

Part C: Annual Report

Section A. Conceptual Framework

During the NCATE accreditation visit in 1998, the Department of Education presented its Conceptual Framework. This Conceptual Framework incorporated a shared vision consistent with the institution's mission as well as with NCATE and INTASC Standards and Principles. The framework has been and continues to be the foundation for all programs from the first classes taken in the freshman year through the student teaching experience in the senior year. Evidence of the Conceptual Framework can be found in the "Critical Decision Points" a key part of the Unit Assessment System (UAS), portfolio rubrics, and course syllabi.

As a result of intensive faculty review of the NCATE 2000 Standards, the Department members (including adjunct faculty) determined that the existing framework comprehensively articulated a shared vision consistent with the unit's efforts in preparing effective teacher's for the 21st century. The Conceptual Framework is key in providing direction for programs as illustrated through the "Critical Decision Points for Teacher Education (CDP)". The CDP was developed in an effort to provide structure and guidelines, and ultimately quantifiable evidence that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The CDP clearly demarks the timeframe, decision point, performance indicator, source of evidence, and evaluators. Each decision point and the related sources of evidence are connected to the University of Saint Francis (USF) Conceptual Framework and INTASC Principles. In addition, the Conceptual Framework establishes the connection between what teachers should know and be able to do with the process and procedures to become a teacher, which is articulated in the Portfolio Manual and the Teacher Education Handbook.

The portfolio plays a key role in the CDP. The three levels included are Initial Portfolio Check 1, Developing Portfolio Check 2, and Proficient Portfolio Check 3. These levels are clearly described in a new "Portfolio Manual" as are the accompanying rubrics for each. Instruction is based on the philosophical belief that the Conceptual Framework provides a core of competencies from which effective teaching is modeled and practiced. A master table illustrating the alignment of the Conceptual Framework and INTASC Core Standards is included in the USF Portfolio Manual. Teacher candidates demonstrate teacher competencies through the three levels (stated above) as described in the manual. In addition the portfolio rubrics are designed to evaluate individual student performance according to each component of the Conceptual Framework/INTASC through artifacts and reflections. The portfolio may be considered to serve a dual purpose in that it provides evidence of candidate competence and also program effectiveness. While students are provided structure and guidance through the manual to develop their portfolio, the artifacts they select from courses provide feedback to the Department as one method of continuous program evaluation. The "Teacher Education Handbook" has been updated to include the specific processes and procedures for all teacher education candidates as well as an IPSB standards guide for the selected program of study.

The Conceptual Framework's influence and the direction it provides are evident in each course taught in the Department. A new syllabus format was designed based on NCATE and is being implemented during the 2001-2002 academic year. The purpose of this format is to adequately

inform the candidate of the relevant standards and expected skills to be acquired in each class. In addition to the basic syllabus information (e.g., textbook, objectives, references/resources), each course author completes the format by articulating the conceptual framework competencies and also the IPSB content and developmental level(s) with the corresponding performances addressed. Finally, each performance is aligned with the product/evidence that will demonstrate the skill. A menu or listing of a variety of assessment methods was created for consideration and potential selection.

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

No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Content Knowledge

The last report (2000) indicated that the Department was in the process of defining a core of courses that would be used to introduce students as teacher education candidates to content knowledge in order to prepare for their professional roles. The Department is committed to providing a rigorous core curriculum (defined as “what all teachers should know and be able to do”) that addresses diversity issues such as race, ethnicity, language, and exceptionality.

Pedagogical Knowledge

The introductory core culminates with the completion of the first stage of a three-part assessment system referred to as the *Initial Portfolio*. The portfolio for each stage is assessed through the use of a respective rubric. The newly constructed rubrics (based on the Conceptual Framework) are part of a system that is consistent and monitors both the candidate’s performances and the teacher education programs’ effectiveness in developing knowledge-based skills to support all students. Next, the Department focused on creating effective pedagogical curricula. Once beyond the introductory core, students accepted into the Teacher Education Program enter the pedagogical courses to continue their professional development. The pedagogical level of course work is assessed through the second stage entitled the developing portfolio. The final level of study is student teaching, which integrates content knowledge and dispositions required to teach all students. The proficient portfolio was designed to demonstrate candidate competencies that meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The “Critical Decision Points” illustrates the connection between the decision point, Conceptual Framework, and standards.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge

In addition to curriculum content and pedagogical changes the Department has investigated ways to increase candidate involvement in content/pedagogical experiences such as participation and attendance in conferences and workshops. Faculty members in the Department serve as mentors and attend conferences and/or workshops in conjunction with students. A journal/log (includes reflections) completed by each candidate illustrates their efforts to be involved in extended learning opportunities. The above-mentioned log is required and reviewed during *Initial and Developing Portfolio* checks. A scheduled listing of activities is made available to students.

Examples of specific conferences and workshops attended by candidates and their mentors last year include Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics Conference (ICTM), Indiana Council for the Social Studies (ICSS), Science Central Workshop funded by an Eisenhower Grant, and Marcy Cook Math Workshop. Finally, students attended and presented in a national service learning conference hosted in Denver.

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

No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The 2000 report defined and described multiple formative and summative assessments that would provide a collective presentation of the quality of the program and each student's progress. To address the progress made in the 2000-01 year each of the seven criteria for the Unit Assessment System will be used to organize the information.

Criterion 1: Stakeholder involvement

The Department of Education determined that two existing committees, the Teacher Education Committee and the Teacher Education Advisory Council would be effective formal structures to provide stakeholder input. The Teacher Education Committee consists of Department faculty, content faculty, and candidates representing each teacher education program. The Teacher Education Advisory Council includes professional education and content faculty, P-12 school faculty and administrators, and program alumni. Since these are established structures whose primary purpose is to provide input relative to the teacher education program, these stakeholders were logical groups to involve in the steps to establish the UAS. Both are included in the procedures for the UAS to assure their continued input.

Criterion 2: Conceptual Framework incorporates the standards.

The USF Conceptual Framework is aligned with the INTASC principles and is evidenced in the "Teacher Education Handbook", course syllabi, and the requirements and format prescribed for the portfolio. Since the framework is aligned with INTASC principles, which are included in the IPSP standards the Department is confident that it comprehensively addresses all standards. Education faculty members complete course syllabi formats that include content and developmental standards addressed in each course. Finally, faculty members are mapping courses in each program (elementary, secondary, and special education) to provide a mechanism to assure USF programs address standards that ensure teacher competency.

Criterion 3: The UAS provides a coherent, sequential, assessment system for individual candidates.

Candidates are informed of the standards in the core courses, syllabi, the "Teacher Education Handbook", the portfolio experience, and the "Critical Decision Points". Each course, within specific programs, depicts the standards that are addressed and matches those performances with products that provide evidence of skills. The assessment methods are described in the syllabus,

which are aligned with products the student is recommended to use to demonstrate competency in his/her portfolio. The assessment process is circular in that the Department delivers instruction, allows opportunities to practice, assesses the acquisition, and provides feedback. This process is multi-leveled, within each course, each decision point, and program. It ensures the candidate maximum opportunities to gain the necessary knowledge and skills to be an effective teacher. The “Critical Decision Points for Teacher Education” delineates the formative and summative elements according to year of study, criteria, source of evidence, evaluator, and alignment to standards & conceptual framework. Each decision point is considered a performance checkpoint, which must be assessed using the appropriate source(s) of evidence. The student is not allowed to progress unless he/she has successfully met the criteria. To facilitate the assessment process three of the checkpoints include rubrics. The Department of education faculty reviewed the rubrics and are currently piloting their use. Training sessions will begin in the spring to broaden the pool of raters. Currently students receive individual feedback from their advisors and instructors at each decision point. Once the UAS is fully implemented in a secured online database it will serve two purposes. First students will be able to gain access and view their progression through the program. Second, faculty in the Department will be able to analyze the effectiveness of courses and the overall program by the use of aggregated data reported across students. Finally the Department has determined that some program decisions about candidates may continue to be recorded in individual student files.

Criterion 4: UAS used collective presentation of candidate assessments & related data to document that standards are met.

Over the past year, the Department developed several specific databases to store information in either Excel or Access and organized individual candidate assessment information stored in the Department secured files to document that candidates meet standards. Practicum and student teacher evaluations, plus Praxis results (part of the “Critical Decision Points for Teacher Education”) are examples of data stored in this mechanism. The applications being used can produce aggregated data across students or individual student performance reports that can be used to monitor if standards are being met. These databases represent the initial stages of a comprehensive UAS. However, the University recently purchased a more comprehensive system (Teams Elite and Info Maker) that offers the Department the ability to use existing internal databases to run individual or group aggregated reports to view and monitor student performance. This system will avoid the necessity to re-enter or update information existing in other University databases. The 2001-02 academic year begins the collection of assessments in the new assessment system to comprehensively document individual performance and aggregate data across students to view the successful completion of standards. The sequential system of “Critical Decision Points” allows the Department to identify weaknesses in candidates and offer remediation. The implementation of the UAS is in progress so the aggregation of data relating to the specific standards is not available. However, the Department has collected assessment data related to the “Critical Decision Points” which represents multiple assessments from internal and external sources for current candidates. The CDP is key in regularly and systematically compiling data necessary for the UAS mechanism developed to ensure all standards have been assessed. The following data are being collected to demonstrate candidate performance and analyze if they are meeting standards.

Decision Point	Passed	Failed	Total Number Attempting/Respondents
Initial Portfolio Check			
Admission to Teacher Education Introductory Courses GPA Praxis I			
Developing Portfolio Check			
Student Teaching GPA – Cumulative GPA – Professional 94 Semester Hours Computer Competency			
Cooperating Teacher/Administrator Evaluation Survey			Total Number/Respondents
Program Effectiveness->Successful Teaching University Supervisor Provided Successful Support			
Praxis II			
Proficient Portfolio Check			
Recommendation for Licensure Successful Completion of Praxis I & II Successful Course Completion Successful Student Teaching Completed Limited Criminal History Check			
Program Completers			
Graduate Follow-Up Survey	Yes	No	Total Number/Respondents
Employed in a Teaching Position Teaching in Area Trained Completed Mentor Year Successfully			

Criterion 5: UAS uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine & revise the framework, courses, & curriculum.

The Department uses multi-level, internal and external assessment tools to gather data for the UAS. Examples of these tools are:

- Initial, developing, and proficient portfolio checks,
- Praxis I and II
- Course evaluations
- Practicum
- Student teaching
- Senior exit interview
- Cooperating Teacher/ Administrator Evaluation Surveys
- Graduate Follow-Up Survey
- Beginning Teacher Induction Survey

Aggregated data across students and programs are compiled from these assessment tools. This data is used to make revisions in Teacher Education Programs, which is recorded in the “History of Change Within the Department of Education” Document. The changes stated in the History Change document occur as a result of many of the assessments mentioned earlier (e.g., course evaluations, practicum & student teaching evaluations, surveys). The source, rationale, and date for each change are noted in the document.

Candidates are provided individual feedback based on the assessments used to make decisions respective to their performance and related to their progression through the program. Feedback is given during each course, at each decision point, and during advising sessions. Students will be able to access their individual file to view their performance in relation to the CDP with a password through a secured online database.

Faculty receive feedback and are able to reflect on their performance at the course level through course evaluations (revised in 2000) that are aggregated and include student comments. At the program level a compilation of information gleaned through the senior interview is shared with the Department members on an annual basis. Finally, the University conducted (2001) a campus-wide survey entitled, “Student Satisfaction Inventory (Noel Levitz)” of students’ attitudes regarding for example academics, advising, and instructional effectiveness.

The Department continues to review the effectiveness of its data system as it implements the UAS in phases. As stated earlier, changes have already occurred in the data system.

Criterion 6: The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed.

The University recently invested in a new campus-wide system, Teams Elite and Info Maker. The Department of Education is in the process of shifting its original Access/Excel-based UAS to this system since it appears to be a more effective and comprehensive mechanism for storing, documenting, monitoring, and analyzing program and student data. This move demonstrates the Department’s effort to test different information technologies and improve its assessment system.

In summer of 2001 the Unit was successful in redefining and upgrading the secretarial role to administrative assistant. This effort was spurred in part by the need for a data manager and as such those skills were included in the search for an assistant. A new administrative assistant was hired in August 2001. The Academic Computer Center worked with the Department to create the UAS system but the administrative assistant will be responsible for managing, collecting, and aggregation of the data. Validation and documentation processes are the responsibility of all Department faculty members as advisors.

Criterion 7: The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system.

The new UAS is in the early phases so monitoring is at a rudimentary level. However, the process for review and revision is based on input from the Teacher Education Committee, which includes members from content areas with education majors, student representatives from all programs and the Teacher Advisory Council, which includes faculty and administrators from K-12 schools, alumni, and Department faculty. Established timelines are being defined for data

input so information is available to advisors and students for feedback, reflection, and make decisions. Potential threats to security and confidentiality are being studied so that solutions can be implemented. Lastly, the effectiveness of existing external assessments (e.g., graduate follow-up survey) are being reviewed and revised.

Section C. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The Department continuously evaluates the effectiveness of the field experiences and clinical practice it provides for candidates in teacher education. Feedback supplied by pre-service candidates during the senior interview indicated that these experiences were among the most useful ways to develop professional skills. A field experience tracking system has been designed to evaluate type, level, and the numbers of hours of each placement candidates have been exposed. The Unit is committed to offering experiences that are diverse, high quality, and adequately supervised.

Collaboration between unit and school

Several collaborative projects developed between schools and the Department provides authentic experiences for teacher education candidates. There are two distinctive types of collaboration with schools – through a content/field courses and methods/field courses. An example of a collaborative content/field experience is the Irwin/USF project. Irwin Elementary hosts a school-based course (Sped 236) that is taught cooperatively by school and professional education faculty members. The class meets twice a week at the school where the candidates receive content instruction followed by working with 1-5 grade students in inclusive general education classrooms. Field experiences are also established in methods classes to employ the strategies taught. Methods courses in each program provide a block of hours in settings that match the developmental level(s) students are being trained. Examples of methods/field-based projects are found in Whispering Meadows and Lindley Elementary Schools.

Design and implementation of field experience and clinical practice

Changes and improvements occurring in the final field experience include the combination of two former separate courses, the Student Teaching Seminar and the Foundation in Education course. This combination allows students to focus on specific educational issues such as culture, ethics, and gender in a meaningful context. In addition, the new seminar class includes as part of the student teaching requirement a discussion area online. All student teachers are required two substantive postings per week. The University supervisors enter the discussion area each week and offer comments. The purpose of the discussion area is to encourage collaboration/sharing of ideas among students with guidance from the supervisors.

Development and demonstration of skills and dispositions

Finally, the Department added a service learning component to the curriculum for all teacher education candidates. Several courses require service learning experiences. These experiences

provide opportunities for students to demonstrate dispositions and develop professional skills. One such service learning project was the Vincent House (a shelter for homeless people), which was an interdisciplinary, campus-wide event. Students volunteered to organized activities to support and assist individuals and families in need and reflect on the process and their personal and professional growth.

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

No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Standard 4. Diversity.

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

The unit does not have a plan to recruit a diverse faculty.

The unit faculty is not diverse.

The unit does not have a comprehensive, systematic plan for recruitment, admission and retention of a diverse teacher candidate population.

Please indicate how the unit how the unit has addressed these weaknesses

Recruitment – Faculty

On an annual basis each University of Saint Francis department is required to submit a Business Marketing Plan (BMP) to the administration. The 2001 BMP of the Department of Education included a plan to recruit and retain ethnic minority students and faculty. This plan included goals, objectives, strategies, and tactics. In the spring of 2001, the University, which is an Equal Opportunity Employer, placed advertisements in local, regional, and national media to search for diverse, qualified faculty. Unfortunately, the search did not produce qualified candidates. The unit will continue its search for candidates representing diverse racial and cultural heritage. This search level will be increased since the administration has approved the hire of two additional faculty members for the 2001 - 2003 academic year.

Recruitment/Retention of Students

Current enrollment indicates that students from the following undergraduate populations have increased:

Ethnic Group	1999-00 Group#/Total Pop.	2000-01 Group#/Total Pop
African or African American	5/1453	91/1490
Hispanic or Hispanic American	1/1453	29/1490

The reason for this increase may be due to recent efforts to recruit students from the 21st Century Scholars Program, which targets minority students in the State of Indiana. Approximately 80% of the 21st Century Scholars students at the University of Saint Francis are minority students. Another effort to recruit students was the intense collaboration between the Department of Education and the Admissions Department in hosting campus visitation days.

The retention of students has been a focus of the unit. An in-depth analysis was undertaken to discover the factors related to either withdrawal from the program or from the university. It was found that decisive factors related to retention were quality advising and academic support. With the addition of 2- ½-time faculty members, the advising load was equally divided permitting each faculty member to give quality time and therefore guidance to each student in the Department of Education. The Student Learning Center serves students with disabilities on campus. The concept for and the development of the Center began with the Department of Education. Currently 35 students with documented exceptionalities (e.g. blind, hearing impaired, learning disabled, etc.) are supported by a full-time staff member and peer tutors. The Student Academic Support Services program provides tutoring for students requesting assistance and also administers the Praxis I tutorial Learning Plus Program.

Field Experiences

The professional component in the Department of Education has, in numerous courses, combined content and field experiences. These courses have offered candidates opportunities to know and develop an understanding of the needs of diverse learners in P-12 urban, suburban, rural, parochial, and private schools.

Partnerships have been developed and sustained with the Catholic Schools (K-8 and 9-12), two urban elementary schools (both with large minority populations), one rural school, and an elementary school in a suburban setting. Through these experiences candidates are exposed to diversity of race, culture, settings, and a wide variety of teaching and learning styles.

Opportunity has been given to University of Saint Francis students to receive training and subsequently substitute teach as interns with the Fort Wayne Community School program entitled “Little Red School House” and with the Catholic Schools Program known as “Sub-Mission”. Substitute teaching experiences have been diverse in grade level and in profile of the student body.

In addition to field placements, students are expected to participate in and document time devoted to service learning activities. These activities have the potential to further develop in the student a sense of civic responsibility for populations in need. Examples of such outreach activities are found in projects like the “Jesters” (performance/drama group with special needs) and the Vincent House Project (a transitional homeless shelter).

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

Qualified Faculty

The University and the Department of Education seek to hire qualified faculty. The summer of 2001 resulted several successful searches for the Department. Qualified faculty were hired in special education (1-1/2), elementary (1), and reading (1). An additional search has been approved to add a full-time secondary education member to begin in January and another special education full-time member beginning in fall 2002. The following statistics illustrate the qualifications of the current faculty.

Faculty/Degree ⇒ ↓	Doctorate/Administrative	Masters
Full & 1/2-Time Faculty	71 %	29 %
Content Faculty	66 %	34 %
School Faculty	22 %	78 %
Clinical Faculty	50 %	50 %

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

Consistently assigned and accepted faculty overloads & assignments interfere with the faculty's ability to be effective in teaching, scholarship and service.

Please indicate how the unit how the unit has addressed these weaknesses.

Last year the Department had five full-time faculty members. As of fall 2001, there are 7 faculty members, of which two are ½-time, resulting in 6 full-time equivalents. The Department has received approval to hire another full-time member as of January 2002. Additional adjunct have been hired over the past year to deter faculty overloads. As a result there were no faculty overloads for the 2000-01 academic year. All program directors have an earned doctorate. Beginning this academic year, program directors have a 10-month contract and a one-course reduction will be implemented in spring 2002. The Department chair was given a 12-month contract, which is a change from a 10-month. In addition, the chair responsibilities were changed to ¾ time administrative duties and ¼ time teaching (one course) from ½ time administrative duties and ½ time teaching. Professional education, content, clinical, and school faculty members are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise. In addition to faculty with degree qualifications, the Department hires faculty that includes contemporary professionals with experiences in school settings who model "best practice".

Professional practices in scholarship and service

Professional education faculty are engaged in scholarly work in their field of expertise through conference attendance, professional presentations, and inservice. They are involved with the community as demonstrated by the many service learning projects previously discussed in this report as well as inservice with P-12 schools. The following is not intended to be an exhaustive

list but only to serve as evidence that the Department is committed to the development of high quality professional educators to teach all students

Presentations:

- “Portfolio Assessment” - National AAER Annual Conference
- “Technology & Collaborative Distance Education” - Prudue University Northwest
- “Alternative Methods for Teacher Licensure” – Indiana Deans & School Administrators
- “My Little Corner of the World – Getting Involved and Making a Difference” and “Building Community through Community Action” - National Service Learning Conference, Denver
- “The IDEAL Partnership – National CEC Conference-Teacher Education Division
- “Service Learning and Teacher Education” – IPFW Deans Annual Conference on Building Community

Conferences:

- National AAER Annual Conference
- Technology & Collaborative Distance Education Midwest Conference
- Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics -State conference

Inservices:

- “Latinos Count” - Lindley Elementary Bilingual Program, Fort Wayne Community Schools
- “Advanced Methods in Mathematics” – Fort Wayne Community Schools
- “Aligning the Individual Education Plan with the Indiana Academic Standards” – Fort Wayne Community Schools

Service:

- Vincent House Project – Fort Wayne Community
- Family In Need Project – Fort Wayne Catholic Schools
- “Jesters” – USF Drama Program

Associations:

- Regional Consultant for the Partnership of Service Learning and Higher Education Consortium
- Board of Examiner Member for Southern Association of Colleges
- Advisory Board Member for Fort Wayne Community Schools
- President of Corporation for Menkes Disease – National Organization representing families and professionals of a rare disorder

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

Governance within the Department of Education remains unchanged since last year. It continues to make the decisions that effect teacher education programs and candidates. An example of the

authority of the Department is the “on hold” status of the graduate Reading Specialization program. Further discussion will occur this year and final decisions regarding the Reading Specialization program and its viability.

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

Budgets for materials in the Instructional Media Center and the Education Technology Learning Center are limited.

Please indicate how the unit how the unit has addressed these weaknesses

Unit Budget

Unit budget and personnel has steadily increased over recent years. Those increases are demonstrated in faculty salary, personnel support, and instructional resources. The Leadership Team approved two additional faculty members in addition to those in the 2001 budget, one position to begin in January 2002 and the second position to start in August 2002. The chair position has been upgraded to a 12-month contract. The new demands for personnel with the expertise to support and manage the UAS were addressed by redefining the role and responsibilities of the secretarial position to include database knowledge. As of August 2001, the Department is staffed with an administrative assistant who has the expertise to manage the UAS. Finally, the 2001 budget specific to instructional resources experienced an overall increased of 43%. Target items warranting an increase were those related to instructional equipment (up 21%) and instructional support (up 17%).

Unit Facilities & Resources Including Technology

Unit facilities remain unchanged since the last report. However, unit resources including technology continue to increase. This year the Department of Education partnered with the former “Education Technology Learning Center (ETLC)” (now “Oaks & Willows Center”), and the Academic Computer Center on campus to purchase a mobile computer lab. The lab contains 16 computers, a cart with a printer, hub, zip drive, and Internet capability. This portable set-up will service education courses and the ETLC. In addition three faculty members were provided new computers and another laptop was purchased for a total of 4 laptop computers available to Department members and the Oaks & Willows Center.