Institutional Report: Auburn University at Montgomery

by AUM Administration

Overview and Conceptual Framework

Overview and Conceptual Framework

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

I. OVERVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Institutional Information

Auburn University at Montgomery (AUM) is the metropolitan campus of Auburn University, a land-grant institution, located on a 500-acre campus seven miles east of downtown Montgomery, Alabama. AUM has approximately 5,000 students and is a broadly-based academic institution organized into five schools: Business, Education, Liberal Arts, Nursing, and Sciences. Approximately 60% of the students enrolled at AUM are first generation college students. Undergraduate degrees include the Bachelor of Arts in communication and dramatic arts, English, fine arts, history, and international studies; and Bachelor of Science in business administration, education, justice and public safety, mathematics, physical science, political science, and psychology. AUM offers graduate degrees in all five schools and the Education Specialist degree in the School of Education. A Ph.D. in public administration and public policy is offered jointly with Auburn University.

AUM is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). AUM was first accredited by SACS as a separate institution from Auburn University in 1973, with reaffirmations in 1978, 1988, 1998 and most recently in 2008. The Quality Improvement Plan is Writing for Success, which seeks to improve the quality of student writing campus-wide by incorporating writing-intensive instruction into all undergraduate students' required programs of study. Specifically, all undergraduate students are required to complete a total of five Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) courses in order to graduate: (a) two Composition courses, and (b) three courses labeled as writing-intensive (WI), with two of the three WI courses required in the program major or concentration.

AUM has several governing bodies and policies that help make decisions and guide the university in strategy, planning, and daily functions. The university is under the governing body of Auburn University's Board of Trustees and the main divisions that make up the administration organization of the university. The Chancellor's Cabinet is made up of the

senior staff and special assistants to the Chancellor and the directors, or senior directors of main divisions or departments of the university. Faculty Senate is the executive body of the Faculty Council and is responsible for interpreting the Faculty Council constitution, establishing and abolishing committees, and several other duties that deal with managing the Faculty Council. The Staff Council represents all employees at Auburn University Montgomery below the rank of Vice Chancellor who do not hold an academic appointment. The Staff Council serves in a positive and constructive way to affect beneficial changes by serving in an advisory capacity to the administration. The SGA serves as the liaison between students and administration, and enhances student life both academically and socially by being the voice of the students, through activities and programs led by students for the students.

AUM fosters and exemplifies excellence in education in a personalized, engaged, diverse learning community that serves as a key partner in the growth and economic development of the state. Students are prepared to be leaders, ready to make a difference and take on the immediate challenges of the working world.

The following goals of the Strategic Plan (2007) are to enhance student programs, increase student success and retention, enhance AUM's engagement with Auburn University, increase AUM's partnership with business, government, and the community external to AUM, attract, recruit, and retain a diverse faculty and staff of highly qualified individuals, identify and obtain the financial resources needed to support the University's mission and maintain a physical facilities infrastructure, including building and information technology.

1.2 Professional Education Unit

Dr. Samuel Flynt is the dean of the School of Education. Drs. Rhonda Morton, and Sheila Austin serve as Associate Deans. The School of Education is comprised of four departments:

- Counselor, Leadership, and Special Education (Head-Dr. Sheila Austin)
- Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading Education (Head-Dr. Lynne Mills)
- Foundations, Technology, and Secondary Education (Head-Dr. Kellie Shumack)
- Physical Education and Exercise Science (Head-Dr. Hank Williford)

The SOE has approximately 830 students enrolled, 500 in undergraduate programs and 330 in graduate programs. Over 60% of the students in SOE undergraduate programs transfer to AUM during their first two years of study, primarily from junior colleges. Approximately 85% of the undergraduates (the highest number at AUM) were satisfied in their preparation at graduation last year on the AUM Exit Survey. Most SOE students commute from surrounding counties (Autauga, Elmore, Montgomery) and do not live on campus.

The goals of the unit for 2012 – 2013 are to increase research and scholarship, secure external funding for research and other endeavors, focus on programs to recruit and retain candidates, increase online courses and degree offerings, continue using the SOE Assessment System in an accurate, fair, consistent, and flexible manner, successfully integrate WAC into all programs, develop a plan for service learning for all candidates, and develop a plan for internationalizing the curriculum and providing international opportunities for faculty and candidates.

Undergraduates in all SOE programs must complete a state core of courses, offered in other Schools at AUM, in the areas of English, social science, science, fine arts, and mathematics before graduation. They, as well as students in some graduate programs, also have additional

content area courses, taught in other Schools at AUM, depending on which program they follow. All candidates in initial teaching programs for Secondary Education must complete a content major in the School of Liberal Arts or the School of Sciences before they graduate.

1.3 Summary of Programs

The SOE offers 13 undergraduate teaching programs (no off-campus or distance programs), 27 Master of Education programs (11 alternate route programs, 2 distance programs, but no off-campus programs), and 7 Education Specialist programs (2 distance programs but no off-campus or alternative route programs at this level). The four distance programs in the SOE are all advanced programs. All programs are approved by the Alabama State Department of Education and no programs are nationally recognized. The M.Ed School Counseling program is accredited by CACREP. (I.5.d.) For a complete listing of individual programs please see AIMS (Manage Programs) on the NCATE website.

1.4 Conceptual Framework

In 2005, the faculty members in the SOE were asked to rank important abilities of an exemplary graduate from our programs. This survey was given to stakeholders outside the School of Education (AUM faculty, school administrators, teachers) to see if their rankings were similar to our rankings. From those surveys and subsequent discussions, the stakeholders set a goal in the School of Education to produce *The Professional Educator*, who is Competent, Committed, and Reflective. In 2007 the School of Education ranked the abilities on the survey once again and decided to reaffirm the use of *The Professional Educator* model as a foundation for all programs in the School of Education. (I.5.c.)

In 2008 the faculty decided to update the wording on the Professional Educator Model. A new poster was designed to display the revised model. In 2011 the model was once again revised. However, the wording on the model remained the same as the revision in 2008. The definition of "Competent", "Committed", and "Reflective" are found below.

A Competent Professional Educator is someone who is equipped with the knowledge, skills, and technological expertise to help all individuals learn and develop. A Committed Professional Educator is someone who is dedicated to the ethical practices and collaboration that serve as a foundation of a diverse and intellectually vibrant society. A Reflective Professional Educator is someone who is devoted to analyzing his/her past practices in ways that fuel ongoing learning and improve future practices.

From the Conceptual Framework, ten Learning Outcomes were identified that represented areas that should be developed in order to produce *The Professional Educator*, who is Competent, Committed, and Reflective. The ten Learning Outcomes are described below.

Outcome 1 – Subject Matter Knowledge (Competent)

The Professional Educator understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the disciplines.

Outcome 2 – Human Development (Competent)

The Professional Educator understands how people learn and develop.

Outcome 3 – Diversity (Competent, Reflective)

The Professional Educator understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Outcome 4 – Planning (Competent, Committed, Reflective)

The Professional Educator develops plans based on knowledge of subject matter, students, community, and curriculum goals.

Outcome 5 – Learning Environment (Competent, Committed, Reflective)

The Professional Educator uses an understanding of individual and group motivation, and is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

Outcome 6 – Instructional Strategies (Competent, Committed, Reflective)

The Professional Educator understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies.

Outcome 7 – Communication (Competent)

The Professional Educator uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication technologies.

Outcome 8 – Assessment (Competent, Committed, Reflective)

The Professional Educator uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate.

Outcome 9 – Technology (Competent, Reflective)

The Professional Educator is proficient in the use of technology to enhance teaching.

Outcome 10 – Professionalism (Committed, Reflective)

The Professional Educator is a reflective practitioner who evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others, and seeks to grow professionally.

Sixty-seven indicators and rubrics were generated from the Learning Outcomes that inform decisions on whether or not each Outcome has been met. The original indicators and rubrics from 2005 were revised in 2009 to align with the new Alabama Quality Teaching Standards and the state department redesign requirement for M.Ed. Instructional Leadership program. See 2.3.a. for lists of indicators for Instructional Leadership and Teacher Education. The AUM School of Education Assessment Alignment Table for Teacher Education (for all programs except Instructional Leadership) shows how individual indicators are aligned with INTASC, State Board Core Propositions, and Alabama State Department standards. The AUM School of Education Assessment Alignment Table for Instructional Leadership shows how individual indicators are aligned with Alabama State Department Standards and Educational Leadership Policy Standards. (I.5.d.)The indicators are utilized throughout all programs for assessment in order to provide support for individual candidates, documentation of candidate/program strengths and weaknesses, and produce data for analysis in order to make programmatic/instructional changes.

1.5. Exhibits

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

II. UNIT STANDARDS AND MOVEMENT TOWARD TARGET

Movement Toward Target

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

Initial	Advanced	Standards
		Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
		Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
X		Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
		Standard 4: Diversity
		Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
		Standard 6: Governance and Resources

~Back to Top~

Standard 1

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

All initial and advanced programs within the unit are currently accredited by the Alabama State Department of Education. (1.3.a.)

KEY ASSESSMENTS

Basic Skills Tests: (measures basic content knowledge, external assessment) A passing score on three Basic Skills Tests (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) is used as a requirement for undergraduate Admission to Professional Education and a mid checkpoint requirement for ITP graduate candidates. Therefore, all ITP candidates have a 100% pass rate for all Basic Skills Tests before graduation. (1.3.d.)

Praxis II Tests: (measures content knowledge primarily with some pedagogical knowledge on multiple tests, external assessment) Candidates in initial teaching programs and two advanced programs (Instructional Leadership and Reading Specialist) are required to take Praxis II. The percentage of enrolled candidates in each program passing Praxis II varies from 20% to 100%. (1.3.d.) The SOE emphasizes development of strong content knowledge

before candidates work extensively with P-12 students. Therefore, most initial teaching candidates must pass specific content area test(s) before Professional Internship and all others, including advanced candidates, must pass Praxis II before completion of clinical courses in their programs. Because of this requirement all candidates who graduate in programs in which these tests are required have a 100% pass rate. (1.3.d.) Beginning Fall 2013, the State of Alabama will require a passing score on new Praxis tests that measure pedagogical knowledge more extensively. (1.3.c.)

GPA:(measures content and pedagogical knowledge, internal assessment) Undergraduates must have a 2.5 GPA overall, in the teaching field, and in the core to graduate. All graduate candidates in M.Ed. programs must have a 3.0 GPA, except Instructional Leadership M.Ed. candidates must have a 3.25, and all Ed.S. candidates must have a 3.25 GPA to graduate. GPA averages in 2011 for candidates graduating in all undergraduate programs were above 3.12, all M.Ed. programs were above 3.56, and all Ed.S. programs were above 3.76. (1.3.d.)

SOE Comprehensive Exam: (measures pedagogical knowledge primarily, internal assessment) Candidates in all programs must pass a comprehensive exam to graduate. The pass rate is 100%, as would be expected for candidates who have completed the other requirements by this point. (1.3.d.)

University Graduate Data: (measures candidate perceptions of pedagogical knowledge, internal assessment) SOE initial teaching candidates are surveyed immediately after Professional Internship every semester. Last year in Teacher Development areas, candidates felt most prepared in Presentation of Organized Instruction and Establishing a Positive Learning Climate. Candidates felt less prepared in Classroom Management. All averages were above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. On the SOE Learning Outcomes, candidates felt most competent in Professionalism and least competent in Diversity and Assessment. All averages were above 3.4. A content analysis of the comment section of the survey from Fall 2006 – Spring 2011 revealed Classroom Management as the greatest concern followed by the need for more field-based experiences before internship. The majority of the comments focused on candidate confidence and recognition of demanding and high expectations from instructors. Candidates also desired more field experience hours in professional courses and fewer hours in pre-professional courses, a better screening process for mentor teachers, and a longer time period with one teacher rather than split placements. (1.3.i.)

Stakeholder Data: (measures employer perceptions of content and pedagogical knowledge, external assessment) One hundred forty seven principals in a hundred mile radius of AUM were surveyed in 2012 to determine the proficiency of our graduates hired over the last three years. Of the respondents who had hired AUM graduates (13.6%), all confirmed the proficiency of the graduates in regards to knowledge, understanding, skills, and professionalism. Feedback from Superintendents of AUM graduates in the Instructional Leadership advanced programs were also surveyed in 2012. Of the 20 superintendents surveyed, 5 responded (25%). Superintendents who had hired AUM graduates in leadership roles were satisfied with our graduates. No concerns were noted. Other data in this area are generated from Stakeholder meetings with the professional community. At the Stakeholder meeting in 2012, twenty principals and teachers felt that the strengths of AUM SOE graduates were in Professionalism, Establishing Rapport, Use of Technology, and Use of Hands On Activities. Stakeholders identified the primary weaknesses of AUM SOE graduates in Classroom Management and Written Communication. (1.3.j.)

EDUCATEAlabama Statewide Data Report: (measures teachers' perceptions of their own effectiveness) The State of Alabama has not issued the Annual State Report Card on Teacher

Preparation Programs since 2009. The SOE has attempted to gather data related to competence of its graduates through the Stakeholder Data component, with limited success. The EDUCATEAlabama Statewide Data Report is a new report that begins to address this gap in assessment at the state level. The data in the AUM report is a self-assessment completed by first year teachers who graduated from the SOE. (1.3.k.) Candidates identified their strengths as:

- Content Knowledge - content and pedagogical knowledge, designing activities based upon state standards, providing appropriate accommodations
- Communication - oral and written
- Teaching and Learning - providing a positive climate
- Professionalism - ethics and compliance with regulations and policies

Candidates identified their greatest weaknesses as:

- Diversity - primarily working with ELL students
- Professionalism - collaboration with other professionals in effective professional development

SOE Outcome Scores on Assessment Indicators/Supplemental Forms: (measures content and pedagogical knowledge tied to ten learning outcomes stemming from Conceptual Framework, and to professional, state, and institutional standards, (I.5.c.) internal assessment) Instructors in the SOE who teach clinical courses generate scores on these outcomes. For initial teaching programs the clinical course is Professional Internship and for advanced programs various practicum courses are used. All programs (initial teaching and advanced), including the Reading Specialist program use the same outcomes. However, the Instructional Leadership programs use only 7 of the 10 learning outcomes and have different indicators due to specific state requirements for those programs. The outcome scores are averaged across each of the ten Learning Outcomes in each program area. (1.3.d.) Some of the learning outcomes most relevant to Standard I for teacher candidates and other school professionals are:

- Content Knowledge - understanding of the disciplines related to their teaching field and anchoring content in meaningful learning experiences (not used for Instructional Leadership)
- Diversity - understanding how students from diverse backgrounds learn and develop
- Instructional Strategies - understanding how to use a variety of strategies to facilitate student learning
- Technology - proficiency in the technology used to enhance learning
- Planning - understanding how to develop plans based on knowledge of subject matter, students, community, and curriculum goals
- Assessment - understanding the use of effective assessment techniques to inform practice by analyzing student, classroom, and school performance and make data-driven decisions
- Professionalism - understanding how to access resources to gain information about policies and procedures and how to use resources to improve as a teacher and learner

Every program also has program specific indicators (on supplemental forms) aligned with national and state standards that are also evaluated during Professional Internship in undergraduate initial teaching programs. Candidates in all programs must score at least "2" or "Basic" on each of the indicators, including those delineated on supplemental forms, in order to graduate. (1.3.d.)

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

Ten indicators in teacher preparation programs including, Reading Specialist (Diversity, Communication, Professionalism) relate directly to professional dispositions. Thirteen indicators from Instructional Leadership learning outcomes (Human Development, Diversity, Planning, Instructional Strategies) relate directly to professional dispositions. (1.3.e.) The outcome scores of these indicators are used to discern how well our candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidates in all programs must score at least "2" or "Basic" on all indicators before they are allowed to graduate. Most averages are "3" or "Competent." No outcome average is below 2.75 on any professional disposition indicator in any program. (1.3.f.)

IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING

Teacher candidates in all programs (initial teaching and advanced programs) focus on student learning and this is measured primarily in capstone courses, even though most programs focus on student learning much earlier. Impact on student learning is measured through the Teacher Work Sample, patterned after the work produced by the Renaissance Partnership. (1.3.g.) Programs that do not use the Teacher Work Sample (advanced Special Education programs and the Reading Specialist program) provide an explanation of how impact on student learning is measured on the annual Data Analysis Reports by program area (1.3.d.). The Teacher Work Sample (or similar assignment) requires teacher candidates to assess and analyze student learning in the classroom and school, make data-driven and appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress accordingly. (1.3.g.) Candidates develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience.

1.2.b. Continuous Improvement

Since our last NCATE review, four advanced programs have changed their method of delivery to include more online courses as a response to candidate requests. The Education Specialist advanced programs in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Physical Education and the Masters of Education advanced program in Physical Education have moved from a traditional format to an online format for over 50% of the courses in those programs.

The SOE Assessment System was revised following new State of Alabama standards in 2008 and full implementation in 2009. The SOE Conceptual Framework and ten learning outcomes were not changed. However, the indicators stemming from those outcomes had to be revised to more closely align with the new state standards. This precipitated a change in the rubrics for the revised indicators and a revised alignment to state and national standards. (I.5.c.)

In 2009 the faculty began exploring ways to better identify deficiencies in candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions throughout their programs and generated ideas to increase support for struggling candidates. By 2011 all programs had established Candidate Monitoring Plans to support these candidates. (2.3.c.) The plans use our current assessment system more effectively than in the past. From the beginning of the use of our assessment system, instructors have evaluated candidates on the indicators in various courses throughout all program plans. However, very little was done with the mid-checkpoint data. The Candidate Monitoring plans center on those mid-checkpoints and use the data to identify and create specific plans to support weaker candidates. Support often is in the form

of small committee meetings with the candidate to explore issues of concern. This personal touch assists weak candidates to identify appropriate changes in careers, majors, and/or personal obligations necessary to succeed.

Data Analysis Templates were designed in 2009 to provide program faculty with standardization and structure for data analysis. Data Analysis templates have been revised every year based on input from program faculty. The procedures assist faculty as they examine how well goals set the previous year are met, analyze new data, and plan instructional/programmatic changes based upon those data. Data Analysis Reports by program, as well as Data Analysis Procedures, are found in 1.3.d.

Recent Changes that Relate to Standard I:

1. A majority of the SOE faculty members are now certified to teach online courses due to the increased number of online courses offered in the SOE. Approximately 20 faculty members obtained teaching certification through the university and four faculty members completed the recertification program during the last two years.
2. Initial certification in the Collaborative Teacher K-6 program was changed to Dual Certification in Elementary Education/Collaborative Teacher K-6 to improve candidate marketability and to better prepare candidates to serve all K-6 students. The Collaborative Teacher K-6 only program was eliminated.
3. A policy stating that initial certification candidates must pass Praxis II before being allowed to graduate was implemented in order to ensure that candidates' content knowledge was sufficient prior to working extensively with students.
4. Additional Writing Intensive courses were developed across the School of Education and eleven faculty members have been trained to teach writing intensive courses. This is in fulfillment of the Success in Writing Quality Enhancement Plan of AUM.
5. Advisors are consistently informing undergraduate candidates of the 2.5 GPA requirement needed for admission to Professional Education. Advisors have also informed candidates of the opportunity for low-cost physicals at the Nursing Care Center. Therefore, the physical is no longer a barrier to admission to Professional Education.
6. A new Ed.S. program in Instructional Leadership was implemented due to new state requirements.

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

Not applicable

1.4 Exhibits for Standard I

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.3.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework
1.3.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual fram
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairnes that all students can learn
1.3.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions
1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning

Standard 2

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.a. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The primary and most comprehensive assessment tool used in the unit, SOE Outcomes and Indicators, stems from the Conceptual Framework of *The Professional Educator*. (1.3.c.) Indicators associated with the learning outcomes are assigned to various courses throughout all programs. See Assessment Matrices in 2.3.a. Instructors evaluate candidates on requirements tied to indicators assigned to their courses. At the end of each course, each instructor scores the indicators in candidate portfolios submitted in LiveText. Scores range from "1" (Unsatisfactory) to "4" (Exceptional). Candidates may review LiveText scores throughout their program to identify strengths and weaknesses. Instructors of clinical courses evaluate indicators as program outcomes. Candidates must score at least "2" (Basic) on all indicators to pass clinical courses. Outcome scores are used primarily for program or instructional improvements.

ENTRY POINTS

Undergraduate Entry Requirements: All candidates must have a minimum overall GPA of 2.5 on all work taken prior to admission to Professional Education and a GPA of 2.5 in pre-professional education courses with no grade less than "C". Additional requirements for all candidates include: physical exam, showing no communicable diseases and good general health; speech and hearing test; self assessment in FNDS 2010; adequate communication skills; passing score on all three Alabama Basic Skills assessments (APTT); and physical fitness test for Physical Education majors only. Background clearances are required for all candidates during the first course at AUM with a field experience. Less than half of the candidates who apply for Professional Education in the SOE are admitted every semester. Most candidates are denied admission due to issues with GPA. In 2011, 31% of Physical Education majors were admitted, 39% of Special Education majors were admitted, 45% of Childhood Education majors were admitted, and 53% of Secondary Education majors were admitted. The decrease in admission rate over the last five years has been linked to the SOE Repeating Course Limit Policy (2.3.b.) that prohibits candidates from repeating pre-professional courses more than twice to raise GPA.

Master of Education (ITP) Entry Requirements: Requirements used for entry to these programs include an earned bachelor's or higher degree with a minimum GPA of 2.5, MAT or GRE scores, a passing score on the appropriate Praxis II test or prerequisite coursework at the undergraduate level for the degree being sought, and ABI/FBI Background Clearance. The undergraduate degree posted GPA and the MAT/GRE score must yield a decision score of 400 or higher for full admission. (2.3.b.)

Master of Education (ADV) Entry Requirements: Requirements for entry to these programs include a valid bachelor's level Alabama Teacher's Certificate in the same teaching field for which the M.Ed. is sought, except for special education, reading specialist and instructional leadership candidates. Additional entry requirements for all M.Ed. candidates include: an undergraduate GPA of 2.5 or higher, MAT/GRE score, and Background Clearance. The MAT/GRE score must yield a decision score of 400 or higher for full admission. Certain areas require specific additional requirements. (See requirements for Reading Specialist candidates- Graduate Catalog p.75-76 and Instructional Leadership candidates – Graduate Catalog p.71-73) (2.3.b.)

Education Specialist (ADV) Entry Requirements: Requirements for these programs include a valid master's level Alabama Teacher's Certificate in the same teaching field for which the Ed.S. is sought, with few exceptions (See Graduate Catalog, p.69). (2.3.b.) Additional entry requirements for all Ed.S. candidates include: a master's GPA of 2.5 or higher, MAT/GRE score not over 5 years old, and Background Clearance. The MAT/GRE score must yield a decision score of 475 or higher for full admission into the Ed.S. programs. Certain areas require specific additional requirements (See Instructional Leadership – Graduate Catalog p.71-73). (2.3.b.)

TRANSITION POINTS

Initial Teaching Program Transition Points: Candidates in initial teaching programs must accomplish several requirements before conducting Professional Internship. Each program has specific courses that must be passed with a grade of "C" or higher prior to admission to Professional Internship. Key assessments used for this transition point are GPA (2.5 for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduates) and a passing score on an appropriate Praxis II. (2.3.a.).

Advanced Program Transition Points: All advanced programs have a midpoint assessment to inform candidates of remaining requirements for graduation and/or certification. Midpoint assessment requirements include but are not limited to: maintenance of the minimum GPA required before registering in clinical courses or comprehensive exams; required Praxis II test(s); required AECTP/APTT test; and Background Clearance. See SOE GPA Requirement for Practicum, Internship, and Comprehensive Exam in 2.3.a.

Program Exit Requirements: All programs have specific teaching field and professional education courses required prior to program completion that must be passed with a grade of "C" or higher. Requirements used for program exit are GPA (2.5 for undergraduates in teaching field, professional courses, and overall, 3.0 for M.Ed. candidates in programs other than Instructional Leadership, 3.25 for Ed.S. candidates and all M.Ed. Instructional Leadership candidates), a score of at least "2" (Basic") on every SOE Assessment Indicator, a passing score on an appropriate comprehensive exam, and a passing score on the content knowledge and pedagogy Praxis II test, if not already required. (2.3.a.)

FAIRNESS, ACCURACY, CONSISTENCY, AND AVOIDANCE OF BIAS

Fairness- Assessments are valid when they appropriately assess the candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions assessed throughout their coursework. The SOE Assessment Matrices illustrate how the curriculum is mapped in different courses for every program. Course syllabi clearly state and share assessment expectations with the candidates. (2.3.c.) All course syllabi in which indicators are assessed have the following statement: *At the end of this course you will be assessed on the indicators in this syllabus. A rubric will be used in LiveText, and you are encouraged to review how your instructor assessed you on that*

rubric. A video explaining how to access your rubric results is located at
http://aumsoetechnologyresources.weebly.com/livetext-tutorials.html

Accuracy - The AUM SOE Assessment Alignment Tables align all SOE Assessment Outcomes/Indicators to state/national standards and demonstrate how all standards are appropriate for candidates in all programs. Course syllabi affirm that assignments and assessments are aligned to the Assessment system. A relationship exists between candidates' scores on key assessments and their success throughout the program.

Consistency- Faculty participated in exercises to ensure consistency in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Fall 2012. Results were discussed in small groups and as an entire unit to improve and confirm consistency. Multiple raters evaluate candidates as they move through their program on the same indicator. Inter-rater scores are discussed in program faculty meetings. (2.3.c.)

Avoidance and Elimination of Bias - Instructors evaluate indicators in a variety of ways as evidenced on course syllabi. (2.3.c.) All indicators are evaluated in multiple courses or clinical experiences to ensure a single evaluation or assessment is not used to make decisions concerning candidate achievement. (SOE Assessment Matrices 2.3.a.) Every program uses a variety of key assessments at entry, transition, and exit points to ensure candidates are not adversely affected by bias in assessment. The Diversity Committee examined the AUM SOE Assessment Rubric for Outcomes and found the instrument free of bias based on race, ethnicity, or gender. Minutes of the meeting are provided. The SOE is continually upgrading classroom and facilities to make sure instruction and assessment take place in the appropriate environment.

DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION

All candidates are required to purchase LiveText during their first pre-professional undergraduate or graduate course and are trained to use it. The SOE has a full-time Instructional Support Specialist who serves as the LiveText Coordinator and assists faculty and candidates individually with LiveText questions or issues and maintains a website with tutorial videos. Please refer to training sessions provided by the SOE and to the website for more information.

Data are continuously collected from multiple internal and external sources, and analyzed and evaluated annually by program faculty. See Data Analysis Procedures in 2.3.d. Data are disaggregated by program area, distance and alternate route. (1.3.d.) The SOE has no off-campus programs. Two distance Ed.S. programs in the Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading Education exist but no traditional Ed.S. programs in that department are available in which to compare outcome scores to note discrepancies. Likewise, the advanced M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs in Physical Education are only offered as distance programs with no traditional advanced programs in that area to compare outcome scores. Data analysis reports showing changes made in department/program areas, as well as a summary of changes for the SOE are found in 2.3.g.

2.2 Continuous Improvement

Since the last NCATE review, numerous changes have been made to the SOE Assessment System. All changes have been made to promote continuous improvement. Changes to the SOE Assessment system can be attributed to modifications or revisions in requirements mandated by the Alabama State Department of Education; identified problems associated

with our assessment system as we accumulated more data; the need to make programmatic/instructional changes; and change as deemed important due to stakeholder input.

Professional Internship Evaluations for Initial Teaching Candidates

The Professional Internship Evaluation system uses numeric ratings of "1" to "4" with "1" being Unsatisfactory, "2" Basic, "3" Competent, and "4" Excellent. Initially, interns were measured against master teachers on the internship indicators for comparison across all programs. Only candidates in advanced programs made "4's". A group of cooperating/mentor teachers brought forth a concern with the evaluation practice for initial teaching candidates. Since initial teaching candidates rarely were evaluated on any indicator with a "4," the final evaluation appeared low, even though the initial teaching candidates had done an excellent job as beginners. This evaluation practice was problematic when administrators compared AUM's initial teaching candidates' evaluations with evaluations of interns from other universities during the hiring process. Therefore, the SOE voted to allow initial teaching candidates to receive "4's" on indicators related to their strengths. Data are disaggregated by program and comparison of candidates across all programs is no longer conducted.

New State Standards

The SOE Assessment indicators tied to the ten learning outcomes were revised due to mandated changes in state department requirements in initial teaching programs (2008) and the M.Ed. Instructional Leadership program (2009). A redesign of the Ed.S. Instructional Leadership program was accomplished in 2012 and the assessment system is in transition for that program.

Mid Checkpoint Data Use

In 2009, SOE faculty searched for ways to use data gathered from mid checkpoint scores more effectively. At that time the SOE had a rule that no candidate could score lower than a "2" (Basic) and still pass a course, even those courses taken prior to clinical courses. At a SOE faculty meeting, faculty members expressed they were hesitant to give "1's" on indicators, even if appropriate, because these same candidates might have the required points on assignments to pass the course with a "C". It is possible to be weak in one specific area, as measured by one or more indicators, and not be so weak overall as to fail the course. Therefore, in order to rectify this problem, the faculty voted to allow "1's" on indicators on all coursework prior to clinical courses. This change in the use of mid checkpoint data allowed candidates to become more aware of their weaknesses while allowing faculty to more closely monitor struggling candidates prior to clinical coursework.

Data Collection and Analysis

From 2008 – 2010 there was a concerted effort to collect data in an organized and structured manner. Data collection for various items was assigned to individuals with semester/annual deadlines. This enabled data analysis to become more formalized. Data analysis templates were designed to structure annual data analysis meetings by program faculty. These templates have been revised every year to improve the analysis process and allow for better use of the results. See Data Analysis Reports, 2.3.g. for template design of 2011.

Candidate Monitoring Plans

Candidate Monitoring Plans were developed by each department for every program in 2010 - 2011, after faculty members began evaluating candidates with weaknesses a score of "1". The SOE Assessment Coordinator runs reports at the end of every semester of candidate scores in every course, except clinical courses, by program area. Candidates who have a "1" on any indicator are tagged for referrals. After receiving a specified number of referrals (varies by program), these candidates are targeted for additional support. Candidates usually meet with one or more faculty members who discuss their concerns with the candidate. At this time, candidates are encouraged to share roadblocks with program faculty and for faculty to offer suggestions, as well as a written remedial plan to candidates in need. Follow up meetings are held, if necessary. See 2.3.c. for more details.

Employer Surveys

After the State of Alabama discontinued issuing the Annual State Report Card for Teacher Preparation Programs in 2009, data gathered from employers regarding the competence of AUM graduates was non-existent. Every year since the discontinuation of the Annual State Report Card, the State Department of Education has alluded to the reinstitution of the Annual State Report Card or some comparable measure, but this has not yet occurred. Therefore, the SOE created and disseminated an electronic survey to area principals and superintendents to discern their perception of the quality of our graduates in 2012. See 1.3.j. for survey information.

Mentor Teacher/Cooperating Teacher Surveys

Mentor Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Surveys were developed to gather data regarding diversity and other faculty member characteristics to better inform the SOE of the characteristics of supervisors for interns in initial teaching programs. Surveys were distributed to all mentor/cooperating teachers for two years with plans to continue on an annual basis.

Future Changes

The SOE Assessment System has accumulated an abundance of data through the years and it is necessary to begin to streamline our data collection process to only collect useful data. The SOE would like to obtain more robust data from fewer sources to assist with continuous program improvement. Identification of responsibilities of who collects data and how data are collected is imperative. To continuously improve our programs, the SOE will need to continue to identify data collection techniques that are more efficient and effective in the future.

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

Accreditation Review

1. Not all stakeholders are involved in the development of the unit assessment system.

In 2007 the SOE decided to re-evaluate the unit assessment system. The faculty met and soon thereafter with other stakeholders (candidates, former candidates, Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty members, business and community leaders, teachers, school administrators) to examine the Conceptual Framework, learning outcomes, and accompanying indicators. (I.5.c.) There was overwhelming support to reaffirm the existing assessment system with the same Conceptual Framework, learning outcomes, and indicators. In 2012 another large

stakeholder meeting reaffirmed its continued use. Smaller stakeholder meetings by program area are held more frequently to evaluate the assessment system. The stakeholders are consistently satisfied with the indicators and rubrics, especially since they are so closely aligned with state and national standards.

2. Rubrics used to assess some indicators of candidates' performances are not written in such a way as to provide consistent developmental assessment as candidates progress throughout the program.

In 2008 the state department issued new standards to be met beginning in 2009. Work began immediately to revise the existing list of SOE indicators. The 135 new state standards were combined into 85 indicators for assessment purposes. New assessment matrices were developed for every program and new rubrics were written by the Assessment Committee with faculty input, through a survey. Over the next year, the 85 indicators were combined into 67, with more revisions in the rubrics. In 2009 the M.Ed. Instructional Leadership program, due to a redesign in state standards for this program, formed a unique set of indicators tied to 7 of the original 10 learning outcomes. This precipitated a new set of rubrics for those indicators, designed by program faculty, with input from school partners.These same indicators and rubrics were adopted by the Ed.S. Instructional Leadership program in 2012.

Annually, program faculty address any concerns they have or changes they would like to make on the rubrics or the assessment system in general on the Data Analysis Report. Goals are then set for the next year. No negative comments have been noted on the annual data analysis reports about the rubrics. No significant changes have been made to indicators since 2009. However, from time to time, program faculty will choose to move various indicators to new or different courses. The rubrics have been changed due to faculty input. For the list of indicators assigned to courses in each program see Assessment Matrices in 2.3.a.

3. The unit does not systematically ensure the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of all assessments or whether they are predictors of candidates' success.

The Assessment Matrices, designed in 2007 and revised in 2008 and 2009 show how all indicators were assigned to specific courses at different points in all programs. Course instructors are aware of indicators assessed in their courses and thereby require specific assignments/experiences to teach content/pedagogy related to the indicators evaluated. Candidates understand the assignments and objectives from course syllabi. Candidates are taught how to use LiveText and the evaluation system so that they may review their scores on a regular basis. This ensures that the assessment system is fair.

Course assignments are aligned to indicators aligned to state standards and learning outcomes. The learning outcomes are aligned with national standards and the Conceptual Framework. Therefore, all indicators are appropriate and accurate.

The SOE faculty members have participated in three consistency activities as a large group. One activity (Spring 2010) focused on Teacher Work Samples and allowed faculty members to evaluate several common examples and discuss evaluations in small groups consisting of a mixture of program faculty members. A second consistency activity (Fall 2010) focused on recorded teaching episodes. Faculty members scored the teaching examples using the evaluation instruments commonly used with intern observations. After scoring, small group discussions were held, followed by a large group discussion related to what was learned from the experience. A third consistency activity (Fall 2012) focused again on recorded teaching episodes. Discussions followed. In each case, program faculty

members were encouraged to continue these types of activities with each other to develop more consistency over time.

Inter-rater scores are reported for all evaluators of SOE assessment indicators in LiveText. These scores are useful for program faculty to review and discuss. From this section of the reports, program faculty members may see if faculty members evaluate vastly different from others by reviewing the standard deviation score of each evaluator. This review has been added to the Data Analysis Report for 2012 so that these discussions will more formally take place to ensure further consistency.

2.4 Exhibits for Standard II

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

Standard 3

Standard 3

3.1 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Field and Clinical experiences reflect the Conceptual Framework and help candidates develop appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. (I.5.c., 3.3.g.) Candidates meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice (3.3.g.) and demonstrate mastery of content/pedagogical knowledge prior to clinical practice. (Standard I)

COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNIT AND SCHOOL PARTNERS

The SOE has Memorandums of Agreement with twenty school systems that have agreed to place candidates in field and clinical experiences. For most programs the Director of Student Services and Teacher Certification works directly with personnel at the central offices of these school systems to jointly place candidates in field experiences and clinical practice. Central office personnel communicate with principals initially to find good cooperating teachers. Interns and university supervisors provide feedback on the effectiveness of all cooperating teachers to the Director after Professional Internship. This feedback may affect whether or not teachers are used in the future. The Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading Education has Memorandums of Agreement with eighteen schools within some of the school districts mentioned above. Clinical liaisons in this program work directly with principals to place candidates for field/clinical experiences. The Instructional

Leadership program has Memorandums of Agreement with nineteen school systems. See 3.3.a. for specific agreements.

Stakeholder meetings are held bi-annually (most recent meeting in February 2012) that involve principals, teachers, and university faculty members from across all programs, including those in other Schools at AUM, to gather input about broad issues, such as the Conceptual Framework and the SOE Assessment System. School/community partnership meetings are held on a regular basis for smaller groups of program faculty and school/community agency personnel to revise programs, assessments, and provide more effective support for candidates and teachers. Faculty members in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading Education have annual summer training sessions for mentor teachers and meet twice per year with the Mentor Teacher Advisory Council, which is a group of representatives from each school involved in the program. Instructional Leadership faculty members meet annually with the Instructional Leadership Advisory Council. Online surveys disseminated to school principals and superintendents in 2012 produced data to add to existing stakeholder data. (1.3.j.) See 3.3.a. for collaborative activities between faculty members and field sites.

DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

Candidates have intensive and extensive field/clinical experiences prior to graduation. (3.3.b.) Field experiences are explained in the Field Experience Manual and clinical practice for initial teaching candidates is explained in the Professional Internship Manual. Clinical practice for advanced candidates is explained in syllabi for individual courses. (3.3.e.) In a Fall 2012 survey, initial teaching candidates reported they had a variety of experiences. (3.3.b.) Candidates in the SOE were involved in tutoring students in approximately 47 schools over the last two years. Others were involved in community projects. See 3.3.a. for syllabi related to interactions with families/community.

Use of Technology Instructional Technology is one of ten learning outcomes on the SOE Outcomes and Indicators and is evaluated in clinical courses in all programs. (3.3.f.) Candidates have technology assignments, which are placed in their portfolios under the heading Educational Technology (on the AUM Portfolio template). (1.3.h.)

Qualifications of Clinical Faculty Criteria for qualifications of school faculty are delineated in the Alabama Administrative Code. (3.3.c.) Higher education clinical faculty members, not currently serving as classroom teachers in P-12 settings, must have 10 hours of recent classroom experience every semester and are formally evaluated annually. Higher education clinical faculty and interns evaluate P-12 faculty using the Mentor Teacher Evaluation Form. (3.3.d.) Qualifications of clinical faculty in the SOE over the last two years may be found in (5.3.b.). Qualifications are discussed when clinical liaisons, the Director of Student Services and Teacher Certification, central office personnel, and school administrators make clinical placements.

Assessments Formative assessments are used in field/clinical experiences to monitor candidate learning and provide ongoing feedback. Course instructors, who accompany candidates in field experiences, use their own assessment tools related to individual course content, consisting of reflection journals, observation rubrics, and online discussions. Candidates, who are not accompanied by their instructor in field experiences, are evaluated by the classroom teacher using the Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form, which is returned to the course instructor upon completion of the field experience.   During internship and some practicum courses, the SOE Classroom Lesson Observation Form is used. Some

programs use additional forms related to classroom environment and other factors. (3.3.f.) The SOE Outcomes and Indicators (with accompanying rubrics) are used for summative purposes and are reported through LiveText in Professional Internship for initial teaching candidates and practicum courses of advanced candidates. (3.3.f.). Different indicators are assigned to specific clinical courses. (3.3.f.)

Support for Student Teachers Before candidates begin Professional Internship, an orientation session is held. In all programs, except for Childhood Education, the university supervisor conducts three – five formal observations accompanied by conferences with the intern and cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher conducts four formal observations and conferences. These observations use the SOE Classroom Lesson Observation Form. (3.3.f.). The interns submit a Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Evaluation Form (3.3.d.) twice per semester. That information is funneled to the appropriate supervisor and is used in performance evaluations of higher education clinical faculty and to decide if P-12 clinical faculty will be used in the future. Intern seminars are held with university supervisors on campus periodically throughout the internship and supervisors conduct online discussion forums where interns share ideas with each other. See Professional Internship Manual and online discussion forum prompts for every program in 3.3.e.

In the Childhood Education Mentor Teacher Intern Project, clinical liaisons work with mentor teachers who supervise interns. Clinical liaisons meet with interns regularly in ECEL 4453/6453 Professional Development Seminar (3.3.e.) taken concurrently with Professional Internship. Interns share ideas and solutions to problems during these seminar meetings and through the online discussion forum between those meetings. See Childhood Education Mentor Teacher Handbook for more information on this program. (3.3.e.)

Advanced Programs Candidates in advanced programs complete practicum courses where they apply coursework, analyze P-12 student learning through the Teacher Work Sample (3.3.e.) or similar assignment, and reflect on their practice. Candidates in other professional roles have structured activities related to the roles for which they are preparing, involving analysis of data, use of technology and current research, and the application of knowledge. (3.3.e.)

CANDIDATES' DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS LEARN

Candidates participate in field/clinical experiences with diverse students. (3.3.b.) These experiences allow time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty. Reflection and feedback generally occurs during class time or online in courses with field experiences.

When instructors accompany candidates during field experiences, individual feedback may occur immediately through onsite modeling and coaching. Some field experiences have opportunities for candidates to observe each other and time to reflect with the course instructor and peers immediately after working with P-12 students.

P-12 Student Learning Teacher candidates in all programs (initial teaching and advanced) focus on student learning and this is measured primarily in clinical courses. However, most programs focus on student learning much earlier in courses with field experiences. See High Quality Field Experiences in 3.3.a. Impact on student learning in clinical courses is measured through the Teacher Work Sample. (3.3.e.) Programs that do not use the Teacher Work Sample provide an explanation of how impact on student learning is measured on the annual Data Analysis Reports by program area (1.3.d.) and may be reviewed in advanced practicum syllabi (ESPE 6914 Practicum in Special Education, ESPE 7914 –

Advanced Practicum in Special Education, and READ 6914 – Practicum in Reading I - 3.3.e.). The Teacher Work Sample (or similar assignment) requires teacher candidates to assess and analyze the classroom and school using family and community features, plan instruction for all students, make data-driven and appropriate adjustments to instruction for all students, and monitor all student progress accordingly. (1.3.g.) Candidates develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students based on student developmental levels and prior experience.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

INITIAL TEACHING PROGRAMS

During the Fall 2012 SOE Retreat, initial teaching program faculty members met to discuss and rate themselves on specific items in each element of Target for Standard III: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. This self-assessment helped faculty understand where they were in the implementation of Target criteria. Faculty members in each program later selected criteria for immediate implementation in Spring 2013. In February 2013 program faculty met again to assess progress and revise plans for the future. Faculty reported that they met Target standards at different levels but after much discussion, SOE faculty set five goals for the future.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNIT AND SCHOOL PARTNERS

The SOE has not met target for initial teaching candidates in this element. However, movement has been made toward target over the last 3 years. Additionally, one goal has been established in this element.

Over the last year, with a new state superintendent, collaborative relationships are growing stronger between higher education and P-12 schools. Two faculty members from the SOE attend state and regional meetings aimed at improving P-12 learning and teacher education and reports are made to department heads from those meetings. The SOE administrators actively participate in Alabama Association of College Teacher Educators, which meets three times annually across the state. Over the last year, the focus of these meetings has been to establish stronger relationships with P-12 schools. Two state superintendents were invited to join the group five years ago. Furthermore, the state of Alabama has recently joined the NCATE/CAEP State Alliance and a member of the AUM SOE is one of the representatives for the state at these national meetings aimed at developing stronger relationships with P-12 schools.

Both the unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's conceptual framework and the school program at an acceptable level. Stakeholder meetings held bi-annually, smaller group meetings with clinical faculty (higher education and school-based), and the surveys that were recently disseminated to school administrators and superintendents are important. However, Target level requires more involvement in school partnerships. Over the last three years, the Performance Evaluation system was revised to emphasize more involvement in P-12 schools. A Clinical Track Faculty Performance Evaluation was developed. Additionally, SOE faculty members (clinical and tenure track) now receive points on the performance evaluation for supervising and monitoring onsite field experiences, teaching a course in a P-12 school, participation in partnership with P-12 schools, paid/unpaid service to P-12 schools, and conducting professional development with teachers. (5.3.f.) The number of school partnerships for faculty members increased from 5 in 2010 to 24 in 2011. During 2010 and 2011, SOE faculty

members have assisted P-12 schools/community agencies with 25 professional development activities. (5.3.e.)

Some monetary and personnel resources are integrated between the unit and P-12 schools. AUM has allocated additional funding annually ($22,000) for the last 12 years to support the Mentor Teacher Project and mentor teachers and other intern supervisors are paid as adjuncts from the University budget. (6.3.g.) Over the last few years, three grants submitted by SOE faculty members were funded to aid schools in working with ELL students and students with special needs. (4.3.i.) Equipment and supplies are interchanged between partner schools and the unit during field/clinical experiences to ensure that candidates or teachers have ample supplies for effective instruction. Equipment has been purchased for teachers who have worked with SOE candidates for extended time periods. Furniture purchases have been made to provide an environment for instructors to meet with candidates on a school site. Numerous collaborative activities have occurred between the unit and P-12 schools (3.3.a.).

Goal:

The SOE will develop stronger collaborative relationships with P-12 schools by participating in professional development and instructional programs with each other. Furthermore, the unit and school partners will integrate more resources to increase learning of candidates and P-12 students. The timeline for this goal may be found in Target Level Performance Exhibits.

DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The SOE has not met target for initial teaching candidates in this element. However, movement has been made toward target over the last 3 years. Additionally, three goals have been established in this element.

The number of hours spent in field/clinical experiences in all initial teaching programs has increased over the last seven years. Recently more practicum courses have been added to some programs. Field experience hours have been rearranged so that fewer hours are spent in foundations/survey courses, where only observation occurs, and more field hours are spent in the higher level courses, where candidates are more involved with school programs. Professional internships in all initial teaching programs span a full semester in one school system (one school if only one placement is required) and ensure that candidate learning is integrated into the school program and teaching practice. Candidates may return to campus for a maximum of 5 days for other work during that semester. Interns are members of instructional teams in the school and are active participants in professional decisions where appropriate. They attend grade level planning meetings, faculty meetings, data analysis meetings, and in some cases parent-teacher and IEP meetings.

Interns reflect on, and justify their own practice, through online journals, discussion forums, and face-to-face seminars. (See course syllabi, seminars, and online discussion forum prompts in 3.3.e.). Candidates reflect on their practice and form professional development goals in Sections F and G of the Teacher Work Sample, which is required in all initial teaching internships. (3.3.e.)

Tracking Field/Clinical Experiences

SOE candidates have a variety of field and clinical experiences based on diversity of schools in the geographical area. However, tracking those experiences could be improved to collect data on individual and group experiences more effectively. Currently, candidates are required to complete the LiveText Field Lab Experiences Page (3.3.b.), listing all field experiences with the school, school system, semester of experience, year of experience, and number of hours, which is turned in with the Professional Internship application form. The Director of Student Services and Teacher Certification and clinical faculty in Childhood Education review this before internship placements are made to ensure candidates have a variety of experiences with diverse students. While this form provides some information, data cannot be retrieved and compiled for analysis. Furthermore, this system is only used for initial teaching candidates. In Fall 2012, a candidate survey on the quality and placements of field/clinical experiences for all programs (initial teaching and advanced) was developed and disseminated, which produced more useful data about diversity and types of experiences. However, the instrument needs revision or a new instrument should be identified to produce more useful data.

Goal:

Design an accurate, simple, and easy-to-use system to track field experiences and clinical practice of all candidates. This system should track racial/ethnic/socio-economic diversity and the types of experiences for different programs across the SOE, as well as allow effective data analysis of individuals and groups. The timeline for this goal may be found in Target Level Performance Exhibits.

Quality of Field Experiences

Well-designed opportunities to learn through doing are incorporated into the Professional Internship for initial teaching candidates. Candidates are immersed in a school environment for a full semester and jointly control instruction with the cooperating/mentor teachers. The state requires interns take full control of the classroom for at least 20 days, 10 of those days in succession. (3.3.e. - Professional Internship Manual, page 10)

Field experiences are designed to prepare candidates for Professional Internship. The preparation occurs more gradually for undergraduates than it does for graduates. Undergraduate candidates take pre-professional education courses with field experiences (FNDS 2010 – Social Foundations of Education and ESPE 3760 – Survey of Exceptionalities) prior to admission to professional education. Field experiences in foundations courses and the special education survey course in all initial teaching programs (including graduate candidates) allow the opportunity for candidates to observe teachers working with P-12 students. After undergraduates are admitted to Professional Education they may enroll in higher level courses, such as methods courses and clinical practice (practicum courses). Graduate candidates may begin methods courses during the first semester of coursework. Field experiences in methods courses and clinical practice prior to Professional Internship require candidates to work directly with students, if the cooperating teachers allow. Field experiences in some programs, especially those where instructors accompany candidates to field sites, require lesson planning, instruction, and reflection on impact of student learning. Some course instructors and P-12 faculty model teach for candidates to observe and others teach their courses on a school campus and/or supervise onsite field experiences. The number of instructors who require intensive work with students in field experiences has increased over the last five years. However, these practices are not used across all programs. See 3.3.a. for high quality field experiences.

Goal:

Field experiences in all programs will be designed to provide more modeling by clinical faculty members and more opportunities for candidates to learn through doing. The timeline for this goal may be found in Target Level Performance Exhibits.

Interaction with Families and School Community

Candidates have always interacted with teachers, administrators, and university supervisors during field and clinical experiences. Candidates in all programs analyze the school and surrounding community as they create a Teacher Work Sample during Professional Internship. (3.3.e.) In Physical Education, candidates interact with families at practices, games, and other events. In Childhood Education, all undergraduates work with families in the Early Childhood Internship and all graduates (in the initial teaching program), including those in Special Education programs, work with the Hispanic families at Brewbaker Intermediate in several courses. However, interaction with families of students is difficult to arrange in secondary settings when even the 6 – 12 teachers rarely interact with families. See examples of field experiences that involve interactions with families and community in 3.3.e.

Goal:

Interaction with families and school community will increase for all candidates in the SOE through community and service learning projects that are collaboratively planned and implemented by peers. The timeline for this goal may be found in Target Level Performance Exhibits.

CANDIDATES' DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS LEARN

The SOE has not met target for initial teaching candidates in this element. However, some parts of this element have been met at Target level. Additionally, one goal has been established in this element.

Field/clinical experiences facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students. Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools. The well-developed SOE assessment system and the diversity of students in schools in which field/clinical experiences are conducted ensure candidates develop and demonstrate these proficiencies. (3.3.b., 3.3.f.) Furthermore, the Teacher Work Sample, required of all initial teaching interns, requires candidates to plan and implement effective instruction for all students. See Teacher Work Sample guidelines for specific information. (3.3.e.)

Critiquing and Reflecting on Each Others' Practice

As explained in Support for Student Teachers candidates currently share ideas with clinical faculty and peers through seminars and online discussion forums, where some informal critiquing and reflecting on others' practice occurs. (3.3.e.) More formal means of peer critiquing is beginning to surface. Some instructors place several candidates with one group of students in the field and they critique each other as one candidate teaches. In Spring 2013

several other opportunities for peer evaluation have occurred. One instructor for undergraduates will conduct video analysis with the candidates in a field experience, if funds are available. Candidates critique themselves and other candidates by tagging comments and questions for each other on the video. Interns in two programs beginning in Spring 2013 are required to observe a peer and formally critique him/her. Other than the examples already mentioned there are few instances of formal critiquing, either through live observations or video analysis, among peers across the SOE. Furthermore, all critiques should place more emphasis on student learning.

Goal:

Candidates will work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on their own and each others' practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice. The timeline for this goal may be found in [Target Level Performance Exhibits.](#)

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

Not Applicable

3.4 Exhibits for Standard III

[3.3.a](#)	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of
[3.3.b](#)	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be d program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
[3.3.c](#)	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school
[3.3.d](#)	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
[3.3.e](#)	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical facult support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
[3.3.f](#)	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
[3.3.g](#)	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These as included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropria
	Target Level Performance Exhibits

Standard 4

Standard 4

4.1 Diversity

DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALAUTION OF CURRICULUM AND EXPERIENCES

Diversity Proficiencies Diversity proficiencies, aligned to the Conceptual Framework (I.5.c.) are taught and evaluated in 8 of the 10 Learning Outcomes. Outcomes, indicators, and accompanying rubrics were approved by a diverse group of faculty members before being used. (4.3.a.) See 4.3.c. for a complete list of diversity indicators for all programs. Courses in which the diversity indicators are evaluated have specific assignments or field experiences to assist candidates learn how to work effectively with diverse students (4.3.b.). These assignments include an awareness of different learning styles (Indicator 6.3), instruction in adaptation of student instruction or services (Indicators 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 5.6), communication with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences (Indicators 3.6, 3.9, 3.10, 3.17, 3.23, 3.27), connecting lessons, instruction, or services to students' experiences and cultures (Indicators 3.7, 3.22, 6.4, 8.2), incorporating multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught or served (Indicator 4.6), and developing a classroom and school climate that values diversity (3.1, 3.9, 3.11, 3.13, 3.14, 3.18, 3.21, 5.6, 6.4, 8.2, 8.4, 9.1, 10.8, 10.9).

Indicators mentioned above are evaluated in all programs (initial teaching and advanced). See 4.3.b. to identify where indicators are taught and evaluated by program. Candidates must earn at least "2" (Basic) on all indicators assigned to practicum courses and internships to pass the courses and graduate. Scores on all indicators are placed in candidates' portfolios and can be viewed throughout their program as they plan for improvement.

Special Needs/English Language Learners Indicators are directly related to students with exceptionalities (3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.22, 5.6, 8.2, 8.4, 9.1, 10.8, 10.9) and related content is taught and evaluated in every program. English language learners in P-12 classrooms in the geographical area have recently become more common. Currently, indicators 2.3, 2.7, and 3.3 are evaluated in all initial teaching programs and all advanced secondary and physical education programs. Indicator 3.20 is evaluated in Instructional Leadership programs. Plans are underway to add at least one English Language Learner indicator (2.3, 2.7, or 3.3) to all advanced programs not already evaluating them. See 4.3.b. for course activities.

EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE FACULTY

Professional Education faculty, as shown by diversity tables in 4.3.d., are both female and male, and from at least two ethnic/racial groups. The SOE faculty members (higher education and school-based) were predominantly female. More males were hired in 2011 to ensure more instructor diversity. Candidates also take content courses in other Schools at AUM, where more male instructors are common.

Racial/Ethnic Diversity of Higher Education Faculty In 2011, 25% of initial teaching program instructors, 33% of advanced program instructors, and 11% of instructors in both types of programs were African American or Hispanic. In 2012, the percentages were 31%, 33%, and 16% respectively. Diversity in faculty has increased over the last year, partially as a result of the Provost's incentive to offer an additional position to any School at AUM that hired a minority candidate. Fifty percent of the new hires in the SOE in 2011 were from underrepresented groups (African American and Hispanic), which led to a more diverse faculty in 2012. The SOE has a higher percentage of faculty members from underrepresented groups than the university average. (4.3.d.)

The institution employs faculty members from other racial/ethnic groups, such as Asian and American Indian or Alaska Native but none of these faculty members work in the SOE.

Candidates who take content courses at AUM work with diverse faculty members in the Schools of Liberal Arts and Sciences. (4.3.d.)

AUM practices good faith efforts to recruit diverse faculty. The AUM Strategic Plan, written in 2007 and revised in 2011, established an Office of Diversity to develop, implement, and monitor programs to foster a culture of diversity. This Office evaluates campus climate, program effectiveness, and campus statistics to recommend relevant changes. All search committees for SOE faculty and staff members have at least one member from an underrepresented group. The SOE assigns a faculty mentor to new faculty members, including those from underrepresented groups, for support as new faculty work toward tenure and promotion. (4.3.g.)

Racial/Ethnic Diversity of School Based Faculty An average of 11.5% of school based faculty members are African American and 0% are Hispanic. The SOE makes a concerted effort to recruit mentor teachers from underrepresented groups. However, recruitment is a collaborative arrangement with P-12 schools and is dependent on school faculty willingness to serve and school principal recommendation. (4.3.d.)

Special Needs/English Language Learner Expertise Candidates in every program are required to take a special education survey course taught by special education faculty members who have worked with children with special needs. Candidates in all initial teaching programs receive instruction from one or more of six instructors in the SOE who have had extensive experience working with ELL.

EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE CANDIDATES

Candidates enrolled in SOE programs are predominantly female; however, candidates have courses with male students outside of the SOE. Approximately 60% of AUM's students are first generation college students. Also, 37% of AUM students currently receive Pell Grants to attend college. Therefore, it may be generalized that candidates are from different socioeconomic groups.

Racial/Ethnic Diversity Approximately one-third of the candidates enrolled in SOE programs are African American, which is comparable to the institution average and slightly more than the average for the geographical area served by the institution. Over the last three years, more candidates are reporting their race/ethnicity as Two or More Races and Unknown annually. As more candidates report their race as Two or More and Unknown, it appears that the African American averages have decreased in some areas. However, the majority of candidates reporting Two or More Races in the geographical area are usually African American/White, which are the two most common races. (4.3.e.)

AUM does provide orientation and support programs/activities for international students. However, few international students are enrolled in SOE programs. University recruitment activities and efforts are aimed at all potential students, including those from underrepresented groups. Because the diversity in the AUM service area is high, special recruitment is not needed for diverse candidates.

EXPERIENCES WORKING WITH DIVERSE STUDENTS IN P-12 SCHOOLS

Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that follow the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. (1.3.e., 1.3.f.) Feedback from peers and supervisors in coursework

and on the Teacher Work Sample helps candidates reflect on their experiences with diverse students and their ability to help all students learn. (4.3.a., 4.3.b.)

Field/clinical experiences for all programs provide experiences with male and female P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups. School systems used for field/clinical experiences in 2011 reported 22% to 90% of their students as receiving free/reduced price lunches. Most SOE candidates are placed in three school systems (Autauga County, Elmore County, and Montgomery County), which report 46% - 73% as students receiving free/reduced price lunches. (4.3.f.)

Student Racial/Ethnic Diversity All candidates have field/clinical experiences with at least two racial/ethnic groups of students. Two – four percent of the students in Autauga, Elmore, and Montgomery counties are Hispanic, 1% - 3% are Asian, and 24% - 78% are African American. The other predominant racial/ethnic group represented in most counties is White. (4.3.f.)

Students with Special Needs/English Language Learners Candidates are placed in school systems with some English Language Learners at least once before graduation. In 2011 the percentage of ELL students was less than 1% in Autauga County, 1.5% in Elmore County, and 3.6% in Montgomery County. (4.3.f.) The number of ELL students enrolled in this geographical area is growing rapidly and is expected to be an area where more support will be focused in the future. Most ELL students in the state are Hispanic or Asian.

In 2011 candidates were placed in systems with students with special needs (6% - 13% of the system enrollment). Nine to eleven percent of the students in Autauga, Elmore, and Montgomery counties have special needs. (4.3.f.)

In Fall 2012, results from a survey showed that candidates had a variety of classroom settings for field/clinical experiences. Most experiences took place in public schools but other sites included parochial schools, Department of Defense military base schools, and AUM campus programs. Sites included rural, suburban, and urban schools. Candidates reported that there were English Language Learners in 17% - 75% of the sites, students with special needs in 15% - 75% of the sites, and racially/ethnically diverse students in 25% - 52% of the sites. (4.3.f.)

4.2 Continuous Improvement

Racial/Ethnic Diversity of Faculty

Diversity of SOE faculty has increased since our last review. In 2005 the faculty was 86% White and 14% African American or Hispanic. In 2012 the faculty was 80% White and 20% African American or Hispanic. Eight new faculty members were hired in 2011, 50% from underrepresented groups (3 African American and 1 Hispanic). (4.3.d.)

Diversity of Candidates

Diversity of SOE candidates has increased since our last review. The number of candidates in racial/ethnic groups, other than White or African American, has increased to 18% in 2012 from less than 6% in 2005. White enrollment at AUM has decreased from 60% to 53%. African American enrollment has decreased from 33% to 29% during those same years. AUM enrollment of Two or More Races or Unknown has increased from 2% - 15%. The predominant races in the SOE have historically remained White and African American. (4.3.e.)

Candidate monitoring plans have been implemented in all programs to ensure all candidates, including diverse candidates, are supported effectively if problems are identified in their programs. These plans target candidates who score low on SOE indicators before internships/practicum courses in order to provide individualized attention from faculty members in their program. (4.3.h.)

Diversity of P-12 Students

The P-12 student population has become more racially/ethnically diverse since our last review. A slight increase in African American students and a decrease in White students has been reported. However, the influx of Hispanic and Asian (primarily Korean, Vietnamese, and Chinese) racial/ethnic groups to the geographical area has raised awareness in the school community since many of these students are English Language Learners. This influx has led to recent changes over the last year.

- A Hispanic professor in the SOE, recently hired from Montgomery County Public Schools, serves as a liaison between the SOE and Brewbaker Primary and Intermediate Schools. The enrollment at these schools is approximately 25% Hispanic and the majority do not speak English as a first language. Over the last year candidates in the SOE have worked with Hispanic families from those schools in service learning projects, many of which are supported with funding from AUM grants. (4.3.i.)
- While all SOE faculty members have worked with White and African American P-12 students over the years and have begun to work with Hispanic and Asian cultures more recently through the Recent Classroom Experience Policy (5.3.c.), this experience is not extensive. New faculty members in the SOE have more experience working with Hispanic and Asian cultures. Plans are underway for this knowledge to be formally shared with all faculty members in the SOE and shared with candidates.
- In Fall 2012, survey results for field/clinical placements indicated that many candidates felt they were placed in settings that had little diversity. These results may be due to the candidates' lack an understanding of the definition of diversity. Therefore, plans are underway to revise the candidate field/clinical tracking program to gather more accurate data in Spring 2013. (4.3.f.)

Special Needs

The number of students in P-12 classrooms with special needs has increased in the last 7 years. Special educators in the SOE have taken a leadership role in supporting faculty members in other programs in this area. Partnerships have been formed with Secondary Education faculty to infuse best practices for working with special needs students in middle and high school through multiple grants. In addition to behavior management classes and lectures, all interns in initial teaching programs are offered one day of training in Positive Behavior Support. Several grants have been funded to support work with students with special needs. (4.3.i.)

English Language Learners

Candidates have worked with English Language Learners for at least 5 years in P-12 settings on campus and in the public schools since the opening of the Hyundai plant in Montgomery County. Many Korean students associated with this plant attend elementary schools in close proximity to the AUM campus. Most SOE programs involving early childhood and elementary students serve predominantly Asian ELL students. The number of Hispanic ELL

students has increased over the last several years. The influx of ELL students in the public schools is expected to continue to increase. Undergraduate candidates in most programs complete a new research-based online module related to English Language Learners taught by special educators in ESPE 3760 – Survey of Exceptionalities. (4.3.i.) New faculty members in the SOE have extensive experience in working with ELL students and plans are underway to share that experience formally with faculty members who have limited experience in this area. A grant has been funded to support ELL students in the community. (4.3.i.)

In the past little data were collected in some advanced programs related to indicators for English Language Learners. Beginning in Summer 2013 at least one Diversity indicator related to English Language Learners (2.3, 2.7, or 3.3) will be added to all advanced programs not already evaluating those indicators.

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

Not Applicable

4.4 Exhibits for Standard V

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

~Back to Top~

Standard 5

Standard 5

5.1 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

QUALIFIED FACULTY

Most higher education faculty members have earned doctorates and others have at least an M.Ed. and exceptional expertise in their fields. Exceptional expertise is defined as state certification at a Class A level or higher, and eight years of experience in P-12 schools in the field for which they are certified. Personnel contracts are held in AUM's Human Resources and transcripts and curriculum vita are held in the Dean's Office. P-12 professional education

faculty members (mentor teachers) are certified at the Class A (M.Ed.) or AA (Ed.S.) level and have at least three years of experience in the field in which they are certified. (5.3.a.) Most higher education clinical faculty members have doctorates, but some have M.Ed. degrees and at least 8 years of classroom teaching experience. (5.3.b.) Eighty-one percent of P-12 clinical faculty members in 2012 had at least an M.Ed. The others, in high need positions, had B.S. degrees. All P-12 clinical faculty members have at least 3 years of teaching experience but in 2012 the average number of years was 13. One hundred percent of P-12 clinical faculty members are teaching in the fields in which they are certified. (5.3.b.) P-12 clinical faculty members are supported through the guidelines specified in the Professional Internship Manual and the Childhood Education Mentor Teacher Handbook. Partnership meetings with P-12 clinical faculty and higher education clinical faculty are held periodically to exchange ideas and to provide support to one another. Higher education clinical faculty members work directly with P-12 clinical faculty on a continuous basis through face-to-face interactions and email to provide support for intern supervision. (3.3.d., 5.3.c.)

MODELING BEST PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES IN TEACHING

Candidates consistently measure the quality of instruction in the SOE as high. In 2010 – 2011 candidates rated the quality of instruction in the SOE higher (4.27 out of 5.00) than the university average (4.16) on course evaluations and higher (3.57) than the university average (3.46) on exit surveys. Candidates in initial teaching programs rated instruction in a similar fashion on exit surveys compiled by the SOE. (1.3.i.)

Leadership at AUM: Over the last 7 years, across five academic Schools, 50% of the AUM Ida Belle Young Professorships and 29% of the AUM Distinguished Teaching Awards have been awarded to SOE faculty members. Furthermore, SOE faculty members, who were some of the first at AUM to teach online/hybrid courses, actively participated on AUM leadership committees to design procedures and develop quality standards for online instruction.

Special Qualifications: Instructors must have graduate teaching status approval and be certified in Writing Across the Curriculum and certified in Online Instruction before they are allowed to teach related courses. All higher education clinical faculty members, not currently serving as classroom teachers in P-12 settings, must have 10 hours of recent classroom experience every semester. This experience is defined as co-teaching or substitute/guest teaching in a P-12 class for teaching faculty and as comparable activities for faculty members in other professional roles. (5.3.c.)

Course Instruction: Faculty members assess candidate performance throughout their programs on multiple measures tied to professional, state, and institutional standards. They guide candidates in the application of research, theories, and current developments in their fields and in teaching. (I.5.c., 2.3.a.) Faculty members encourage candidates to reflect, think critically, solve problems, and to develop professional dispositions necessary to become an effective educator. (See Standards I and II.) Faculty members use a variety of instructional strategies (including technology) (5.3.a.), integrate diversity in their course content (4.3.b.), and assess their own effectiveness as teachers who impact candidate learning and performance. (5.3.f.)

Teaching Performance Evaluation: Candidates evaluate instructors anonymously through the Instructional Assessment System. Course evaluations are conducted every two years for tenured faculty members, and every semester for non-tenured faculty members, including adjuncts. (5.3.f.) Candidates in 2011 rated their preparation highest in instructor enthusiasm, instructor preparation, and the comfortable atmosphere of the classroom that

encouraged them to ask questions. The lowest ratings were in course difficulty and course workload. (1.3.i.) Fifty to seventy-five percent of the SOE performance evaluation is allotted to Teaching. Exact percentages, within this range, are chosen by faculty members and depend partly on the type of appointment occupied. Important aspects of Teaching, such as using technology or alternatives to lecture, supervision of field experiences, department head observation, and candidate course evaluation forms are used as part of the evaluation process. The SOE average Teaching score on the performance evaluations for 2010 was 3.58 (Excellent) and for 2011 was 2.83 (Good). (5.3.f.) Individual evaluations may be verified during the onsite visit.

MODELING BEST PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES IN SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty members are given much support in scholarship activities. The university offers financial support to faculty members for research through the AUM Research Council and the Dean of the SOE. (5.3.d.) In 2011 SOE faculty members published 34 articles in national and international refereed journals, 2 articles in state refereed journals, and 11 book chapters, received two external grants and 10 internal (AUM) grants, presented at 49 national and international conferences, and 48 state or regional conferences. Ten to forty percent of the SOE performance evaluation is allotted to Scholarship. Publications, grants, professional conference presentations, and editorial board memberships are considered Scholarship activities. See Annual Reports in 5.3.e. for activities of all faculty and 5.3.d. for samples of those activities. In 2010 the average SOE score in Scholarship was 3.25 and in 2011 was 2.86, a rating of "Good" in both instances. (5.3.f.) Individual evaluations may be verified during the onsite visit.

MODELING BEST PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES IN SERVICE

In 2010 and 2011, full-time professional education faculty members were involved in 106 unpaid service activities for schools/community agencies, 29 partnerships with P – 12 schools, 54 community boards, 47 tutoring programs for P-12 students, 25 professional development activities for teachers/community employees, and 15 grants for community projects. Almost all schools in which P-12 service is provided are Title I schools, with a high number of children receiving free or reduced lunch. The faculty also participated in 18 collaborative activities with other universities, served on 64 editorial boards, and held 40 offices in professional organizations. Activities of individual faculty members, summary of activities, and examples of activities are found in 5.3.e. Faculty members collaborate regularly and systematically with P-12 practitioners. (5.3.c.) Ten to thirty-five percent of the faculty performance evaluation is allotted to Service to the department, SOE, AUM, and the community. The average SOE score on performance evaluations for Service in 2010 was 3.97 (Excellent) and in 2011, 3.41 (Good). (5.3.f.) Individual evaluations may be verified during the onsite visit.

UNIT EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Faculty members submit a report of activities in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service and a self-evaluation, including a teaching self-assessment, to the Department Head annually. The Department Head completes his/her evaluations and submits them to the Dean for approval, before final evaluations and conferences with faculty members are conducted. Faculty members then specify goals in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as well as choose percentages in each of those areas, for the following year. Individual evaluations are stored in each Department Head's office. Faculty performance evaluations are used for merit pay raise, tenure and promotion, as well as faculty dismissal decisions. New faculty members are assigned a mentor during the first semester of employment and tenured faculty members

and the department head participate in a third year review of their accomplishments to ensure they receive feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion. Adjuncts are evaluated annually using the SOE Adjunct Evaluation form and teaching/advising staff members are evaluated according to the AUM Performance Management System. (5.3.f.)

UNIT FACILITATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Faculty members participate in many professional development activities each year. Faculty attended 100 professional conferences at the state, regional, national, and international level in the last two years (2010 – 2011). Faculty attended over 37 technology workshops over those years, due to the increase in online/hybrid course offerings.

The university and the SOE offer a wide variety of professional development opportunities throughout the year. Some examples, in addition to those already mentioned are: Writing Faculty Development Institute, new faculty orientation workshops, tenure and promotion workshops, leadership training for current and future administrators, grant writing support, campus safety, research support, and diversity training. The SOE spent over $135,000 in professional development for faculty members in the last three years (2010 – 2012). (6.3.f.) Most of those funds were used to send faculty members to professional conferences. The university offers professional improvement leave with and without pay, if approved. Faculty members receive extensive training within the SOE for the assessment system and LiveText. (5.3.g.)

5.2 Continuous Improvement

New Performance Evaluations:

An extensive revision of performance evaluations for all AUM employees has occurred since the last review. The focus was, and continues to be, on structuring the process and the criteria for all employees, ensuring objectivity, clarity, and fairness. The AUM Human Resources Department designed and monitors the online staff performance evaluation system. (5.3.f.) The university allowed faculty to design the faculty evaluation system, based upon School goals, within certain parameters, as long as the evaluations were numerical in nature and contained specific measureable criteria to judge different levels of performance. Separate evaluation forms were developed for tenure faculty track and clinical faculty track positions. The new faculty performance evaluation system necessitated a change in the Annual Reports submitted by faculty members and the recent development of a self-assessment form directly related to candidate performance.

Classroom teaching observations by department heads and a required recent classroom experience for all higher education clinical faculty members, who are not currently teaching in a P-12 site, were significant changes in the new criteria. Adjunct evaluation forms and process were designed in the SOE for long-term adjuncts. (5.3.f.) Even though interns evaluate cooperating/mentor teachers with the Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form (3.3.d.), additional changes are needed and are planned in the near future in the evaluation of P-12 clinical faculty for continued quality assurance.

Teaching Certification Requirements:

Since the last review the University has initiated two university certification requirements before instructors are qualified to teach related courses. Online Instruction Certification and Writing Across the Curriculum Instruction is explained in 5.3.a.

Personnel:

A large number of P-12 professional education faculty members have been hired since the last review, brought about because of an increase in the number of P-12 school partnerships in the SOE. (5.3.a.) Also, four clinical faculty track positions have been added to provide support to tenure track faculty as they work in the field and to serve as liaisons between the SOE and P-12 sites.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines:

A post tenure review and third year review were added as part of AUM's tenure and review process. The post tenure review ensures that tenured faculty members, who are not meeting performance standards, are evaluated and supported effectively. The third year review helps new faculty members fully understand the expectations of tenure before the formal process begins. (5.3.f.)

Graduate Teaching Status:

Graduate Teaching Status Guidelines were revised in 2011 with heavy input from faculty and administration at the School level. (5.3.a.)

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

Not Applicable

5.4 Exhibits for Standard V

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

Standard 6

Standard 6

6.1 Unit Governance and Resources

UNIT LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

The unit has sufficient leadership (department heads, associate deans, and dean) with authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. See 6.3.b. for organizational chart.

Collaboration with University Administration Deans meet on a bi-weekly basis with the Provost, who reports directly to the Chancellor at AUM. The Dean has flexibility to rearrange personnel easily within the SOE. Three faculty members from the SOE sit on the AUM Faculty Senate, representing the AUM Faculty Council. (6.3.a.) Faculty members evaluate university administrators every three years and have online access to the academic calendar and AUM departments. (6.3.d.) Deans are selected primarily through a search committee process. The search committee consists of unit faculty and staff members who make recommendations to the Provost.

Collaboration with Other Schools Program faculty and the Associate Dean (Director of Graduate Programs) meet with faculty in other Schools at AUM on a regular basis to discuss program changes and course offerings, especially in relation to Secondary Education undergraduate majors, who have joint degrees in the School of Sciences or Liberal Arts. In 2011, SOE faculty members participated in 98 collaborative activities/committees with faculty/staff members in other Schools at AUM. See Annual Reports (Collaboration with Other Schools, University Service) in 5.3.e. Over the last 7 years, 50% of the Ida Belle Young Professorships and 29% of the AUM Distinguished Teaching Awards were awarded to SOE faculty members, who mentor young faculty members at AUM and are guest speakers at graduation. SOE faculty members, who were some of the first at AUM to teach online/hybrid courses, sat on AUM leadership committees to design procedures and develop quality standards for online instruction.

Collaboration within the SOE   The Dean of the SOE meets with Department Heads on a weekly basis, who then meet with program faculty from 3 – 12 times annually, to disseminate information, discuss issues of concern, and analyze data. Department Heads have the ability to request faculty replacements or new positions through the Dean, and the university pays for many expenses related to search committee work. (6.3.a.) P-12 practitioners and professional community formally relay issues/concerns to faculty members during Stakeholder meetings and through surveys. (3.3.a.) If faculty members and Department Heads wish to change/add/delete programs and courses, those decisions are made within departments, after state department approval. The SOE Faculty Council, consisting of all SOE faculty/staff, meets twice annually. If an individual or group of SOE faculty members have a concern, or issue which requires a vote, that information is disseminated to the appropriate SOE Faculty Executive Council Chair for consideration at one of these meetings. (6.3.a.) Faculty members have online access to all academic policies in the SOE, including those related to grading. (6.3.a., 6.3.e.) Faculty members evaluate Department Heads and recommend continuance of service to the Dean, who has the final approval, every three years. (6.3.a.) Deans are evaluated by faculty members every three years.

UNIT BUDGET

Technology/distance learning and professional development expenses have increased annually over the last three years due to high demand associated with the online/hybrid course offerings. Field/Clinical expenses have changed over the last three years, due primarily to enrollment fluctuations in initial teaching programs. The unit receives sufficient

budgetary allocations that are proportional to other units on campus with clinical components (Nursing). Over the last two years, the SOE faculty received over $60,000 from external grants to help candidates with research and other professional activities and almost $13,000 to aid in professional development of faculty members within and outside the SOE. In 2012 the SOE funded over $24,000 in scholarships for candidates from SOE endowed funds and SOE Luau (annual fund-raising activity) proceeds. Faculty/staff/administrators in the SOE believe that resources are adequate. (6.3.f., 6.3.g.)

PERSONNEL

Class sizes are small, which allows individualized support on campus and in field/clinical experiences. Online course enrollments do not differ from on-campus course enrollments and faculty members receive the same load credit for on-campus courses as they do for online/hybrid courses.

Faculty members who teach graduate courses generally teach an average of 18 hours per year (fall and spring semesters), undergraduate faculty members generally teach an average of 21 hours per year, and no faculty member supervises more than 18 interns per semester. Faculty members who teach in the summer may teach 1 – 3 courses, if they are available, for extra compensation. Faculty members at AUM are allowed to teach one overload course per semester for additional compensation. See SOE and AUM Workload/Overload policies in 6.3.h. A centralized advising system, by competent staff members, allows faculty to have more time for research, teaching, and service.

Full-time tenure track faculty members, with graduate teaching status approval, teach most courses offered in the SOE. There are four full-time clinical faculty members (2 in Physical Education and 2 in Childhood Education) based on campus, who are in non-tenure track positions with 3-year contracts. Three clinical track faculty members have M.Ed. degrees, only work with undergraduates, and have responsibilities in teaching field-based courses, supervising interns, and/or working with P-12 professional education faculty in partner schools. One clinical track faculty member has a doctorate and also works with graduate candidates. Sixteen percent of the on-campus teaching faculty members are part-time adjuncts who teach a limited number of courses per year. One hundred percent of school-based faculty members (mentor teachers) are part-time adjuncts. The SOE was allotted new faculty positions by the Provost to increase faculty diversity, which led to a decrease in adjunct usage over the last two years. Graduate assistants do not teach courses used for certification programs; they are hired only to help faculty members with other activities. Three full-time staff members, with M.Ed. degrees, teach undergraduates. Other staff members only work in administrative positions. (5.3.a.)

Each of the four departments and the Dean's Office has an administrative associate. The Certification Office consists of a Director of Student Services and Teacher Certification, who is a full-time staff member, two part-time undergraduate advisors, and an administrative assistant. The Graduate Office consists of two full-time graduate advisors and shares the administrative assistant with the Certification Office. These offices, supervised by the Associate Dean, help faculty and candidates with admission, advising, certification, and field/clinical experience issues. The Early Childhood Center's staff consists of a full-time Director, a full-time Lead Teacher, and an administrative assistant.

The full-time SOE Instructional Technology Specialist, the full-time SOE Grant Writer, and the half-time SOE Assessment Coordinator provide valuable support to faculty members and allow them to have more time for research, teaching, and service.   Department Heads receive

five release courses annually in their position and Deans and Associate Deans are not required to teach courses, although some choose to do so.

UNIT FACILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES

Technology Resources Candidates have access to two computer labs in the Education building, as well as others located throughout the campus. University technology fees, allow the SOE opportunities to update technology resources frequently. Many classrooms have interactive whiteboards, LCD projectors, computers, speakers, and document cameras. If more classroom space with technology is needed, SOE faculty members may request to teach in one of the six available classrooms in the tech wing of the Liberal Arts building. Faculty computers (desktop or laptop) are updated every three years and most faculty members have iPads. The SOE furnishes free WiFi cards, on a checkout basis, so that faculty members may access the Internet as they work in the field and five laptops and eight iPod Touches are available for checkout. (6.3.j.) Faculty members who graduate from Faculty Development Institute (Technology) and Writing Faculty Development Institute receive $400 - $800 to buy instructional technology.

Other Resources

- AUM Counseling Center – provides assistance for candidates with more serious personal problems
- AUM Nursing Care Center – provides assistance for candidates' medical needs
- AUM Wellness Center – provides space for the SOE Physical Education Department and assistance for candidates' physical well-being
- AUM Learning Center – provides Assistive Technology and Instructional Support for candidates with special needs and/or academic problems
- SOE Early Childhood Center – provides an exemplary training site for candidates enrolled in Early Childhood Internship
- SOE Reading Center - provides resources for field/clinical experiences, such as nametags, materials (books, games, Praxis II guides) for check out, consumable materials, and low-cost laminating services

The AUM Library provides adequate resources for traditional and online candidates. Library staff administrators seek input from departments on an annual basis before purchasing additional resources. The Library is included in the approval process for new graduate course development to ensure that appropriate resources are available for new courses. (6.3.i.)The AUM and SOE websites offer assistance to all candidates, even those enrolled in distance education programs/courses. (6.3.d.)

Many professional development activities are available for faculty and staff through the university and SOE, as well as funds for travel to state, regional, national, and international conferences. (5.3.g., 6.3.f.)

6.2 Continuous Improvement

Five Provosts, three Deans, five Associate Deans (in two positions), and seven Department Heads (in 4 positions) have occupied those positions since our last review. The current Dean will step down this year. Transitions to new leadership have been smooth and it is expected to continue to be that way in the future.

The SOE moved to a centralized advising system since our last review and currently has two part-time undergraduate advisors and two new full-time graduate advisors. This allows faculty members to have more time for other endeavors and provides more consistency for all candidates to ensure their needs are met and no problems occur during the graduation/certification process.

Clinical faculty members were added to the SOE faculty since our last review, after the University approved clinical faculty positions. These positions have proven valuable in implementation of strong field/clinical experiences.

The leading improvement since our last review has been in the development of online/hybrid courses/programs. Almost 50 courses and 4 online certification programs have been developed over the last 10 years. Faculty development has increased to meet the needs of this area at the University and School level. Three AUM Instructional Designers were hired to help faculty develop courses and provide training. The SOE Instructional Support Specialist, added in 2009 with federal stimulus funds and later moved to SOE funds, assists faculty and candidates with online/hybrid coursework. All faculty members are certified, or in the process of certification or recertification, in online instruction through the AUM Faculty Development Institute in Technology. (5.3.a.) Plans are underway for a SOE multi-media room in the Education building. All other classrooms will be updated with appropriate instructional technology equipment by the end of 2013.

Most faculty members have been trained to teach Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) courses so that the SOE is in compliance with the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan: Success in Writing. The university provides excellent training, release time, and financial compensation for faculty members who attend WAC training and teach WAC courses. (5.3.a.)

Funds from the Dean's Office, in addition to departmental funds, were offered to faculty members for professional support, travel, and research in 2010 and these funds have continued to be offered every year, except for one, in spite of statewide funding issues. (6.3.f.)

The SOE building was recently remodeled with University and SOE funds. Floors, ceilings, lighting, heating and air units have been replaced in some classrooms and administrative areas. Rooms have been painted and new furniture has been purchased for some areas. The physical education program faculty and facilities have been moved from the gymnasium to the state-of-the-art AUM Wellness Center. The AUM Wellness Center houses a new human performance lab, faculty offices, and classrooms for instruction, including a hard surface area, a swimming pool, a running track, and multiple weight machines and other exercise equipment.

The University has improved its instructional support labs, writing center, and assistive technology since the last review. Sixty percent of AUM students are first generation college students and need much support to succeed. These services have helped struggling candidates in the SOE, as well.

The SOE is in the process of updating all recruitment brochures and processes in order to increase the enrollment of high quality candidates. A staff member is responsible for meeting with departmental faculty to update all materials, including the SOE website.

Extensive revisions to policies related to Governance since our last review are: Department Head Continuance Policy (limiting heads to 3-year renewable contracts), AUM Grade Forgiveness Policy (allowing candidates to be forgiven for 9 hours of low grades), and SOE

Repeating Course Limit Policy (limiting candidates to only taking professional courses twice).

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

Not Applicable

6.4 Exhibits for Standard II

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits

Exhibits: Overview & Conceptual Framework

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 1

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years

1.3.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework
1.3.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual fram
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairnes that all students can learn
1.3.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions
1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.3.h	Samples of candidates' work from programs across the unit
1.3.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates
1.3.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation program effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, wh

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 2

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 3

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 4

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 5

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

~Back to Top~

Exhibits: Standard 6

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to in governance structure
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to c education community
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support fo distance learning , and alternative route programs when applicable

6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campus
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virt computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning in services and resources, if applicable