Offsite BOE Report: University of Maine

July 18, 2014

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Scott S. Sparks, Chair
Dr. Harold N. London, Member
Dr. Stacey M. Neuharth-Prichett, Member
Ms. Alicia A. Sneed, Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Mr. Harry W. Osgood, State Consultant
Dr. Linda M. Bradley, CAEP Staff

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

One of the key features of the Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway is the combination of formative and summative processes. *The BOE Offsite Report provides formative feedback from the offsite review meeting. The BOE Onsite Report provides a summative evaluation of the findings from the onsite visit.*

The following BOE Offsite Report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite Team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

I. 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	X	Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
		Standard 4: Diversity
		Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
		Standard 6: Governance and Resources

STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Preliminary Findings

1.1.a What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The following programs are offered by the unit, according to the Institutional Report (IR) and noted exhibits. The unit offers a B.S. in Education that includes specializations in elementary and secondary education, kinesiology, physical education, early childhood education, art education, and music education. The unit also offers a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) for liberal arts graduates of four-year colleges and a Master of Science in Teaching (MST) with degrees comprising the majority of the unit's primary initial preparation programs (I.5.a.1-19). The music and art programs are accredited (I.5.d.1).

The MAT offers certification programs for secondary education. All are based on an assumption that candidates have a strong liberal arts-based academic background (I.5.a.29), child development, and pedagogy courses reflecting the latest research in teaching and learning, and incorporate standards-based instruction and assessment. The MAT program is a full-time, 12-month initial certification program, demanding total immersion in research-based methods and practice, and intensive teaching, learning, and inquiry featuring field experiences in area Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP) schools (1.5.b.1-15). The MST is a 31-credit master's program requiring a research thesis and an option to take coursework to meet initial secondary certification requirements. The State of Maine recognizes both initial and advanced certifications.

The unit provided an exhibit that responds to the AFI at the advanced level from the last visit. The undergraduate early childhood education program has been participating in the college-wide assessment system through identifying and utilizing key assessments, applying rubrics, and uploading learning outcomes data to Tk20 for two years, as shown by the Tk20 reports (1.4.d.4, 1.4.d.23). The program faculty review the data reports and consider implications for improvements in courses, program, and assessments in an annual report (1.4.a.10).

The graduate program in curriculum, assessment, and instructional outreach is now called curriculum, assessment, and instruction (CA&I). It has been participating in the college-wide assessment system through identifying and utilizing key assessments, applying rubrics, and uploading learning outcomes data to Tk20 for two years, as shown by the Tk20 reports (1.4.d.3, 1.3.d.22). The program faculty review the data reports and consider implications for improvements in courses, program, and assessments in an annual report (1.4.a.13).

As determined from the Title II reports, the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) offers eleven initial licensure programs in teacher education. It also offers several graduate programs for advanced and other professionals (literacy, science education, special education, educational leadership, counselor education, computer assisted instruction (CAI), and instructional technology (IT).

According to the IR, key assessments are aligned with state and college proficiencies, the conceptual framework, and the NCATE (CAEP) elements of knowledge, skills, and dispositions (1.4.c.1-2). The crosswalks indicate which NCATE domains for Standard 1 link with which elements of conceptual framework themes and their identified 16 proficiencies. There is a crosswalk for the teacher development and other school personnel programs that shows how those programs link the key assessments and the conceptual framework themes and proficiencies. Data are presented for initial programs (IP), advanced programs (AP), and programs for other school professionals (OSP) showing alignment with proficiencies, which are referenced by the letter P and their number. The exhibits provide a variety of reports that address the key assessments and the data to support the unit's meeting of the standard. The unit's assessment system features three levels prior to completion, Level One being admission to the programs, Level Two being pre-student teaching, and Level Three being student teaching. The unit also has follow-ups that are also considered as part of the system.

According to the IR and exhibits, at Level One in initial programs for teachers, 100 percent of applicants must have passed Praxis 1 in 2012 and 2013 and earned a minimum 2.5 GPA for undergraduate programs and 3.0 for graduate programs. All candidates met expectations on the candidacy portfolio, which includes an observational report, mentor teacher rating, and reflection. At Level 2, pre-student teaching, 90-100 percent met expectations on multiple assessments that include case studies and examinations. Candidates must pass Praxis II before being admitted to student teaching. Therefore, 100 percent of program completers passed Praxis II exams required for licensure (1.4.c.4, 5). At Level 3, student teaching, 100 percent demonstrated content knowledge through multiple portfolio assessments and summative observations of teaching. Ninety-two percent of mentors agreed that candidates displayed the

content knowledge needed. Ninety-eight percent of principals rated IP graduates as prepared in content knowledge.

In advanced programs for teachers, 100 percent met expectations through assessments that include curriculum development projects, research papers, and examinations. One hundred percent passed PRAXIS II in special education and literacy (1.4.c.4, 5). At the capstone phase, 100 percent met expectations on key assessments that include action research and presentations. Advanced program principal surveys yielded only two responses, an insufficient sampling to report.

According to the IR and Exhibits 1.4h.1 , in initial programs, more than 90 percent of the pre-student teaching candidates met expectations for teachers' planning skills, as evidenced by lesson plans, classroom profiles, and case studies (P4, 5); knowledge of instructional strategies (P6); and creating meaningful learning experiences, which included development of a one-year curriculum (P3). Zero to 100 percent met expectations for P7, which includes lesson plans using technology. More than 90 percent of the student teaching candidates met expectations in demonstrating planning skills and instructional strategies through lesson plans and unit plans (P4, 5, 6); making learning meaningful, which includes unit plans (P3); and using technology, which includes creating electronic portfolios (P7). Results are supported by the summative observations (P3-7). A total of 89-94 percent of mentors agreed that student teachers understand the Maine Learning Results and/or Common Core State Standards (P5), effectively use technology for instruction (P7), and display competencies of an effective beginning teacher (P3, 4, 6). Eighty-five to 92 percent of principals rated IP graduates as prepared in planning and organizing effective lessons (P3, 5); using a variety of teaching strategies (P3, 4, 6); and using a variety of instructional technologies (P7). The assessments and work samples are provided in Exhibits 1.4h.1-7 and 1.4h.16-30. Assessments and work samples from the elementary physical education program are provided in Exhibits 1.4h.8-15. Exhibits 1.4j.1-3 provide copies of mentor teacher and principal surveys and data from those surveys. The data the unit has provided are disaggregated by program and not by assessment.

In advanced programs for teachers, 100 percent of the candidates met expectations on assessments that include annotated bibliographies, curriculum development projects, teacher research studies (P4, 5), thematic units, case studies, planning an online classroom, and research papers (P3, 6, 7). In the capstone phase, 100 percent of the candidates met expectations on assessments that include capstone reflections, reflective essays, final projects, and portfolios (P3-7). The data the unit has provided are disaggregated by program and not by assessment.

In initial programs for teachers at pre-student teaching, 71-100 percent of the candidates met expectations on assessments that include a philosophy of classroom management, differentiated lesson plans, and a diversity paper (P8). Ninety-two to 100 percent met expectations on assessments that include field experience observations and unit planning (P9). In student teaching, 98-100 percent met expectations on assessments that include differentiated lesson and unit plans (P8), classroom management philosophy, lesson plans (P9), essay series and action research. (P15). Candidates met expectations in summative observations (P8, 9, 15). Ninety-five percent of mentors agreed that student teachers supported "the learning of all students" (P8, 9) and knew their "strengths and limitations" (P15). Principals rated graduates as prepared: 79

percent of candidates - adjusting instruction for individual learning needs (P8); 75 percent of candidates - managing the classroom effectively (P9), 68 percent - using research to inform practice (P15). The data the unit has provided are disaggregated by program and not by assessment.

In advanced programs for teachers, 100 percent of the candidates met expectations on assessments that included research papers (P15), organizational profiles, reflective logs and action research (P8, P9). At the advanced program level in the capstone phase, 89-100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include case studies, creating an online classroom, action research, and capstone reflection (P8, P9). One hundred percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include final papers, presentations, and portfolios (P15).

In initial programs for teachers at the pre-student teaching level, 83-100 percent (depending on program) met expectations on assessments that include lesson plans, annotated bibliographies, unit plans (P16), and on assessments about impact on student learning that include conducting student band and action research projects (P17). During student teaching, 75-100 percent met expectations assessments that include action research projects, lesson and unit plans (P16). Eighty-seven to 100 percent met expectations on assessments that include impact charts (P17). Candidates met expectations on summative observations (P16,17). Mentors agreed that 92 percent know how to monitor student achievement (P16), and 88 percent could identify strategies to measure impact (P17). Principals gave ratings of prepared: 87 percent using a variety of assessment strategies (P16), and 74 percent using student assessment data to inform practice (P17). The aggregate data by program were presented in the IR, but specific disaggregated data by assessment were not presented.

In advanced programs for teachers, 80-100 percent met expectations on key assessments that include action research plans and case studies (P16, 17). In the capstone phase, 100 percent met expectations on assessments that include capstone reflection papers and final assessment projects (P16,17).

OSP foundational phase candidates met expectations on assessments (P7, 10, 15): 87-100 percent of candidates on the developmental guidance plans and organizational profiles (P2); 75-100 percent of candidates on the program analyses, case studies, creating online classrooms, essays and reflective papers (P7,10, 15). At the capstone phase, 100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments such reflections (P2) and on final presentations and projects (P7, 10 - 15). One hundred percent of counselor education candidates passed PRAXIS II (1.4.c.4, 5). A total of 90-95 percent of principals rated graduates as prepared in professional knowledge and skills (P2), knowledge of professional standards (P2), and using research to inform practice (P15). The aggregate data by program were presented in the IR, but specific disaggregated data by assessment were not presented.

Other School Personnel at the foundational phase – 100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments (P8, 9, 18) that include creating developmental guidance plans and analyzing how materials are presented to diverse students (P8, 9,18). One hundred percent of capstone phase candidates met expectations on assessments that include presentations to constituents and final projects (P8, 18). Eighty percent of principals rated graduates as prepared to support student

learning. The aggregate data by program were presented in the IR, but specific disaggregated data by assessment were not presented.

In the initial programs, novice candidates address professional issues (P10 -P14) including confidentiality, in a candidacy portfolio and self-report on any legal issues. Mentor teachers rate candidates on professional behavior and appearance during the five-day observation; 100 percent of candidates met these expectations. At pre-student teaching, 85-100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include an interdisciplinary backward planning unit plans, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) lesson plans (P11, 12, 14), teaching in a clinic, classroom profiles (P13), parent booklets and service learning reports (P10). During student teaching, more than 90 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include lessons, unit plans, portfolios (P11, 12, 14), unit plans and lesson plans focused on fair treatment for all students (P13), service projects, case studies, and reflections (P10). Candidates met expectations on summative observations (P10-14). Mentors agreed: 95 percent of candidates showed positive professional demeanor and commitment to the profession (P11, 12) and supported the learning of all students (P10, 13), and 88 percent knew his/her strengths and limitations (P14). Principals gave ratings of prepared: 81 percent of candidates motivated and engaged all students in learning (P10,13) and knowledge of ethical and legal responsibilities (P11, 12), 87 percent - building positive relationships with diverse students (P10,13), and 94 percent of candidates - demonstrating commitment to professional growth (P14). The aggregate data by program were presented in the IR, but specific disaggregated data by assessment were not presented.

In advanced programs at foundational phase, 100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include case studies, philosophy and practice paper, journals (P10), action research, reflective essays, exams (P11, 12, 14), case studies, and intervention plans (P13). In the capstone phase, 100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include action research projects, reflective essays (P11, 12, 14), graduate projects (P13), e-folios, presentations, and final reflections (P10). In the OSP foundational phase, 75-100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments that include professional platforms, developmental guidance plans, organizational profiles, and action research (P11, 12, 14). A total of 87-100 percent met expectations on assessments for P13 that include a multicultural philosophy statement. A total of 75-100 percent of candidates met expectations on assessments for P10 that include developing a web page, a case conceptualization paper, and a leader reflection. In the capstone phase, 100 percent met expectations on assessments that include final papers, reflective essays, e-folios (P11, 12, 14), final presentations, graduate projects (P13), final projects, presentations, and reflections (P10). A total of 90-95 percent of principals rated OSP graduates as prepared in commitment to their ethical and legal responsibilities (P11), to professional growth (P14), and to reflecting on practice to improve practice (P14). The terminology used by the unit for IP, AP, and OSP are not clear in the assessment system.

1.1.b How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?

The IR and accompanying exhibits, as well as the institutional and unit websites, were reviewed by the team for the offsite report. The aggregate data provided showed candidates making good progress and the unit programs producing candidates that met the expectations of employers.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.a Movement Toward Target. Not applicable to this standard.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

According to the IR and exhibits, the following continuous improvement procedural and operational initiatives have been instituted by the unit:

The unit has created a new system for uploading key assessments to Tk20 to ensure timely data access. A Curriculum Task Force was established in fall 2013 to address curriculum concerns across programs based on data and state and national initiatives. The Advising Center has assumed responsibility for advising students through the candidacy process, providing workshops for both candidacy and for PRAXIS I and II. The unit has developed targeted interventions for candidates that began in spring 2014. A new Teacher Candidate Disposition document was created and approved by the teacher education faculty in May 2009 and is now consistently presented in the orientation course and included in syllabi. A new Teacher Candidate Dispositions document, a referral form that allows faculty to recommend a candidate to the assistant dean of students for support and coaching (1.4.e.2), has been implemented. Dispositions (P8, P13) are now assessed through discrete key assessments during student teaching. The mentor teacher, supervisor, and candidate assess each candidate at midpoint and at the end (1.4.e.3).

The following programmatic changes have been instituted, according to the IR and exhibits:

Based on data showing weaknesses in candidates' use of technology to inform instruction and assessment, the teacher education faculty passed a proposal to include a technology requirement in all programs (1.4.e.1). To allow for more differentiated learning among candidates, the special education program has separated its combined undergraduate/graduate course on diverse learners into an undergraduate course (SED 302) and a graduate one (SED 502) (1.5.b.9). Based on data from key assessments and principal and mentor teacher surveys, the teacher education faculty approved a recommendation in February 2013 to increase time in the field for secondary education students from 60 to 100 hours. This policy change took effect in fall 2013; however, candidates currently enrolled in the program may register for either 60 or 100 hours (1.4.c.7) Faculty in counselor education revised the course in which 100 percent of candidates did not meet expectations in content knowledge (P2) and added a second course later in the program, CEC580 Principles and Practices of School Counseling, to support candidates in further developing their professional knowledge and competence. The course is also designed to improve learning outcomes relative to P18: policy contexts (1.4.a.14). Because candidates fell below the benchmark on the webpage design key assessment (P10), instructional technology faculty revised the key assessment to better reflect the proficiency measured (1.4.a.4).

The IR also lists several changes that are in process as the unit continues to look at continuously improving the programs that it offers.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The early childhood education, curriculum and assessment, and instructional outreach programs do not have assessment data.	ADV	Early childhood education program has been participating in the college-wide assessment system through identifying and utilizing key assessments, applying rubrics, and uploading learning outcomes data to for the last two years, as shown by the reports (1.4.d.4, 1.4.d.23). The disaggregated data to show the results of these efforts were not provided in the IR or exhibits

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. It is not clear that each program has sufficient data to indicate that candidates demonstrate the expected proficiencies.

   Rationale: The unit has not provided three years of data disaggregated by program and assessment.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. What is the total number of programs offered within the unit at initial, advanced levels, and OSP?

2. What are the names for different levels in the assessment system?

3. Does the unit have data from the last three years on key assessments disaggregated by program and assessment?

4. What data can be provided addressing the AFI?

5. What is the process that is used to ensure continuous improvement initiatives are brought forward in a timely and efficient fashion?

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1. Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The elements of Standard Two are evident in the exhibits presented by the unit. The unit has an assessment system that is regularly reviewed for reliability and validity beginning in the summer of 2014. Multiple assessments over multiple points in time are utilized. Further, assessments are used to make program changes and to track candidate performance. Faculty are actively engaged in reviewing assessment data and making modifications as indicated. In 2008, following its last NCATE review, the unit engaged in a significant overhaul of the assessment system based on NCATE and state input. The comprehensive assessment system (CAS) was developed and tied directly to the unit's conceptual framework, NCATE domains, and state standards. The CAS system collects data from multiple sources using multiple assessments. Candidate, program, and unit performance are targets of the CAS.

The CAS consists of a number of assessment tools that are designed to collect data on candidates, programs, faculty, and other members of the professional community. The unit uses a PeopleSoft program called Mainstreet to collect demographic and performance data from program entry to post-graduation. Candidates also take the PRAXIS examinations to determine candidate performance. Tk20 is used by the unit to collect and manage proficiency data. Tk20 was implemented in 2011 after unit leadership received training and orientation on the system. Instructors and candidates are able to access the Tk20 system in areas appropriate for them, but only unit supervisors can access the full system. Several surveys are also part of the CAS; they include candidate, mentor teacher, recent graduate, and post-graduation supervisors surveys. The final assessment tool in the CAS is course evaluation.

It is clear that the CAS has improved the unit's data collection and use. In 2014, the plan is for the assessment team to evaluate the statistics generated by the CAS and to determine reliability and validity constructs. The unit does not have three years of data using the new system, but does present two years of CAS data and one year from the old system. The development of the CAS is an ongoing process.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.a Movement Toward Target. Not applicable to this standard.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit engages in continuous improvement in the assessment system by continually reviewing assessment data and developing modification based on those data. Continuous improvement reports listed in the exhibits show use of assessment data on an annual basis. An assessment

team has been formed to guide this ongoing evaluation and modification. The unit dean has monthly meetings to discuss program issues that come up based on assessment data. Candidates may access the annual summaries of assessments to monitor their own progress. Using the tools of the CAS, the unit has merged data so that it can be accessed from one source. The way information collected in the CAS is used by department chairs and program coordinators allows for a clear information flow.

Continuous improvement is demonstrated through the PRAXIS examinations that are downloaded and linked with other data in the CAS. Using the Tk20 system allows instructors and mentor teachers to directly input their data. The development of post-graduation surveys is ongoing and has been implemented in the CAS. The unit has noted that it intends to expand the input of current candidates based on issues that have evolved as a result of the CAS. Programs within the unit have demonstrated how the Tk20 system could be expanded. The counselor education program is currently engaging in an expansion of the system that will incorporate specific program certification and accreditation requirements.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. Systematic, comprehensive data for only one semester were available and reported at the time of the visit.	ITP,ADV	The unit has developed a comprehensive assessment system which has multiple assessments from multiple sources and targets multiple areas of candidate, program, and unit performance.
2. The unit has not determined that key assessments are predictors of candidate success.	ITP,ADV	The unit points to its use of linkages between the PRAXIS examination and other academic outcome data with other key assessments as evidence of its efforts at reconciling this AFI.
3. The educational leadership program assessments do not reveal if candidates are meeting unit proficiencies.	ITP,ADV	The program is now collecting and using data as specified in the CAS. This includes candidate data on meeting proficiency targets.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and evidence presented thus far.

2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. How frequently does the unit assessment team meet?

2. How do candidates and faculty access the Tk20 system?

3. When will other programs link with certification and accreditation?

4. What are the issues discussed at the dean's monthly meetings and assessment team meetings?

5. What remediation is in place for candidates who do not pass Praxis II before student teaching?

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has entered into a partnership with surrounding school districts entitled the Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP). PREP's Teacher Preparation Committee (TPC) meets monthly to discuss the design, implementation, and evaluation of the teacher education program; however, the membership of the committee was not supplied. P-12 principals and mentors are surveyed annually regarding the programs and candidate preparedness.

The unit presented evidence of professional development opportunities that it provides to practicing educators. Some of the opportunities were conferences that were offered at no cost or at minimum cost to practicing educators. The unit utilizes practicing educators in its student teacher workshops.

The unit requests assistance from school principals for the placement of candidates for field experiences and student teaching. Sample letters to principals were supplied which request feedback from the school for assistance in placing the candidates. There was not any documentation provided regarding extent to which, if any, the principals participate in the placement of candidates.

Initial candidates are to demonstrate mastery of the 17 NCATE UMaine Proficiencies and ten Maine Beginning Teacher Standards through the development of an eFolio. The eFolio must be completed prior to entry into upper-level education courses. The eFolio consists of the following: required coursework/GPA; passing scores on Praxis Core Academic Skills For Educators (Core) exam; and Field Experience Report, fingerprints, and Field Experience Evaluation.

The unit requires a cumulative GPA of 2.5 with a grade of C- or better in each pre-requisite course. Minimum passing scores on the Praxis Core are: Reading 156, Writing 162, and Math 150. A candidate may also have a composite score of 468 if no test score is three points below the requisite subject score.

Prior to entry into educator preparation, candidates complete a pre-requisite course which requires 25- 30 hours of observation. Initial program candidates are also expected to complete at least 525 hours of clinical practice, either through student teaching or internships. The number of additional field experience hours varies, depending on the program, and the majority of the hours in each program are specifically in student teaching. Advanced program candidates are required to complete observation hours as well, which also vary depending on the program.

Initial candidates must pass Praxis II prior to entry into student teaching.

Handbooks exist for both student teachers and supervisors. Additionally, mentor teachers must have at least three years of classroom experience prior to working with student teachers. The unit provide its mentor teachers with orientation materials. Mentor teachers work with the student teachers and are instructed to gradually shift classroom responsibilities to them over the course of the clinical experience.

Rubrics and evaluation sheets are provided to mentor teachers and supervising teachers for student teaching.

Candidates in advanced programs embed research and observation into their current work assignments.

Initial candidates complete the eFolio prior to entry into student teaching and complete additional field placements, depending on the program. There are rubrics included for mentors and supervisors to evaluate student teaching, and there is a handbook for candidates, mentors, and supervisors.

Advanced programs are also individualized. Each program requires field experiences as a component of several classes. The program hours vary by program from 135 hours (M.Ed in Special Education) to in excess of 630 hours (M.Ed. in Counselor Education). The M.Ed in Instructional Technology includes 225 hours of job shadowing and 525 hours of clinical practice during a 15-week internship. The only program without a specified number of hours is the M.Ed. in Elementary Education or Secondary Education, which is a program for already certified educators.

Exactly how candidates are evaluated and peer guidance are not clear from a review of the materials.

A majority of the unit's field and student teaching placements are within a 40-mile radius of the university. The higher poverty populations are outside the 40-mile radius, and therefore, there is not as much opportunity for the candidates to interact in classes with low socioeconomic populations. Initial candidates do have opportunities to interact with diverse student populations and special needs students. Candidates have the opportunity to travel to Bangor to experience additional diversity experiences, although this does not seem to be required.

Due to the employment of the candidates in a variety of school settings, advanced programs candidates have the opportunity to work with a more diverse population. This is because the

candidates in these programs usually work outside the 40-mile radius of the university. There was no documentation provided showing the job placements of the advanced program candidates.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Although there was evidence that the PREP TPC committee discussed the unit's conceptual framework, there was no evidence of final recommendations or the unit utilizing the recommendations in its final revisions. The unit does provide professional development for school partners, but there was not any evidence that the unit built the professional development based on the needs of the school districts or the students. Although the unit places candidates in surrounding districts, there was no evidence that the candidates are placed based on either the needs of the district or the needs of a specific candidate. There was also no confirmation that principals supply input into the placement process, although the unit does ask for input.

Field experiences vary from program to program. The unit has just begun to require specific data on field experiences which will allow the unit to develop a more coherent plan to ensure that candidates have a variety of field experiences in several different school settings.

Candidates in advanced programs have more varied experiences due to usually working in a more diverse setting. Again the variety of experiences depends on the program of study and is not consistent across the programs. No documentation was located to show the job placement of advanced program candidates.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement. Not applicable to this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	**DEVELOPING**	**ATTAINED**
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***OR*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. In some programs, field experience and clinical practice are not extensive nor sufficiently monitored to prepare candidates for the areas in which they will be licensed.	ITP	Although there is better monitoring of field experiences, field experiences still vary from program to program. There is not sufficient evidence to show that this has been corrected.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and evidence presented thus far.

3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. What faculty members serve on PREP and its committees?

2. How is the PREP TPC committee work reviewed and implemented by the unit? What other issues does this committee discuss? Who is on the TPC committee?

3. Who attends the professional development conferences referenced in the report?

4. Are unit faculty presenting and designing the professional development conferences after reviewing the needs of the participating districts?

5. Why are a majority of field placements within a 40-mile radius if that area does not allow for interaction with low socio-economic populations? Why is the opportunity to go to Bangor to work with diverse populations an elective?

Standard 4: Diversity

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

4.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

According to the IR and identified exhibits, Maine is a predominantly rural state, with a high proportion of the population living in or close to poverty, and typically higher for more isolated

rural areas in northern Maine. The candidates at the University of Maine reflect the rural nature of the state and poverty found in Maine, especially northern Maine where the university is located.

About 20 percent of the university's students come from outside of Maine, including 4.1 percent who are international students. When surveyed soon after graduation, 27.8 percent of the 2011 graduates of the unit who had found full-time jobs were working out of state (4.4.e.5). As an education faculty, the unit seeks to impact the state, the nation, and the world through its research and service (4.4.g.13). The college supports the diversity efforts of all degree programs through the many activities of the Diversity and Difference Standing (DDS) Committee. This committee was formed in 2006, and has been very active (4.4.g.4).

The unit has three candidate proficiencies, P8, 13, and 17, aligned with curriculum and assessment with regard to diversity in initial and advanced programs for teachers. Programs for other school professionals also features three diversity proficiencies - P8, 13, and 18 (4.4.c.1). Each degree program specifies the levels and courses in which these proficiencies are assessed (4.4.c.2-5). These data were not disaggregated for each program.

According to the IR, the categories of diversity addressed in courses, and the activities through which diversity is addressed, are summarized in two curriculum matrices (4.4.b.2, 3). These matrices include the courses in which proficiencies #8, 13, 17, and 18 are assessed, as well as other courses that do not have a key assessment task for these proficiencies, but do include relevant instruction. Curricula and assessments address all categories of diversity and all criteria for candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions re: diversity (4.4.b.20-21). A course on exceptionalities is required for initial certification by the State of Maine and is required in all initial programs. These data were not disaggregated for each program. The matrices are not as clear as they might be for a person not familiar with the unit or the region.

Candidate performance with respect to the diversity proficiencies is assessed in undergraduate initial program courses (4.4.c.2), graduate initial courses (4.4.c.3), advanced program courses (4.4.c.4), and courses for other school professionals (4.4.c.5). In addition to programs' annual analyses and reports of all assessment data, the DDS Committee reviews the data for proficiencies #8, #13, #17, and #18 each year. Data by program, proficiency, semester, and course number, were analyzed for all programs (4.4.a.1-4). According to Exhibit 4.4a.5, which delineates the data reports from Tk20, indicates that, for each diversity proficiency, over 90 percent of candidates in most programs meet or exceed expectations. These data were not disaggregated for each program. It is not clear that all programs' candidates have diverse experiences.

The IR states, and indicated exhibits support, that in fall 2013, the unit employed six individuals who are of diverse racial backgrounds (four Asian, two Black), out of a total of 42 full-time and 43 part-time (adjunct) faculty members (7.1%). Two are tenured/tenure-track faculty teaching in advanced programs. A third is a full-time professional who teaches in several undergraduate programs. Two are adjunct instructors; one is a graduate assistant (4.4.d.1). Two graduate candidates, one Latino and one Black, have taught a diversity course in the summer. A Native American of the Wampanoag tribe has been hired continuously since fall 2007 as a guest speaker

for all sections of "Education in a Multicultural Society" (4.4.g.13). Two faculty are foreign-born (Canada, Australia). A majority of faculty are females, compared to 35 percent campus-wide. Faculty are knowledgeable and skillful in preparing candidates to work with diverse populations (4.4.g.13). The actual percentage of female faculty in the unit was not provided. The university as a whole currently employs 636 full-time faculty, of whom 43 (6.8%) are faculty of color (4.4.d.1). Disaggregated data for each program in the unit were not provided.

The Faculty Recruitment and Retention Plan, adopted in 2006, describes procedures for encouraging a diverse pool of applicants for faculty positions, ensuring fair consideration in the review process, and promoting retention of diverse faculty (4.4.g.1). It is not clear that this plan has been updated since 2006. Language regarding diversity is included in position descriptions (4.4.g.2). Position descriptions are widely circulated, including in sources targeting potential applicants of color (4.4.g.3). The unit works closely with the Office of Equal Opportunity in faculty recruitment, hiring, and retention, and follows all pertinent campus and system policies (4.4.g.4).

The unit currently enrolls 933 candidates (not counting international students), of whom 38 (4.1%) are persons of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds, as follows: 28 of 648 initial candidates (4.3%), 10 of 285 advanced candidates (3.5%). It is not clear that international students are included in the data. Thirteen candidates are international students (4.4.e.1). The college has awarded 106 assistantships to 67 candidates since 2008, of which 14 assistantships (13%) were awarded to persons of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds. There are generally seven areas of diversity that the unit measures and tracks. It is not clear what data are available for each of the seven areas for each program and the unit.

The unit’s candidates work with each other and with diverse candidates across campus in general education and academic concentration courses and in shared courses in related programs within COEHD. Two COEHD undergraduate non-certification concentrations are not included in the NCATE unit: child and family development (within the Child Development and Family Studies degree), and exercise science (within the Kinesiology and Physical Education (KPE) degree). Students in these concentrations take some courses along with candidates in the NCATE unit. As of spring 2012, 19.8 percent of the child and family development students were of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds, as were 8.7 percent of exercise science students. Also, 9.9 percent of the candidates in the KPE teaching/coaching concentration, and 7.5 percent in the KPE exercise science concentration are international students.

The IR indicates that the university actively recruits applicants in several large urban areas of the east coast, and as far west as Chicago. Recruitment efforts are also targeting the small but growing numbers of diverse students in high schools in Maine's small urban centers. Two admissions office staff members are engaged primarily in the recruitment of applicants of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds. The university also supports and seeks to retain diverse candidates through its Office of Multicultural Student Life and its Office of International Programs.

According to the IR and indicated exhibits, the unit places initial candidates in field experiences and clinical practice in 93 PK-12 schools in Maine, as well as in four PK-12 schools abroad (4.4.f.1). The unit also places advanced program candidates in 59 schools in Maine for clinical

experiences (4.4.f.2). The unit actively encourages candidates to take advantage of opportunities to student teach in schools, primarily located in southern Maine, with a relatively high percentage of students of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds and English language learners (ELLs). The unit promotes placements abroad through the Global Links program. Field experiences provide supervisor feedback and require candidate reflection on their ability to help all students learn (4.4.i.7- 30).

The IR and indicated exhibits, which provided an analysis of diversity in placement schools compared to all schools in the state of Maine, show that the unit's initial and advanced programs have attempted to place candidates in diverse schools. For initial programs, in aggregate, higher percentages of placement schools exceed the thresholds for ELLs, for students receiving special education services, and for "non-White" students, compared to schools statewide, while a lower percentage of placement schools exceeds the threshold for lower socioeconomic status (free/reduced price lunch). For advanced programs, in aggregate, higher percentages of placement schools exceed the thresholds for lower socioeconomic status (free and reduced price lunch) and for students receiving special education services, compared to schools statewide, while lower percentages of placement schools exceed the thresholds for ELLs and for "non-White" students (4.4.f.3).

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.a Movement Toward Target. Not applicable to this standard.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The IR and indicated exhibits indicate numerous changes and updates have taken place in the programs, including the section on diversity in the unit's conceptual framework. The Diversity and Difference Standing (DDS) Committee has recommended substantial revisions to the diversity section (4.4.b.17).

The scope of the course Adapting Instruction for Students with Special Needs (SED 302) has been expanded to include English Language Learners, students at risk due to poverty and other issues, as well students who are different with regard to race, ethnicity, and culture (4.4.b.8). In the required course for all undergraduate education majors, Education in a Multicultural Society (EDB 202) all course instructors are now collaborating with staff and students in the University's Office of Multicultural Student Life to address race, class, and gender issues. Somali high school students from Lewiston have also visited for discussions of "culture." Other experiences that have been added include guest lectures and discussions with a Native American of the Wampanoag tribe who also teaches in the University Native American Studies program (4.4.g.14); a field trip to the Islamic Center of Maine; guest appearances by a university staff member whose transgender daughter has been the focus of a successful legal challenge to local school practices; and training sessions led by representatives of the campus LGBT office (4.4.b.5). In the course Teaching Social Studies in Early Childhood Education (CHF 322) the instructor has adopted "the persona doll project" in which each candidate receives a doll representing a different aspect of diversity and is expected to be an advocate for their persona

doll throughout the course (4.4.b.9-10). The counselor education program has revised many of its courses as part of plans to seek CACREP accreditation. Diversity has been infused throughout the curriculum (4.4.b.11). The teacher candidacy e-portfolio now includes a field experience report (4.4.b.6-7), which has been substantially revised to infuse diversity proficiencies into four of its seven components. The DDS Committee reviewed the 2011-12 data on assessments for the diversity proficiencies and made suggestions for improving accuracy (4.4.b.16). Data for 2012-13 showed greater awareness and understanding.

Two full-time persons of diverse backgrounds (one AP tenure-track, one IP undergraduate professional) have been hired since 2010. The tenure-track faculty member represents 25 percent of the new tenure-stream hires since 2010. The unit has used Libra Professorship funding to bring four faculty from other institutions with expertise in urban education and multicultural education, including diverse faculty, to work with faculty and candidates on strengthening the faculty's understanding of diversity through presentations and consultations (4.4.g.6, 8, 12). The DDS Committee has arranged for and coordinated these Libra visiting professorships. One of these visiting Libra professors was a Latina (4.4.g.7), and two were African- American women (4.4.g.9, 11). The DDS Committee has organized numerous other events for faculty and candidates to support diversity and has updated and improved the College's diversity web page as a resource (4.4.g.16). Within the past two years, three faculty members have participated in the University of Maine Diversity Leadership Institute (4.4.g.17) Faculty involvement in international opportunities has increased substantially in the past three years, including activities in Vietnam, Jordan, and Mexico (4.4.g.13).

The unit has recently revised and updated a Candidate Recruitment and Retention Plan, in cooperation with the university vice president for enrollment management. The plan calls for additional scholarships, new and updated marketing materials, recruitment events, diversity ambassadors, and cooperation with campus diversity programs that conduct recruitment efforts (4.4.h.3). The unit has also revised its criteria for graduate assistantships to seek applicants who come from underrepresented groups (4.4.h.1-2). Through a partnership between the instructors of Education in a Multicultural Society (EDB 202) and the Office of Multicultural Student Life (OMSL), now in its third year, candidates in Education in a Multicultural Society (EDB 202) have small group conversations about race, class, and gender with OMSL students. All EDB 202 candidates meet in small groups for three 75-minute classes with pairs of OMSL students leading discussions of readings and sharing reflections on how each OMSL student and candidate experiences these aspects of diversity. As a result, some OMSL students have enrolled in EDB 202, a course required of all pre-education candidates.

The IR states that there have been four tenure-track faculty hired since 2010, with 25 percent of the new hires being non-White. A faculty member was hired effective in fall 2011 as a tenure-track faculty member in the counselor education program. He is Asian (from Taiwan). He has been actively involved in teaching a variety of counselor education courses, conducting research, advising students, supervising the Lindlof Center (which offers counseling services to people in need), and working toward future CACREP accreditation. He is now the program coordinator for the counselor education program.

The unit has piloted a new form to be completed by candidates, in which they record and reflect upon experiences with students of diverse backgrounds, including race/ethnicity, socioeconomic, gender, disability and English language learning. This form is being added to the Tk20 system for better tracking and placement (4.4.b.22). In addition to school placements, candidates are being given information about volunteer opportunities, on and off campus, to work with students of diverse backgrounds (4.4.i.2). The Educators of International Students in Maine Symposium, beginning in April, 2012, has brought high school faculty and international students to interact with faculty and candidates. (4.4.b.12). The multicultural counseling course (CEC 520) includes a requirement (as of fall 2011) that candidates perform 10 hours of service to international students or other diverse students in Maine schools. One school contact led to an overseas connection with the start-up American University of Vietnam, and its feeder high school, and to placement of several counselor education interns at AUV, starting in spring 2012. Somali students from the Tree Street Youth program of Lewiston now visit annually and participate in EDB 202, beginning in February, 2013. Since spring 2011, the unit has been planning and piloting new field experiences to enhance candidates' experiences with diverse PK-12 students. The university has approved both undergraduate and graduate course numbers for this field experience (4.4.i.5-6).

The IR and identified exhibits state that the unit has made efforts to attract other racially diverse faculty. The college and the university, under the guidance of the Office of Equal Opportunity, make vigorous efforts to attract a diverse applicant pool. For example, all external faculty searches must include at least one Affirmative Action Recruitment strategy reaching out to underrepresented groups, and these strategies are documented on a Faculty Recruitment Strategy Form (see 4.4.g.4). The Office of Equal Opportunity also provides diversity training for all search committees for salaried positions and requires an affirmative action statement in all position announcements. While candidates still do not interact with a large number of racially diverse faculty, there have been strides taken to increase these opportunities.

Since the last review, the college has invested $304,613.00 in diversity and diversity-related issues. For example, each year the college, through either the Mark R. Shibles Distinguished Visiting Professorship or the Libra Professorship, has brought in distinguished scholars with expertise in diversity to provide leadership on this important issue. A second area of investment has been on the design and instructional delivery of EDB 202 Education in a Multicultural Society, a required course in the undergraduate initial teacher preparation program. The college invests approximately $3000.00 per year in this course so that the instructor can bring in diverse guest speakers, and to arrange field trips to highly diverse areas. (4.4.i.6).

The IR states and exhibits support through an analysis of diversity in placement schools, compared to all schools in the state of Maine, as reported to the Maine Department of Education, that the unit’s advanced programs have made a good faith effort to place candidates in diverse schools. In aggregate, a higher percentages of placement schools exceed the thresholds for lower socioeconomic status (free and reduced price lunch) and for students receiving special education services, compared to schools statewide, while lower percentages of placement schools exceed the thresholds for English Language Learners and for "non-White" students. Based on this analysis, the unit's advanced programs will continue to monitor the diversity of students in schools where clinical experiences are completed, and guide candidates toward more diverse

schools and agencies to the extent possible (4.4.f.3). This exhibit addresses all areas of diversity, not just racial/ethnic diversity.

The IR states that the clinical experience in the literacy M.Ed. program, Clinical Practices: Teaching Children with Difficulties in Literacy (ERL 569) is conducted as a summer program at an elementary school and has included more recruitment of diverse students and more emphasis on learning to teach English Language Learners. Ongoing professional development sessions led by two ESL trained clinicians focused upon oral language development, cultural, racial, socioeconomic status, and gender diversity in schools (4.4.b.19).

The IR states that in the practicum course for the M.Ed. in Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction, each candidate completes an action research project in her or his classroom or school. The instructor has emphasized identifying students within the full range of diversity categories found in schools, exploring family funds of knowledge, and considering the implications of diversity (especially poverty) in developing and implementing action research projects (4.4.b.23).

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. Advanced candidate interaction with racially diverse faculty is limited in some programs and cohorts.	ADV	The unit has not provided a breakdown of which programs diverse faculty are teaching. It is not clear how candidates are ensured opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.
2. The unit does not have a system in place to assure that candidates in advanced programs for teachers complete field experiences with students from diverse groups.	ADV	Tracking data that show that each candidate has field experiences with students from diverse groups have not been provided to the team.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. More disaggregated data about diversity disaggregated by program is needed to determine if all candidates have the opportunity for a diverse experience.

   Rationale: While it appears the unit is making an effort to provide a diverse experience for all candidates, the data have not been provided to the team to ensure that all candidates in all programs have the opportunity for a diverse experience.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. What percentage of candidates within the unit come from out of state, international, etc.? How many graduates return and how many stay in state after completing their program?

2. What is being done to support candidates who do not meet diversity proficiencies?

3. Did the addition of new faculty affect the breakdown of faculty diversity by program?

4. How has the $304,613.00 been spent to address the issues of diversity and diverse opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse faculty? What have been the results?

5. What has been done to address areas of diversity other than race and ethnicity?

6. How is the unit using the refugee resettlement program?

7. How is the unit enticing and recruiting candidates and providing diverse placement settings?

8. Why are the international students not included in the data?

9. Has the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Plan been updated since 2006?

10. What are the candidate diversity data disaggregated for each program?

11. There are generally seven areas of diversity that the unit measures and tracks. What data are available for each of the seven areas for each program and the unit?

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit's faculty is comprised of 85 faculty members who teach in the initial and advanced preparation programs. The unit disaggregates information regarding the highest level of education of the faculty members (which in most cases is the doctoral degree), as well as their contemporary professional experience in school and other clinical settings. Clinical faculty members hold Maine credentials for the courses they teach or the field experiences they supervise. The unit also employs retired unit faculty members to serve in these clinical roles. The majority of the clinical faculty members have master's degrees or doctorates in their assigned fields and a range of experience (five to 42 years) practicing in school or clinical settings. A job description for clinical faculty who supervise candidates in their internship experiences requires the minimum of a bachelor's degree and three years of experience. Clinical faculty who teach seminars must have a minimum of a master's degree and five years of teaching experience.

Sample syllabi demonstrate that content of courses is connected to the respective specialty areas disciplines (e.g., listing state and national standards on the syllabi). Evidence of contemporary

knowledge in the faculty member's respective discipline is also found in the sample scholarly products listed for each faculty member. Course assessments are tied to NCATE standards, as well as Maine and professional association standards. Assessments include, for example, essays, papers, unit plans, lesson plans, video-taped teaching demonstrations, and development of modified lesson plans for students with exceptionalities. Each assignment is coded with the standards that the assignment addresses, as well as the rubric for evaluation. Evidence of the unit's ability to adjust instruction to enhance candidate learning is found in sample assessment evaluations for candidates where exemplars are provide that do not meet, meet, and exceed proficiency. Inclusion of diversity and technology is found in sample assignments, the unit's use of Blackboard course management software and other technology (e.g., iPADS, iClickers, Moodle, and googledocs), and opportunities for learning more about diversity, not only through classes but also through experiences with P-12 students and professional talks. Faculty seek feedback on their teaching through candidate assessment, as well as peer review of performance. The mean score for faculty in spring 2013 was 4.66 for faculty ratings (on a metric of 1-5).

Faculty in the unit connect their scholarship to a recently revised mission and vision statement. The unit provides data from September 2012 to May 2013 regarding faculty scholarship. This scholarship included 25 peer-reviewed articles, 33 proceedings and reports, and seven books. The faculty also had 89 presentations at conferences or learned societies. For 2012-2013, there was a 3-to-1 ratio for scholarly products to faculty member. Sample titles and conference presentation titles indicate faculty are publishing in leading journals and presenting at highly-regarded conferences in their fields. Evidence of faculty scholarship in connection with school partners is also presented. The unit provides mini-grants to connect faculty to P-12 partners to engage in meaningful research projects. The faculty generated $4,841,085 in extramural research funding in 2013.

Evidence is provided on faculty contributions to service within the unit and to the profession. Brief excerpts from a summary table of faculty P-12 experience provide numerous examples of that faculty hold offices in professional organizations, contribute to the scholarly review of empirical work, and collaborate with P-12 and other partners. For example, the unit reports 40 full- and part-time faculty (78%) hold positions of responsibility as officers or conference planners for professional organizations.

An annual evaluation system is in place for faculty which adheres to the Affiliated Faculties of the University of Maine contracted agreement. Evaluation data are received from candidates as well as through a peer-review system. Faculty are required to submit portfolios with data and faculty reflections on teaching, advising, scholarship, and service. Faculty also submit plans for professional development and teaching. Sample faculty reflections include a summary of teaching responsibilities and a summary of course evaluations with specific faculty critique of how they would change their practice. Information gleaned from the Adjunct Faculty Handbook was also provided for how adjunct faculty are evaluated. For example, a sponsoring faculty member serves as a mentor who assists with review of student evaluation comments following the completion of the course. When an adjunct faculty member is appointed, their credentials are also reviewed for placement on the University of Maine graduate faculty. Cooperating teachers must hold a Maine certificate for the field in which they teach and have three-to-five years of

experience. An explicit procedure for review, reappointment, promotion, and tenure is also provided for faculty.

The unit makes provisions for faculty professional development and mentoring. For example, the institution provides a variety of professional development opportunities through its Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment, Project Reach, and Women's Studies programs. A formal mentoring program is in place at the university for all new faculty. The university provides funding for faculty through technology stipends to develop online courses or create instructional materials that incorporate technology. The unit provides Diversity Dialogs, Research-in-Progress presentations, technology skill-building sessions, and brown bag conversations. The unit provides funding for faculty travel to enhance professional learning. In 2014, the unit provided $46,200 in travel stipends for faculty. Clinical faculty participate in orientation meetings and professional development activities offered through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment. Finally, a sabbatical policy is in place for faculty to enhance their learning.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

5.2.a Movement Toward Target. Not applicable to this standard.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Evidence that the unit is moving toward continuous improvement is found in collaborations between faculty in the unit and other colleges on campus. For example, faculty have a high scholarly productive to faculty member ratio. The unit has increased funding and resources for professional development and scholarship activities. The unit has also engaged in a number of diversity efforts to augment its faculty.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last accreditation review.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and evidence presented thus far.

5.5 Evidence for the Site Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. For some faculty the faculty member's highest degree was not listed on the qualifications matrix provided by the unit. Information about their teaching credentials was listed (with the exception of two cases), but there was no educational information listed for highest degree earned. What is the highest degree earned by those individuals with missing information in the Qualifications of Professional Education Faculty chart?

2. The unit provided sample midterm feedback, university summative course evaluation documents, and some sample evaluation data from one faculty member who discusses the

mean ratings from students and the faculty member's analysis of such feedback. Evidence of how such feedback is used for individual faculty is presented, as are aggregate scores for all faculty for spring 2013. How does the unit use these data for program or unit improvement? Are there data for more than just spring 2013?

3. Although data are provided for 2012-2013 with regard to faculty scholarship, what additional data does the unit have for 2013-2014 on faculty scholarship to meet the requirement regarding the number of years of data for review?

4. There are a number of opportunities for faculty with regard to professional learning. Does the unit keep data on the number of faculty who have participated in such learning or who have been awarded technology stipends?

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The University of Maine is a RU/H (research university, high research activity, land and sea grant) institution accredited by New England Association of Schools and Colleges. The College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) has been charged by the institution's provost to be the professional education unit. The unit works in conjunction with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture (NSFA) to offer programs of study. Examples of recent collaboration include joint appointments of faculty from the Liberal Arts and Sciences to the COEHD. Annual AACTE reports confirm yearly progress to greater collaboration between the unit and the Liberal Arts and Sciences. The unit is also coordinated through a university-wide Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC). Recently, the COEHD reorganized into three core departments, which provided for a tighter structure for support and supervision of adjunct faculty. The unit is led by a dean and standing committees. Members of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science and Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture have joint appointments with the COEHD.

Recruiting and admission practices are described for both initial and advanced candidates and are available on the website, as well in PDFs that list admissions requirements. Each advanced program has a student handbook that describes admissions requirements and programmatic requirements. Additional websites provide information about general university policies. The Office of Teacher Recruitment, Advising, and Licensure advises pre-service majors, transfer students, and MAT candidates. Teacher education candidates have a faculty advisor; secondary education majors are advised by faculty in the COEHD, as well as other arts and sciences departments. The Teacher Education Coordinating Committee and the Teacher Education Council assist with program design, implementation, and evaluation of unit programs of study. The unit also engages with the Penobscot River Educational Partnership, which is a consortium

of P-12 partners. Student services include writing, career, counseling, health, and disability support centers. Student services also include an Office of Multicultural Student Life, the Onward Program, a First Year Experience program, and a number of support groups.

Although the unit has witnessed a budget reduction over the last five years, the unit has accessed $1,038,316 for assessment, technology, professional learning, and distance learning. The unit operates with a base budget of $7,538,101. The unit also has access to gift funds ($515,064). Specific funds are also allotted for activities associated with diversity. Since 2007, the unit has supported $304, 613 for diversity-related activities. A number of endowed scholarship funds are available to students. The unit provided evidence that the budget supports work within the unit and with its school partners (e.g., mini-grants).

With regard to unit faculty and their workload distribution, the unit abides by an agreement between the University of Maine System and Associated Faculties of the University of Maine, MEA/NEA. This agreement includes information on appointment, ranks, promotion and tenure, workload, and salaries among a number of other components of faculty appointment. Typically tenured or tenure-stream faculty teach three courses per semester. This agreement also specifies policies for online course delivery. The unit employs a large number of clinical and part-time faculty to connect candidates to practitioners. Handbooks are available for clinical faculty, and these faculty are also included in formal meeting and in the TECC. Professional development is available for faculty both through the unit and the university as a whole. For example, workshops and other professional learning opportunities are routinely offered each month, and there are specific technology workshops provided for faculty by the unit's instructional technologist.

The unit is primarily housed in Shibles Hall. Additional locations include Merrill Hall, Lengyl Gym, and Chadbourne Hall. The unit notes it is planning a new building to house all of its unit programs in one building. Technology includes Smartboards, projectors, and docking stations. The unit is housed in a facility with sufficient bandwith for Internet use. iPads are available for classroom instruction.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.a Movement Toward Target. Not applicable to this standard.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Continuous improvement is found the enhanced relationships between the unit and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. As this was a cited Area for Improvement in the last NCATE review, the unit has made significant advances through co-advising relationships with arts and sciences faculty and expansion of the university-wide Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC).

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. Collaboration between College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and unit faculty is not systematic.	ITP,ADV	Examples of this collaboration is found in the joint appointments of faculty from Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) to the unit, advisement of candidates by LAS faculty, and collaborative scholarship between the two entities.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and evidence presented thus far.

6.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. How do arts and science faculty conduct advising of teacher candidates?

2. The unit reports greater connection between it and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. How can the unit confirm these collaborative relationships onsite?

3. The unit does not provide any documentation that its assessment system is well-funded. Although there is a line item in a resource budget for assessment, the unit does not provide a discussion about whether or not these funds support the assessment system. How are funds used to support the assessment system?

4. The unit notes that an on-campus and an online library are superior and references exhibit 6.4.c17. However, this exhibit was not included in the attachments to the instructional report.