacy. The board meets quarterly and provides feedback and recommendations on programming, assessment, community needs, fundraising, and community partnerships. The board was involved in the development of the unit's candidate dispositions and was asked to provide feedback on the conceptual framework. Several of the initial and advanced programs also have established advisory boards to provide feedback on their specific program.

The unit utilizes a large number of adjunct faculty who are also practitioners in the community. They represent the formal and informal (museums, science centers, etc.) education community as well as other related fields such as law and health care. These community professionals are involved in all aspects of program design, implementation, and evaluation and bring their professional expertise to bear on issues such as diversity and literacy. Additional avenues the unit uses to obtain feedback from the professional P-12 community are the Professional Development School Partnership Collaborative (PDSC), and personnel in schools where their candidates do their field experiences.

Student advisement at Webster University is primarily the responsibility of the faculty. Candidates at both the initial and advanced levels are assigned a faculty adviser within their program. Middle school and secondary candidates pursuing a major outside of education or a double major in a content area and education are assigned an advisor within the unit and one in their major.

There is an advising handbook for faculty that includes information about academic advising issues, policies and procedures. The handbook also includes information about student services such as the Academic Resource Center that includes a writing center, a peer-tutoring program and a testing center.

Candidates have access to a university student handbook in hard copy and via the University's website. This handbook includes information about academic policies and

procedures as well as information about and access to resources such as the Academic Resource Center and Career Services. Candidates in initial programs also receive a student handbook that clearly delineates requirements of the unit’s program, information regarding policies and procedures within the unit, the unit’s conceptual framework, and MoSTEP standards. Candidates at the advanced level also receive written information about their program’s requirements, policies and procedures.

The Program Director at the Kansas City campus and the Faculty Coordinator at Crystal Lake campus advise all candidates at their respective extended sites. Candidates at these sites have access to the same information regarding academic procedures and policies via the University website.

Candidates at all campuses and at both the initial and advanced levels have access to faculty via a variety of methods – face-to-face, telephone, and email. Webster campus candidates indicated faculty were easily accessible and generally contacted their advisors in person. Candidates at the advanced level tended to use electronic means to contact their advisors and faculty. Interviews with candidates revealed faculty accessibility was often a major reason for choosing to attend Webster.

University and unit admissions policies and procedures are detailed in both the University’s undergraduate and graduate catalogs, which are available in both print and electronic format. Major revisions of the print catalog occur every two years but the online catalog is updated more frequently. Academic calendars, grading policies and other related information are available online as well in print. The unit also utilizes a number of bulletin boards and display areas to keep candidates abreast of changes in policies, important dates, meetings and opportunities. A review of materials indicated they were accurate and current.

B. Unit Budget

The unit receives its proportionate share of budgetary allocations when compared to other units on campus. These funds adequately support programs preparing candidates to meet standards and on-campus and clinical work essential for teacher preparation. The unit’s allocated 2006-07 budget is approximately \$4.7 million. As a unit within a private institution, the School of Education is dependent on tuition revenues and grants. A review of budgetary data clearly demonstrates the unit receives its fair share of the university budget. In recent years it has received a slightly higher proportion of the budget than it actually generated.

Table 6.2 Fiscal Comparison of Webster University Schools/Colleges Budget Revenue/ Expenditures (Percentage of total, FY 2004-2005)

	Gross tuition revenue	Admin wages & benefits	Instructional costs	Other direct expenses	Total direct expenses	Net tuition revenue
SBT	38.9%	26.6%	32.2%	23.6%	30.2%	45.3%
CAS	27.1%	26.0%	27.9%	22.7%	27.0%	27.2%

SOC	14.3%	16.3%	12.2%	22.2%	14.0%	14.5%
LGCFA	10.4%	16.4%	16.1%	19.6%	16.5%	5.8%
SOE	9.4%	14.7%	11.6%	11.9%	12.4%	7.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SBT = School of Business and Technology; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; SOC = School of Communications; LGCFA = Leigh Gerding College of Fine Arts; SOE = School of Education

Monies allocated to the unit directly support the delivery of programs to candidates. Funding for building and technology maintenance are not included in their budget. Extended campuses generate their own revenue and have their own budgets based on the amount of revenue generated.

At present each full-time faculty member is eligible to receive up to \$2,450 each year that can be used for travel or other professional expenditures such as memberships in professional organizations, print resources for use in the classroom, or software. Funds for faculty development are also provided through a Title III grant that supports technology usage and assessment of student learning. The University offers competitive grants for professional development as well as a wide variety of workshops, conferences, and training on campus.

Faculty salaries are competitive because of the university's commitment to achieving and maintaining certain benchmarks that equate their salaries to those of equivalent Carnegie institutions.

In addition to monies generated by tuition the unit is currently supported by two major external sources – a federal grant of \$747,000 for the Webster Institute for Literacy and the \$2,800,000 Kornblum endowment, which provides annual budget of \$74,000 for scholarships, innovative curriculum projects, special faculty appointments and research in the St. Louis Public Schools. Since 2003 additional awards and donations included: \$40,000 for the Student Literacy Corp; \$67,500 for the GEAR-UP program; \$45,000 for scholarships and \$9,160 in gifts from alumni.

C. Personnel

According to the Webster University Faculty Handbook, faculty workloads include teaching, preparation, advising of candidates, and scholarship. School of Education faculty are also expected to work in P-12 schools and supervise candidates in fieldwork, practicum, and apprentice teaching. The institutions course load policy as stated in the faculty handbook reads as follows:

...an individual course load should involve no more than nine credit hours per semester, or, where multiple sections of a course are necessary, not more than twelve credit hours, and in no case should there be more than six different three-hour course preparations or the equivalent per academic year.

Review of data indicate course loads for unit faculty adhere to the University policy and are below the NCATE recommendations of not exceeding twelve hours for undergraduate teaching and nine hours for graduate teaching. However, candidate advisement is tied directly to program faculty and there does not appear to be an equitable distribution of this work responsibility. Advisement loads range from as few as 5 candidates to as many as 108 candidates.

Although the majority of the supervision of apprentice teachers is done by adjunct faculty, the unit does have a formula equating supervision of apprentice teachers to credit hours. A faculty member receives three credit hours for supervising either six apprentice teachers or twelve candidates doing practica. Because supervision of candidates is done primarily by adjuncts the unit meets the NCATE standard of eighteen candidates per full-time equivalent faculty member.

However, in lieu of candidate supervisory responsibilities some full-time faculty workloads include responsibility for supervising and managing a large number of the adjunct faculty used to deliver various programs particularly at the advanced level. These responsibilities include orienting with new adjuncts to the unit's conceptual framework, policies and procedures, syllabi to be taught; evaluating adjunct performance; and general mentoring. During an open forum with adjuncts, a number of them voiced their concern over this issue. They felt the unit needed more full-time faculty to ensure the continued integrity of the programs.

Related to this issue is the fact that some faculty wears 'too many hats'. Program coordinators do not receive release time for their additional administrative duties, which includes supervising the program's adjuncts, coordinating full-time faculty and attending additional meetings. They do receive an additional stipend but are expected to perform these duties in addition to regular teaching and advising responsibilities; involvement in P-12 schools; the pursuit of grants; and participation in professional development and scholarship activities.

Webster University and the School of Education have a long history of using practitioners to augment their programs. They believe the use of highly qualified practitioners in their programs benefits their candidates by providing a realistic view of the profession. Because of this philosophy the university and unit work hard to ensure that the use of adjunct faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence and quality of the unit and its programs.

Discussions with both full-time and adjunct faculty and the review of minutes indicate the unit is doing a good job of including most adjunct faculty in all aspects of the unit's program development and delivery. New adjunct faculty receives a adjunct handbook and an orientation to the unit's conceptual framework and overview of academic policies and procedures. Part-time faculty at both the initial and advanced levels meet regularly with full-time faculty in their respective programs to discuss issues of curricula design, policies and procedures. The unit encourages adjunct faculty to participate in unit and departmental faculty meetings, and professional development opportunities. The majority

of adjunct faculty interviewed indicated they have at some point taken advantage of these opportunities. St. Louis based adjunct faculty were involved in the development of the unit's conceptual framework. All adjunct faculty has the opportunity to suggest and develop courses for the unit's programs at both the initial and advanced level.

Adjunct faculty at the extended campuses tends to feel a little more removed from the workings of the unit. The university and the unit provide on-site professional development workshops for these faculty several times a year. Periodically, the faculty from the St. Louis campus goes to the extended campuses to work with the adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty at the extended campus is encouraged to adapt courses to the needs of their candidates within the guidelines established by the unit's conceptual framework and program policies and procedures.

The unit employs a staff of nine full-time positions that support the SOE faculty, dean, students and prospective students. These include three Departmental Associates, Coordinator for the Office of the Dean, Coordinator of Teacher Certification, Coordinator of Field Placements and In-service Education, Coordinator of Experiential and Individualized Learning, and two staff Directors who support the Office of Assessment, Post Baccalaureate Teacher Certification, and graduate program operations. In addition, some adjunct advisors and several student workers are regularly employed. The Director of Webster's Student Literacy Corps also works for the School of Education through the Webster Institute for Literacy grant.

D. Unit facilities

The School of Education is housed in Webster Hall, one of the original campus buildings built in the early 1900s. The age of the building does pose some challenges but the unit, with the support of the university, has done a good job of updating their facilities. It is a four-story building that has been equipped with an elevator to make it accessible to those with disabilities. Other buildings on campus are also handicapped accessible. Most classrooms have been updated with a smart teaching station that includes a smart board, computer with Internet access and video capabilities. All offices have the necessary connectivity to support the needs of the unit personnel. Science labs are small but well equipped.

Campus facilities vary in age and configuration but in general are well equipped and maintained. Several new buildings have been recently completed including new campus housing, an arts and music center and a spacious, high tech library. The University is preparing to launch a \$75 million capital campaign to build three additional buildings. One these buildings will provide additional classroom space for the entire campus including the School of Education.

The unit offers many courses at area schools and several off-site facilities in the St. Louis area. Visits to these facilities and information gleaned from faculty and candidates indicate these facilities vary but adequately support teaching and learning for unit's programs.

Extended campus programs are housed in rented facilities. They include classrooms equipped with smart teaching stations for face-to-face teaching and computer labs that can be reserved for instruction. These campuses also have teleconferencing capabilities.

E. Unit resources including technology

The unit allocates resources equitably across programs. With the support of the university, there are adequate resources provided to develop and implement the unit's assessment system. Information technology resources are up-to-date and adequately support faculty and candidates. Library, curricula and electronic resources are easily accessible to candidates and faculty.

The unit does not rely on external funding to carry out its core programs. Grants, like the Webster Literacy project, are used to supplement and enhance the unit's programs and provide services to the broader community. The Kornblum endowment is used to bring in visiting professors to enhance candidates' learning and provide additional professional development for the faculty. The SOE faculty is committed to pursuing additional grant funding to replace and augment the unit's core programs and community outreach.

Technology resources to support candidates and faculty are provided through the University budget, not the School of Education's budget. Two years ago Webster Hall, where the School of Education is housed, was renovated and updated with new instructional technologies. All classrooms are equipped with a computer, data projector, DVD/VCR and speakers. Several have satellite feeds, smart boards and data projectors. There are two labs with 20 computers. One has Macintosh computers the other has Windows based computers. There is also a training lab, a drop-in lab with 3 MAC and 4 Window machines and a cluster of 4 MACs. Parts of the building have wireless connectivity. Lab computers are replaced on a three-year cycle. Office machines are replaced every 5 years. Although there were no data to indicate usage in the building, it was quite evident during the visit that these resources were well used by candidates and faculty.

Several advanced programs within the unit are delivered entirely online using WebCT courseware. Faculty teaching these courses are provided training and support through the Distance Learning Center and the Faculty Development Center which has multimedia stations with video and audio capturing software and devices for capturing video and audio clips for use in presentations; scanners and multimedia software for creating online tutorials and learning activities. This is a relatively new center housed in the library designed to encourage faculty to integrate technology into their teaching. In the past two years forty faculty members, including four from the School of Education, received grants to redesign a course to include more technology. In addition to the online courses some unit faculty at both the initial and advanced level use WebCT to enhance their face-to-face classes. One faculty member has developed a hybrid course that combines six weeks of online course work with two weeks of international travel.

Candidates in the unit also have access to the University's Connections portal, which provides access to registration and advisement information, email, and chat rooms.

The necessity for creating a unit assessment plan for the NCATE accreditation review impacted not just the unit, but the university as well. To support the unit in this endeavor a University Director of Academic assessment was hired in 2004. As the unit moved forward the university began to see the value in creating a system that would produce data that would help the unit assess their program. In 2006 an Office of Academic Assessment within the School of Education was established and a director was appointed. The university has provided funds, expertise, and support to develop the system.

Webster University's new five-story Emerson Library, completed in 2003, provides exceptional research resources for all candidates and faculty in the unit. The facility is state-of-the-art equipment and a welcoming atmosphere that encourages research and learning. On-line access to electronic databases, e-journals, and e-reserves is 24/7. Of the total number of current print journal subscriptions (1,400), 261 or 18.6% support the School of Education. The library leases over 110 databases that provide access to more than 22,000 full-text journals, newspapers, investment reports, and other reference sources, as well as thousands of bibliographic citations to journals, books, and other print and electronic material. Of these databases, 28 or 25.4% support the unit's research needs.

Candidates and faculty are not limited to the resources in the library. The library is part of a statewide consortium, MOBIUS, consisting 58 university and colleges and two large public libraries, that provides candidates and faculty access to over 16 million volumes. Candidates and faculty have borrowing privileges at all these libraries. The library will also deliver any of their Materials to candidates and faculty at the extended campus either electronically by mail.

Two library liaisons work with School of Education faculty to select Materials for the collection and provide instruction in how to do research, work with curriculum Materials and evaluate Internet resources. Faculty regularly conducts classes in the curriculum center.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Review of data, observations and interviews with candidates, faculty within and outside the unit, university administrators and community stakeholders indicate that the School of Education 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.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

The unit does not have a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure the quality of the programs at both the initial and advanced level.

Rationale:

Evidence indicates there is not enough full-time faculty to scaffold the adjunct faculty (practitioners) to guarantee the unit's programs will continue at the level they are currently being delivered and to assure that the necessary content, pedagogical content, and professional knowledge and skills/ dispositions are fully integrated, instructed effectively and assessed.

Sources of Evidence

Interviews

Ed Leadership Faculty	Virginia/Ginny Altrogge Mary Bevel John Heskett
ESOL Faculty	Bert Barry – Second Language Acquisition Instructor Jodi Novotny – ESOL Instructor Phyllis Wilkinson – Coordinator (interim) English-Reading (former dept chair).
Technology in the Unit	Larry Haffner – VP for IT Ralph Olliges - SOE Terri Lucas – Director, IT (desktop) Bill Dyer – Instructional Support Specialist for Education.
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences	Dean Wilson
Recent Graduates of Initial Programs	Sarah Gross – Student Teacher Annette Weis – Student Teacher Sarah Klumb – Student Teacher
Current Initial Candidates	Kevin Moran Elizabeth Yee Lindsey Klees Angie Mortiz Kendra Davis Ashley Armbrasser Katie Walsh Breigh Bossaller Larry Frazier Frau Knott Jennifer Eilers – Cooperating Teacher Sarah Roberts Kayla Brotherton Katie Pell – Cooperating Teacher
Cooperating Teachers	Jennifer Strange Lynne Brooks Jennifer Eilers Phyllis Cook
University Supervisors	Sheri Menscher Sheila Sherman Cheryl Breig-Allen FT Fac has been adjunct. Tana Speikermann Pat Soraghan Sandy Snodgrass Joan Thusbach

	Kathie Vogt
Full time Faculty	Paula Witkowski – Asst. Prof CARE Cindy Poston – Asst Prof CARE Phyllis Wilkinson Maxine Bauermeister Marlene Birkman Evelyn Reid Andrea Rothbart Ralph Olliges Carol Schell Dianne Koehnecke Ted Green Debbie Stiles
UG Curriculum Committee	Gary Glasgow – Webster College of Fine Arts, Co-Chair Curriculum Committee
Open Faculty Meeting 9 AM	Donna Campbell – Special Education
Orientation to Extended Campuses	Jim Haas – M.A.T. Director Kansas City Roy Tamashiro John Heskett
Clinical Field Experience and Certification Coordinators	Peggy Peel Diane Hosford Carol Schell Carol Irvin
Adjuncts	Sheila Sherman Sheri Menscher Melanie Butler Mary Beckmann Ken Holmes Marilynne Bradley Rebecca Browne Joseph Jones “Chips” Larrie Launins David Winkler Ashley Schneider Jennifer Strange Angela Astuto
Graduates of the Advanced Program	Rebecca Price-Jones Mary (Molly) Margaret Welker
SPED	Vicki McMullen Donna Campbell Mary Bevel
Diversity Standards in the Unit	Deborah Dey Deborah Stiles

Deans of Colleges and Schools in the Institution	Debra Carpenter School of Communications Benjamin Akande School of Business and Technology Peter Sargent Leigh Gerdine College of Arts and Sciences
Early Childhood Ed Program	Maxine Bauermeister Lori Diefenbacher
Department Chairs	Catherine Korobey – Chair Dept of Teacher Ed Dianne Koehnecke – Chair CARE Mike Lucas – DESE (state rep) Mary Bevel - Co-Chair Multi Roy Tamashiro – Co-Chair Multi
Faculty Senate	Jim Brasfield – President Faculty Senate
Affirmative Action	Polly Burtch – Director News & Public InforM.A.T.ion Betsy Schmutz – Director for Human Resources Christine Kemmerer – Institutional Research Coordinator Evelyn Reid – Education
Middle School Faculty	Paula Witkowski – Asst Prof.CARE Dianne Koehnecke – Assoc Prof Chair CARE Ted Green – Associate Professor, Teacher Education
Assessment Plan in the Unit	Diane Hosford Roy Tamashiro Larry Haffner Lori Diefenbacher Kathy Marlock
SDD Faculty	Donna Campbell Stephanie Mahfood Victoria Mc Mullen
Field Experience for Advanced Programs	John Heskett Visiting Lecturer, MULT, Coordinator of M.A.T. for Teach for America Cohorts Ginny Altrogge Visiting Lecturer, Ed. Leadership Assistant to the Coordinator for Ed.S. Vicki McMullen Associate Professor DTE and Advisor for SDD Mary Bevel Associate Professor MULT and Coordinator for Ed. Leadership Phyllis Wilkinson: Professor CARE and Remedial Reading and TESL Coordinator
Interview with Coordinators	Deborah Stiles Evelyn Reid Paul Steinmann Andrea Rothbart Ralph Olliges Donna Campbell Mary Bevel Phyllis Wilkinson (Remedial Reading and TESL Coordinator) Cheryl Breig-Allen (Early Childhood) Roy Tamashiro
Principals	Pam Retzlaff – Principal of Edgar Road Elementary - WGSD

	<p>Rose Rudert – Manager St. Louis Children’s Hospital Child Development Center Cynthia Hebenstreit – Principal of Maplewood Richmond Heights School District</p>
<p>Subject Matter and Content Methods Course Instructors for Initial Programs</p>	<p>Carol Schwab – Math and Computer Science Bill McConnell – Split Contract, Social Science Jodi Novotny – International Languages and Cultures (Foreign Lang ESOL)</p>
<p>Admission System – Initial</p>	<p>Andrew Laue – UG Admissions Thomas Nickolai – Advising Matt Nolan – Graduate Admissions Peggy Cox – School of Education Admissions Tyann Cherry – Academic Advising Thuy Witt – Academic Advising Joan Finder – UG Admissions Kim Kleinman – Academic Advising Diane Hosford – School of Education</p>
<p>Current Students</p>	<p>Kate Schwartz [handwriting not clear] Kristen Huber Loren Siegel Shannan Yoest Kristen Wyatt Erica Banks Katie Picarella Morgan Hatfield Sandra Quain Sarah Crader Kathryn Berkley Jessica Truss Amanda Adkins Kayla Brotherton Michelle Parsons Jennifer Putnam Carrie Hershey</p>
<p>Current Students</p>	<p>Katie Walsh Kendra Davis Meredith Rauscher Lara Reed Lisa Decher Breigh Bossaller Joanna Linbeault [handwriting not clear] Sheri Rocklage Mike Schinner Sheila Shalinskiy Nicole Wells Christina Guilfoyle</p>

	<p>Julie Coleman Mary Beth Peasall Steve Beutel Emily Lachajezyk Krista Kennedy</p>
Elementary Faculty	<p>Phyllis Wilkinson Catherine Korobey – Dept of Teacher Ed Kathy Turning – NCATE Lori Diefenbacher - Multi</p>
Academic Affairs	<p>Jim Staley – Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Neil George – Executive Vice President and Vice President for Academic Affairs.</p>
Candidates from Methods of Teaching Secondary English course	<p>Mark Bannecker Therese Nims Makeeta Peters Nora Schaefer Sara Elmore Gloria J. Collier Andrew J. Pastor Marcy Austin</p>
School of Education Advisory Board	<p>Beth Fitzgerald-President-The Magic House (Children’s Museum) Peter Wilson- Social Justice Educator Pat McKissack—Children’s Author Sharonicka Hardin—Vice President for Education, St. Louis Science Center</p>

Additional Data and Exhibits Requested at the Time of the Visit

Item	Description
Item 1	Addendum to Communication Arts MAT Program
Item 2	Rationale for MAP rating scale
Item 3	Evidence of P-12 Learning from C. Korobey
Item 4	Evaluation sheet for Science Majors from C. Korobey to D. Pulliam
Item 5	Assignments/Diversity EDUC 4790
Item 6	SPED UG Demographics
Item 7	SDD Demographics
Item 8	Evidence of Ability to Teach Diverse Learners
Item 9	Results of 2000, 2001, and 2002 undergraduate teacher alumni survey
Item 10	Common Rubric and UEICCC vote
Item 11	Data on 5 year program completers in the Undergraduate English Certification Program
Item 12	Sample English Department student portfolio (different from the School of Ed portfolio)
Item 13	Sample project from the class Poetry on the Planet (graduate literature class)
Item 14	Additional assignments addressing diversity
Item 15	Revised Faculty Survey Data (teaching practices)
Item 16	Gate Keeping records for student teaching
Item 17	Evidence of Ability to Teach Diverse Learners
Item 18	Teaching Learners from Diverse Backgrounds
Item 19	Rationale for 3.0, 4.0 from C. Schell
Item 20	Breakdown of Students
Item 21	Explanation of Portfolio Review
Item 22	Explanation of discrepancies in the numbers of apprentice teaching data reported.
Item 23	Diversity data
Item 24	Demographics on clinical sites for initial and advanced programs
Item 25	Revision of faculty data report
Item 26	Ed Tech MAT revised program report
Item 27	Webster Admin Org Charts
Item 28	Demographics of advanced program practicum
Item 29	Questions concerning the philosophy paper key assessment in EDUC 3150: Education in a Diverse Society
Item 30	Changes that occurred in Ed Tech program as a result of data collection and analysis.

Item 31	Confirmation of accuracy of course based key assessments
Item 32	Program Report for Post Bac Secondary Social Studies
Item 33	Temporary and Provisional Certifications
Item 34	Kansas City – MAT Course Evaluations
Item 35	Crystal Lake – MAT Student Work Samples
Item 36	FAX Copies of online questions with Kansas City MAT students
Item 37	Undergraduate Special Education K-12
Item 38	Changes: Reading Emphasis/Special Reading Certification
Item 39	Extended Campuses/Adjunct Faculty Meetings
Item 40	SP 06 Course Evaluations
Item 41	5 Years C-BASE Scores Art K-12
Item 42	Changes that occurred in CARE
Item 43	Confirmation of course based key assessments
Item 44	SU 06 Course Evaluations
Item 45	Diversity Data
Item 46	Changes to Math MAT program.
Item 47	Standard 4 How diversity issues are addressed in the EDS Program
Item 48	Full Time Faculty by Ethnicity
Item 49	Changes that occurred in ED S program
Item 50	Confirmation of Key Assessments
Item 51	Diversity issues in ED S program
Item 52	ELCC: Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership
Item 53	Advancement to Candidacy
Item 54	Cumulative GPA Post-Baccalaureate Certification
Item 55	Changes that occurred in Undergraduate programs as a result of data collection and analysis
Item 56	Changes that occurred in Immigrant & Refugee Studies program as a result of data collection and analysis
Item 57	Changes that occurred in Communications Arts MAT program as a result of data collection and analysis
Item 58	Confirmation of the number of course based key assessments
Item 59	Changes that occurred in Kansas City MAT program as a result of data collection and analysis
Item 60	Undergraduate transition point data
Item 61	Early Childhood Curriculum
Item 62	Two changes that occurred to Early Childhood Ed program as a result of data collection and analysis

Item 63	School of Education dispositions added to Early Childhood Standards Course Assessment
Item 64	Addendum to ATC questions – Early Childhood
Item 65	Procedure for tracking departmental GPA
Item 66	Response to question on Minimum GPA at Transition Point 1
Item 67	Components and Activities to Support Diversity in LEAD and SSSL Programs
Item 68	District Diversity Data for Advanced Certification Programs
Item 69	Summary of Disposition Data for Practicum
Item 70	Standards I and II Questions and Data
Item 71	One Student Key Assessment for the Mild/Moderate Cross Categorical Certification Program plus Scoring Guide.
Item 72	Square Footage of SOE Office Space
Item 73	Date of last NCA
Item 74	Printed versions of graduate non-certification program reports
Item 75	Revised Multidisciplinary Studies MAT program report with data organized by elements of Standard 1
Item 76	Report on dead links that are now alive
Item 77	Report on faculty use of technology
Item 78	Report on faculty involvement in p-12 learning.
Item 79	Report on faculty scholarly activity – with breakdown of adjunct vs. adjunct
Item 80	Impact on P-12 Learners
Item 81	Reliability Study
Item 82	Missing Pattonville partnership annual reports were inserted in the exhibits submitted Sunday evening.
Item 83	List of all full-time personnel (faculty and staff)
Item 84	Question of “Is there a student handbook for the School of Education?” was answered Sunday morning as follows: There are separate handbooks for 1) Undergraduate Education majors , 2) Post Bac Certification Majors and 3) Ed S Majors.
Item 85	Part Time Unit/Full Time Faculty Members Who Advise School of Education Candidates
Item 86	Part Time Unit/Full time Faculty
Item 87	Program Faculty, Post Bac Early Childhood, Full time Unit
Item 88	Full Time Unit Faculty Including Advising Load
Item 89	Responses to data request from JB Petty
Item 90	Kornblum Scholars by Name, Year

Item 91	Webster Enrollment 2001- 2005
Item 92	Candidates in Programs as of 3/31/06
Item 93	Evidence of 1 year of dispositions data collection for UG1 PBC Candidates
Item 94	Course Based Key Assessments UG Programs
Item 95	Updated Ed Tech program report
Item 96	Materials which included a course syllabus, student work sample and a copy of poetry collection re: JB's inquiry about writing quality and diversity in the English program.
Item 97	Response to question about ensuring fairness, consistency and accuracy in program key assessments.
Item 98	ATC Assessment Rubric: Communication Arts
Item 99	Program Folio: Communication Arts

**Exhibit Room Documents and
Artifacts
October 28- November 1**

Conceptual Framework	Item
CF 12	16-week AT Policy Change
CF 13	1993 DESE Self-Study Report
CF 14	1997-98 NCA Accreditation Self-Study
CF 15	2000-2001 AACTE Report
CF 16	2001-2002 AACTE Report
CF 17	2001-2002 Success Report

CF 3	2002-2003 1st/2nd year Placement Report
CF 4	2002-2003 AACTE Report
CF 5	2002-2003 Success Report
CF 6	2003-2004 AACTE Report
CF 7	2003-2004 Success Report
CF 8	2004-2005 AACTE Report
CF 9	2004-2005 Success Report
General Information	
GEN: 30	2005-2006 AACTE Report
GEN: 31	2006-07 Budget
GEN: 32	3rd Party Testimony Ad
GEN: 33	Academic Affairs Budgets
GEN: 34	Acceptance to Teacher Certification (UG)
GEN: 35	Adjunct Faculty Compensation
GEN: 40	Adjunct Faculty Compensation Chart
GEN: 41	Adjunct Faculty Meeting Minutes
GEN: 42	Adjunct Faculty Meeting Minutes
GEN: 43	Adjunct vs. Full-time Faculty Teaching
GEN: 43	Advanced Course offerings at International sites

GEN: 50	Advising Handbook
GEN: 51	Apprentice Teaching Evaluation Forms
GEN: 52	Apprentice Teaching Evaluations
GEN: 53	Apprentice Teaching Handbooks
GEN: 54	Arts Initiatives
Standard One	
Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions	
I: 1	AT Supervisors Compensation
I: 10	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program
I: 11	Candidate portfolios
I: 12	Candidate portfolios
I: 13	Candidate Profile Templates
I: 14	Catalog Website
I: 15	CBASE Data
I: 16	CBASE report
I: 17	CBASE Test
I: 19	Center for International Education Grant Guidelines
I: 20	CFR Guidelines for Portfolios
I: 22	CIE 2005-2006 Newsletters
I: 23	CIE Grant Guidelines
I: 3	COMM 5010 syllabus
I: 30	COMM 5040 syllabus
I: 31	COMM 5950 syllabus
I: 32	COMM 5970 syllabus
I: 33	COMM 5970 syllabus

I: 34	COMM 5980 syllabus
I: 7	COMM 5980 syllabus
I: 9	Conceptual Framework
Standard Two	
Unit Assessment System	
II: 1	Cooperating Teacher Apprentice Teacher Evaluations
II: 2	Cooperating Teacher Evaluation forms
II: 3	Cooperating Teacher Program Evaluations
II: 4	Cooperating Teachers Info Session
II: 42	Cooperating Teachers Practicum Evaluations
II: 43	Coordinator Adjunct Meeting Minutes & Correspondence
II: 5	Corporate Grants
II: 7	Course Evaluation Folders
II:10	Course Evaluation Form
II:11	Course syllabi
II:12	Credit by Examination Materials
II:13	CRF Guidelines for Portfolios
II:14	DEAR Minutes
II:15	Demographics of Alumni
II:16	Demographics of Candidates

II:19	Department Minutes
II:20	Departmental By-Laws
II:21	DESE approvals
II:22	DESE Website
II:23	Development of CF
II:24	Disposition Concern File
II:25	Disposition Survey
II:26	Diverse Issues in Higher Ed Ranking
II:27	Diversity Action Research
II:28	Diversity Committee
II:30	Diversity Initiatives
II:31	Diversity Pilot Study
II:32	Diversity Pilot Study
II:34	DTE Archives
II:38	DTE Minutes
II:39	Early Field Experience Policy Change
II:40	Early Field Feedback form
II:6	Ed Majors
II:8	EDUC 2210
II:9	EDUC 2900 syllabus
Standard Three Field Experience	
III: 42	EDUC 3150 Classroom evaluations
III: 43	EDUC 3150 Directed Observations
III: 44	EDUC 3150 Reflection
III: 45	EDUC 3150 Syllabus
III: 47	EDUC 3150 syllabus

III:1	EDUC 4470 syllabus
III:10	EDUC 5220
III:11	EGF Summer 06 Scores
III:13	Electronic Porfolio Guidelines
III:14	Enrollment Trends
III:15	Evaluation of Diversity in SOE Courses
III:18	Evaluation of Diversity in SOE courses Responsiveness to diversity
III:19	Ext Campus Fact Sheet
III:2	Extended Campus and Off-site Data Tables
III:20	Extended Campus Graduate Program: Policy & Procedures
III:21	FA 06 Enrollment
III:22	Faculty Awards and Commendations
III:23	Faculty Best Teaching Practices File
III:24	Faculty Data Table
III:25	Faculty Data Table
III:26	Faculty Development Center website
III:28	Faculty Development Center Website
III:29	Faculty Diversity Survey
III:30	Faculty Files
III:31	Faculty Observation form

III:32	Faculty Professional Development
III:33	Faculty Service in P-12 Settings
III:34	Faculty Vitae Folder
III:35	Faculty/Staff Advising Study
III:38	FDL/Tenure policy
III:39	Field Experience Diversity Chart
III:4	Field Experience Observation Form
III:5	Full-time vs. Adjunct Faculty Teaching
III:6	GEAR-up Grant
III:7	Goal alignment
III:8	Goal Alignments
III:9	Grad Catalog
Standard Four Diversity	
IV: 21	Graduate Catalog
IV: 22	Graduate Catalog Graduate Council Minutes
IV: 30	
IV: 31	Graphic Webster U home campus and schools
IV: 32	Haiti Service Learning Project Artifacts
IV: 40	History of MAT
IV: 41	History of Structural Decisions
IV:10	Impact on P-12 Learners
IV:11	Informal learning initiatives

IV:14	Information Technology Website
IV:15	Initial Cert Employer Surveys
IV:16	Initial Certification Employer Surveys
IV:17	Initial Portfolio Handout
IV:2	IRA approval
IV:3	LEAD 6005 Syllabus
IV:4	Leadership Team Minutes
IV:5	Library Table A
IV:7	Library Table B
IV:8	Library Table C
IV:9	Library Usage Report
Standard Five Faculty Qualifications	
OV 1	M.A.T. Tuition History
OV 10	Maple-Richmond Heights ARCHS Grant Project
OV 11	MAT Alumni Survey
OV 12	MAT Alumni Survey
OV 13	MAT Alumni Survey
OV 15	Messing Award Guidelines
OV 16	MoSTEP 2001 Report
OV 17	MoSTEP 2002 Report
OV 18	MoSTEP 2003 Report
OV 19	MoSTEP 2004 Report
OV 2	MoSTEP 2005 Report
OV 20	Notes from Standard IV Committee
OV 21	NSF Grant Proposal
OV 22	Observation From

OV 23	Old Pract/ AT Handbooks
OV 24	Online programs website
OV 25	Online Programs Website
OV 26	Outstanding Alumni File
OV 27	Partnerships
OV 28	Pattonville Partnership Documents
OV 3	PEAR Minutes
OV 4	Philosophy of Education Assignment
OV 5	Portfolio Evaluation
OV 6	Portfolio Inter-Rater-Reliability Study
OV 7	Portfolio Inter-Rater-Reliability Study
OV 8	Portfolio website
OV: 40	Portfolio Website
OV: 61	Portfolio Workshop Documentation
OV: 62	Practicum and Apprentice Teaching Application Forms
OV:1	Practicum Evaluation Forms
OV:10	Practicum Evaluations
OV:11	Practicum Handbooks
OV:12	PRAXIS Data
OV:13	Pre-Conditions
OV:14	Prior Structure of SOE
OV:15	Professional Organizations Table

OV:16	Professional portfolio guidelines
OV:17	Program Assessment plans
OV:18	Program Handbooks
OV:19	Program Report Index
OV:2	Program Report Index
OV:20	Program report index
OV:21	Retreat Minutes
OV:22	Routes to Initial Certification
OV:23	Salary and Fringe Benefits Agreement
OV:24	Salary and Fringe Benefits Agreement
OV:25	Sample course assignments: Advanced Programs
OV:26	Sample Course Based Key Assessment Assignments
OV:27	Sample Course Evaluations
OV:28	Sample Course Project Assignments
OV:29	Sample Course Surveys
OV:30	Sample Faculty Portfolios
OV:31	School and Community Collaboration File
OV:32	Science MAT Report
OV:33	SDD Syllabi
OV:34	SOCS 5180 syllabus
OV:35	SOE Retreat Minutes
OV:36	SOE Advisory Board Membership
OV:37	SOE Advisory Board Minutes

OV:4	SOE Advisory Board Minutes
OV:5	SOE Advocacy Initiatives
OV:50	SOE Authentic Learning Initiatives
OV:6	SOE Brochure
OV:60	SOE Budgets
OV:7	SOE Grant and Endowment Budgets
OV:8	SOE international initiatives
OV:9	SOE Minutes
Standard Six Governance	
	SOE Minutes
VI: 110	
VI: 45	SOE Newsletter
VI: 46	SOE Strategic Plans
VI: 60	SOE Structure
VI: 61	Special Ed Observation Form
VI: 80	SSSL 6023 syllabus
VI: 90	Statement of Concern Form
VI: 91	Stone Report
VI: 92	Student Complaint File
VI:11	Student Complaint File
VI:12	Student Literacy Corps Description
VI:13	Student Literacy Corps Description
VI:14	Student Literacy Corps Discription

VI:15	Study Abroad Program
VI:16	Syllabi Folder
V:18	Syllabi Study Diversity
VI:17	Teach for American Program
VI:19	Teacher Alumni Survey
VI:2	Teacher Alumni Survey
VI:20	Teacher Alumni Survey
VI:21	Teacher Alumni Survey Data
VI:22	Teaching American History grant
VI:23	Technology Archives
VI:24	Technology Budget
VI:25	Technology Projects List
VI:26	Theresa Perry Workshop Materials
VI:27	Title III Fellowship Proposals
VI:28	Transition Point Chart
VI:29	UEICCC Exec Sum and Minutes
VI:3	UG Catalog
VI:30	UG Catalog p 168
VI:31	Undergraduate Catalog
VI:32	Unit Operations Study
VI:33	Unit Plan Format
VI:34	University Catalogs
VI:35	University Committees and Task Forces

VI:36	University Supervisor Evaluation forms
VI:37	University Supervisor Meetings
VI:38	US News and World Reports
VI:39	Visiting and Part-time Professor Documentation
VI:4	Visiting Scholars Documentation
VI:40	Webster Institute for Literacy
VI:41	Webster U Campuses
VI:42	Webster University Faculty Handbook
VI:43	Webster University Faculty Handbook
VI:5	Webster Works Worldwide description
VI:6	WIL Archives
VI:7	Work Study Allocations
VI:8	WU Engaged Scholarship Survey
VI:9	WU Student Handbook

