

University of Maine
College of Education and Human Development
Institutional Report (IR) – For Program Review – 2014

[IR – 1] – [Overview and Conceptual Framework]

[1.1 Summarize the institution’s mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious)]

The University of Maine is the state's land and sea grant university. Established in 1865 with the tripartite mission of teaching, research, and public service, UMaine is classified as a "Doctoral Research-Extensive" university by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and is internationally recognized for research, scholarship, and creative activity. UMaine is comprised of seven colleges/schools: Education and Human Development (COEHD); Engineering; Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS); Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture (NSFA), the Honors College, the Maine Business School and Graduate School.

With 8,228 undergraduates and 1,017 graduate students, UMaine is the largest higher education institution in Maine which has a population of 1.329,192. While the majority of undergraduates are White, students from all federally recognized minorities are represented at UMaine, including Maine's indigenous Native American population. (I.5.e.1.). As of 2012-2013, UMaine has a total of 543 faculty generating 384.8 FTE and offers 80 baccalaureate programs, 70 masters degree options, and 30 doctoral programs.

The University of Maine aspires to assist the state of Maine as it faces unprecedented challenges. In 2011, Maine had the lowest rate of income growth (3.4%) in the country. Maine's primary economic challenges are directly related to per capita income, an aging population (Maine has the highest median age of any state), costs of remaining competitive in the areas of health insurance (Maine's health care costs are 24% higher than the national average), energy (Maine's electric rates are 60% higher than the national average), taxes, regulations and transportation (25% of Maine's roads are rated as poor or mediocre). Maine must also address the challenge to increase productivity through educated and trained workers (Maine currently is 45th in the nation in average earning per worker). The University of Maine stands at the heart of a state where land meets sea, where the United States meets Canada, where Native American, Franco-American and European cultures come together. UMaine is now a singular place that is a leader in diversity, for the state. Approximately 10 percent of our students represent a variety of ethnic and cultural groups making our campus one of Maine's most diverse communities.

Mission and Vision of the University of Maine

The University is committed to the creation and dissemination of knowledge to improve the lives of its students and Maine citizens in their full social, economic, and cultural diversity. Undergraduate

education, with a foundation in the liberal arts and sciences that guides the intellectual and ethical development of the University's students, continues to be central to its teaching mission. Graduate education, with special emphasis on programs that address the current and future needs of Maine citizens and in selected areas in which the University of Maine can make significant national and international contributions, supports the research missions of the University, provides advanced training, and educates the next generation of teachers and researchers. The University is committed to developing and sustaining a multicultural and pluralistic educational community that encourages the full participation of all of its members.

The Blue Sky Plan is the strategic plan of the University of Maine, responsible for guiding the realization of the university's vision to become the most student-centered and community engaged of the American Research Universities. The Blue Sky Plan has, since its inception, been an inclusive and extensive effort between all campus constituencies and the greater community. The diverse membership advising the stewardship of each Pathway ensures long-term sustainability and momentum of the Plan, while allowing for growth as goals are achieved. For additional information see <http://www.umaine.edu/bluesky/>.

[IR – 1.2] - Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators]

The University of Maine's professional education unit (PEU) is led by the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) and includes the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture (NSFA) through cooperating appointments and participation in the Teacher Education Council (TEC). The mission of the PEU is to prepare reflective practitioners that are highly effective and ethical (I.5.C.1). These candidates are inspired lifelong learners, engaged in the community, and empowered to become leaders who strive to transform the future (I.5.C.3). The strong connection to school communities is manifested through the Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP). PREP is a collaborative effort to develop the capacity of member organizations and individuals to improve teaching and learning. PREP members include local school districts, the Indian Island School, the United Technologies Center, the Child Development Services Agency of Penobscot County, the University of Maine's COEHD, CLAS, and the Maine Business School. Through PREP the unit has a network that incorporates the collaborative work and engagement of P-16 educators in the decision making processes for continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality. The Dean is designated as head of the PEU by the provost and has overall responsibility for the unit. TEC is the mechanism for providing regular and sustained oversight and advisory responsibility to the dean. The council is chaired by the COEHD Associate and Assistant Dean as well as the Director of Field Experiences. Council representation consists of faculty from all professional education programs in the unit as well as participants from CLAS, NSFA, partner schools and teacher candidates. The dean of the COEHD provides leadership and support to all programs in the PEU and serves as the primary liaison with the University of Maine System and the Maine Department of Instruction.

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

The B.S. in Education, the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT-for liberal arts and sciences graduates of 4-year colleges), the Bachelor of Music, the Bachelor of Arts, and the Master of Science in Teaching (MST) degrees comprise the Unit's primary initial teacher preparation programs (I.5.a.1-19). Music and Art are both accredited (I.5.d.1-2). Undergraduate majors, with an array of academic specialization options, are offered in:

- Elementary and Secondary Education,
- Kinesiology and Physical Education,
- Early Childhood Education,
- Art Education, and
- Music Education.

The MAT includes certification tracks for secondary education. All are built around 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. Both undergraduates and MAT students who intern in the area (PREP) schools are guided by mentoring teachers and other participating P-12 educators.

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 in area 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. Maine recognizes both initial and advanced certifications.

The COEHD offers an array of graduate programs at the advanced and other professionals level (Literacy, Science Ed., SPED, Ed. Leadership, Counselor Ed., CAI, & IT) (I.5.a.20-27; I.5.b.16-30).

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

The Conceptual Framework (CF) serves as the foundation for the initial and advanced programs offered by the University of Maine to prepare educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. Initially developed in the mid-1990s and revised several times, it is a dynamic, evolving document that will continuously undergo revision as the needs of the field change (I.5.c.1-3).

The overall goal of the Unit is to prepare educators who are highly qualified to maximize the learning of all P-12 students, a goal which is in concert with the University's mission of creating and disseminating knowledge to improve the lives of its students and Maine citizens in their full social, economic, and

cultural diversity (I.5.c). The framework provides the basis for coherence among the programs, curricula, instruction, scholarship, service, candidate performance, assessment, and evaluation. The overarching theme that drives our professional education programs is that Reflective Practice is critical to the development of excellent professionals. In order to become reflective practitioners we are guided by three primary principles: 1) Excellence in Teaching and Learning, 2) Synthesis of Theory and Practice, 3) Collaboration and Mentoring.

The CF represents a shared vision for all programs in that it reflects an emerging consensus among COEHD, CLAS, and NSFA faculty that Reflective Practice was the central philosophical principle, most frequently integrated into the practices of teaching and learning, while the other three core principles remained important to various components of the program. It is our belief that reflective practice requires a thoughtful and evaluative analysis of the many forces and factors that affect teaching, learning, and schooling. We believe that reflective practice requires recursive self-evaluation and systematic assessment of students and programs. It draws upon shared, ambitious standards and expectations for teaching, research, and service. It promotes personal and professional understanding of one's own actions and potential and contributes to continually improving performance.

The reflective educator is continually developing understandings regarding what content is important to teach, how students learn, and how to teach so that students will learn. When faced with educational decisions, the reflective educator knows how to identify and interpret relevant information that can be used to make an informed, rational, and justifiable decision regarding educational practices. The ultimate outcome of reflective practice is to implement educational practices that are equitable, meaningful, and relevant for student and societal welfare. Our CF provides the foundation for all that we do and is the basis for all of our core courses and curriculum, methods courses, clinical practices and field experiences. Reflective practice and the three principles are assessed and evaluated at almost every stage of our candidates' development and guides our own commitment to continuous improvement. The CF helps us articulate the beliefs underlying both faculty practice and the practice expected of candidates and are reflected in the programs' curricula, instruction, and assessment practices that promote the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of a reflective practitioner.

The CF aligns the professional and state standards with candidate proficiencies expected by the unit and programs for preparation of educators in that all UMaine proficiencies have been clustered in relationship to the three central principles that guide the CF and the five NCATE elements that detail expectations for candidates' knowledge, skills, dispositions, and impact on student learning (I.5.c.4-5).

The Maine guiding principles assert that each Maine student must leave school as:

- a self-directed and lifelong learner,
- a clear and effective communicator,
- a creative and practical problem solver,
- a responsible and involved citizen,

- a collaborative and quality worker, and
- an integrative and informed thinker which clearly align with our overarching theme of reflective practitioners.

In addition the CF explicitly affirms and addresses the unit's professional commitments and professional dispositions, especially its ongoing commitments to diversity and technology integration as these critical components are embedded throughout all levels of our program and are continually assessed throughout the candidates development into a reflective practitioner.

[IR - 1. 5] – 1 – 5 Exhibits]

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

[1. 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions]

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

Key assessments are aligned with state and college proficiencies, the Conceptual Framework, and the NCATE elements of knowledge, skills, and dispositions (1.4.c.1-2). Data are presented for initial programs (IP), advanced programs (AP), and programs for Other School Professionals (OSP) in alignment with proficiencies, which are referenced by the letter P and their number. Exhibits: decision rules for reporting data - 1.4.d.4, 1.4.d.6; key assessment summary data - 1.4.d.3, with specific program exceptions in 1.4.d.5; full range of key assessments for programs by proficiency and conceptual framework - 1.4.d.3; program reports -1.4.a.1-16; summative observations of student teachers - 1.4.g.1; mentor teacher surveys - 1.4.j.1-2; and principal surveys -1.4.j.3.

1A. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (P1)

IP: At Level 1, novice, or at admission to the MAT and MST programs, 100% of applicants must have passed Praxis 1 and earned a minimum 2.5 GPA for undergraduate programs and 3.0 for graduate programs. All candidates met expectations on the candidacy portfolio, including an observational report, mentor teacher rating, and reflection. At Level 2, pre-student teaching, 90% to100% met expectations on multiple assessments such as case studies and exams. Candidates must pass Praxis II in order to be admitted to student teaching. Thus, 100% of program completers passed Praxis II exams required for licensure. (1.4.c.4, 5) At Level 3, student teaching, 100% demonstrated content knowledge

through multiple portfolio assessments and summative observations of teaching. 92% of mentors agreed that candidates displayed the content knowledge needed. 98% of principals rated IP graduates as prepared in content knowledge.

AP: Foundational phase - 100% met expectations through assessments such as curriculum development projects, research papers, and exams. 100% passed PRAXIS II in Special Ed. and Literacy (1.4.c.4, 5). Capstone phase - 100% met expectations on key assessments such as action research and presentations. AP principal surveys yielded only 2 responses, an inadequate sampling to report.

B. PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS (P3-7)

IP Pre-student teaching candidates – More than 90% met expectations on planning skills such as lesson plans, classroom profiles, and case studies (P4, 5); knowledge of instructional strategies (P6); and creating meaningful learning experiences, such as development of a one-year curriculum (P3). 0% to 100% met expectations for P7 such as lesson plans using technology. Student teaching - More than 90% met expectations in demonstrating planning skills and instructional strategies through lesson plans & unit plans (P4, 5, 6); making learning meaningful, such as unit plans (P3); and using technology, such as creating electronic portfolios (P7). Results are supported by the summative observations (P3-7). 89% to 94% 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). 85% to 92% of principals rated IP graduates as prepared in planning & organizing effective lessons (P3, 5); using a variety of teaching strategies (P3, 4, 6); and using a variety of instructional technologies (P7).

AP Foundational phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as annotated bibliographies, curriculum development projects, teacher research studies (P4, 5), thematic units, case studies, planning an online classroom, & research papers (P3, 6, 7). Capstone phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as capstone reflections, reflective essays, final projects & portfolios (P3-7).

1C. PROFESSIONAL & PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS (P8, 9, 15)

IP Pre-student teaching - 71% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as a philosophy of classroom management, differentiated lesson plans, & a diversity paper (P8). 92% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as field experience observations & unit planning (P9). Student teaching - 98% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as differentiated lesson & unit plans (P8), classroom management philosophy, lesson plans (P9), essay series & action research. (P15). Candidates met expectations in summative observations (P8, 9, 15). 95% of mentors agreed that student teachers supported "the learning of all students" (P8, 9) and knew their "strengths & limitations" (P15). Principals rated graduates as prepared: 79% - adjusting instruction for individual learning needs (P8); 75% - managing the classroom effectively (P9), 68% - using research to inform practice (P15).

AP Foundational Phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as research papers (P15), organizational profiles, reflective logs & action research (P8, P9). AP Capstone phase – 89% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as case studies, creating an online classroom, action research, &

capstone reflection (P8, P9). 100% met expectations on assessments such as final papers, presentations, & portfolios (P15).

1D. STUDENT LEARNING (P16, 17)

IP Pre-student teaching - 83% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as lesson plans, annotated bibliographies, unit plans (P16), and on assessments about impact on student learning, such as conducting student band & action research projects (P17). Student teaching - 75% to 100% met expectations on such as action research projects, lesson & unit plans (P16). 87% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as impact charts (P17). Candidates met expectations on summative observations (P16,17). Mentors agreed: 92% - know how to monitor student achievement (P16), and 88% - identify strategies to measure impact (P17). Principals gave ratings of prepared: 87% - using a variety of assessment strategies (P16), and 74% - using student assessment data to inform practice (P17).

AP Foundational Phase - 80% to 100% met expectations on key assessments, such as action research plans & case studies (P16, 17). Capstone Phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as capstone reflection papers & final assessment projects (P16, 17).

1E. OSP KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS (P7, 10, 15)

OSP Foundational phase candidates met expectations on assessments: 87% to 100% - developmental guidance plans & organizational profiles (P2); 75% to 100% - program analyses, case studies, creating online classrooms, essays & reflective papers (P7,10, 15). Capstone phase -100% met expectations on assessments such reflections (P2) and on final presentations & projects (P7,10, 15). 100% of Counselor Education candidates passed PRAXIS II (1.4.c.4, 5). 90% to 95% of principals rated graduates as prepared in professional knowledge & skills (P2), knowledge of professional standards (P2), and using research to inform practice (P15).

1F. OSP - STUDENT LEARNING (P8, 9, 18)

OSP Foundational phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as creating developmental guidance plans, & analyzing how materials are presented to diverse students (P8, 9,18). 100% of capstone phase candidates met expectations on assessments such as presentations to constituents & final projects (P8, 18). 80% of principals rated graduates as prepared to support student learning.

1G. PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS (P10 -P14)

IP novice students address professional issues including confidentiality in a candidacy portfolio and self-report on any legal issues. Additionally, mentor teachers rate candidates on professional behavior & appearance during the 5-day observation. 100% of candidates met these expectations. Pre-student teaching - 85% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as an interdisciplinary backward planning unit plans, UDL lesson plans (P11, 12, 14), teaching in a clinic, classroom profiles (P13), parent booklets & service learning reports (P10). Student teaching – More than 90% met expectations on assessments such as lessons, unit plans, portfolios (P11, 12, 14), unit plans & lesson plans focused on fair treatment

for all students (P13), service projects, case studies & reflections (P10). Candidates met expectations on summative observations (P10-14). Mentors agreed: 95% - positive professional demeanor & commitment to the profession (P11, 12) and supports the learning of all students (P10, 13), 88% - knows his/her strengths & limitations (P14). Principals gave ratings of prepared: 81% - motivating & engaging all students in learning (P10, 13) and knowledge of ethical & legal responsibilities (P11, 12), 87% - building positive relationships with diverse students (P10,13), and 94% - demonstrating commitment to professional growth (P14).

AP Foundational phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as case studies, philosophy & practice paper, journals (P10), action research, reflective essays, exams (P11, 12, 14), case studies & intervention plans (P13). Capstone phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as action research projects, reflective essays (P11, 12, 14), graduate projects (P13), e-folios, presentations, and final reflections (P10).

OSP Foundational Phase - 75% to 100% met expectations on assessments such as professional platforms, developmental guidance plans, organizational profiles, & action research (P11, 12, 14). 87% to 100% met expectations on assessments for P13, such as a multicultural philosophy statement. 75% to 100% met expectations on assessments for P10, such as developing a web page, case conceptualization paper, and a leader reflection. Capstone phase - 100% met expectations on assessments such as final papers, reflective essays, e-folios (P11, 12, 14), final presentations, graduate projects (P13), final projects, presentations & reflections (P10). 90% to 95% of principals rated OSP graduates as prepared in commitment to their ethical & legal responsibilities (P11), to professional growth (P14), and to reflecting on practice to improve practice (P14).

[1.2.b - Continuous Improvement]

Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

PROCEDURAL AND OPERATIONAL CHANGES

- The new College structure including Department Chairs and Program Coordinators has promoted more timely distribution of assessment data and targeted meetings concerning individual candidates and potential program improvements. The new department structure tightens support and supervision for adjunct instructors and improves compliance for uploading key assessments to TK20. A new adjunct handbook clarifies expectations for instructors and details both procedures and avenues for support. (5.4.f.5)
- 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 & II. With changes to the Assessment system allowing us to track individual candidate progress, targeted interventions began in Spring 2014.
- The Office of Student teaching now makes placements for the 5-day observation required for Candidacy, thus strengthening collaboration among partner schools (1.4.e.1).
- Through TK20, we have begun to track candidates' experiences with diverse learners in formal and informal settings. Such data inform placements and ensure a range of diverse experiences across programs.
- The Teacher Candidate Disposition document, was approved by the Teacher Education Faculty in May 2009 and is now consistently presented in the orientation course and included in syllabi. As part of the Teacher Candidate Dispositions document, a referral form now allows faculty to recommend a candidate to the Assistant Dean of Students for support and coaching (1.4.e.2).
- 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). At midpoint, the professional development plan for Student Teaching is evaluated (1.4.e.3, p.7).

PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES

- Based on principal and mentor teacher data as well as candidate feedback, the Office of Student Teaching has organized and implemented a series of professional development days for Student teachers.
- 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).
- Based on changes to certification requirements at the State level, Early Childhood Education increased early field experiences and added a required Early Childhood Special Education course to its program (1.4.e.4).
- To allow for more differentiated learning among candidates, Special Education 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).
- An area of specialization for teaching English as a Second language was approved by the College Curriculum Committee in January 2014 in response to the changing demographics in the state and data from key assessments indicating that more attention to differentiating instruction for diverse learners will help our candidates.

- Based on data from key assessments, and principal and mentor teacher surveys, 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, students currently enrolled in the program may register for either 60 or 100 hours (1.4.c.7)
- After reviewing diversity assessments for P11, Educational Leadership has added content from an advanced class into an earlier one and increased exposure of its candidates to diverse populations beyond their own schools (1.4.a.3).
- Faculty in Counselor Education revised the course in which 100% 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).

PROCEDURAL AND OPERATIONAL PLANS

- The number of key assessments in the unit is overwhelming and makes it difficult to analyze accurately and use the data for program improvement. Fewer and more common key assessments aligned to the Conceptual Framework, State, national and professional standards will be constructed by faculty committees in Spring 2014.
- In looking over the results of the principals' surveys, we were unsure how to interpret "minimally prepared", and if that meant that teachers were capable in this area or not. If IP results reported in 1.1 included "minimally prepared" ratings, then all findings would be higher than 90% acceptable, except for "managing the classroom effectively" at 89%. Based on these results, the Dean of the college along with the NCATE Coordinator has begun revising surveys and meeting with state DOE officials to revise anchors and align surveys with state standards and requirements.
- In a similar manner, principal surveys will be revised for all AP and OSP programs.
- Changes in the Assessment System will track individual candidates' attempts at taking Praxis II exams and allow for targeted intervention for those who struggle to pass the exams beginning in Spring 2014.
- A college-wide system for establishing inter-rater reliability on the key assessments will begin in Summer 2014, including a standard component of mentor training.

PROGRAMMATIC PLANS

- Two newly approved policies will be implemented in Fall 2014. One reduces the number of 24-credit areas of specialization in the undergraduate elementary education program to focus on the 8 specific areas that improve candidates' content knowledge and lead to "highly qualified status" for certification. The second increases the GPA at admission to candidacy and at entry to student teaching.
- Faculty are developing a set of 6 CORE classes with associated Key Assessments which will allow for more systematic and accurate analysis of undergraduates' data and help faculty better track program and individual candidate progress. Disposition data will be tracked systematically by building it into Key Assessments.
- Similarly, a set of CORE courses for key assessments is being identified by AP and OSP faculty.
- Based on data from the Key assessments and surveys, revisions in the Secondary Education program are ongoing, including closer investigation of how best to assess and prepare candidates for expectations of student teachers and beginning teachers regarding classroom management, assessment of student learning, and motivating and engaging all students in learning.
- A new course, "Introduction to Teaching and Diversity" will be offered in the first year of teacher candidacy and include topics related to National and State standards. It will include early field experience and will be closely aligned to the revised Conceptual Framework.
- The Curriculum Task Force, working with the Instructional Technology Committee and faculty, will continue to develop a plan for integrating technology in a new introductory course, in methods classes, and in internships. Working with mentor teachers, we will make a closer alignment between our courses and the ways schools are using technology for data-driven instruction and assessment.
- While some assessment data suggested that candidates are proficient in using research to inform instruction, principal and mentor teacher data suggested otherwise. Conversations among school partners, principals and faculty will inform the development of a new key assessment based on a common definition of the research necessary to inform effective practice.
- Candidates' work in EDS 320, the assessment course, is assessed at the pre-student teacher level but content is presented at an introductory level. Discussions are underway about how to revise the course and/or its key assessments to best prepare candidates for the expectations they face as teachers.
- The Unit will continue to integrate issues of diversity throughout its programs, to bring resources and experts to the University of Maine, and to collaborate with State leaders on issues of diversity, particularly rural poverty. Assessments will be revised as needed to reflect new expectations for candidates.
- On January 1, 2014 the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER) was launched as a partnership between the Maine Department of Education and the University of Maine, College of Education and Human Development (COEHD). The mission is to build state-wide capacity to

improve outcomes for individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) through leadership, training, professional development, collaboration, and research. This effort will support candidates through new coursework and professional development opportunities.

- Changes in the Assessment System are beginning to show steady improvement in how our candidates document their impact on student learning. It will become easier to detect trends as data are collected over time.
- The Counselor Education Program is seeking accreditation through The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Faculty will revise key assessments to specifically address the skills, knowledge and dispositions for professionals in their field.
- Because one CA&I intern did not meet expectations on key assessments for several proficiencies, a candidate with no teach

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

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

♣AFI: The early childhood education, curriculum and assessment, and instructional outreach programs do not have assessment data.

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).

[1. 4 - Exhibits for Standard 1]

1.4.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.4.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.4.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)

1.4.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.4.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.4.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.4.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.4.h	Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.4.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates
1.4.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.4.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

[2.1 - Assessment System and Unit Evaluation]

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

2A. - ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) is built squarely on the UMaine College of Education and Human Development conceptual framework, the NCATE domains of quality professional development, and state standards and needs (2.4.a.2, 2.4.a.14 – p.10). The assessment system is regularly evaluated by the professional community in several ways. First, the Dean meets monthly with regional superintendents to discuss student training and the needs of the professional community. This information is used to shape topics, instruments, and data items within the assessment system. Findings from surveys of post-graduate supervisors and mentor teachers are similarly used to inform the continuous development of the assessment system (2.4.a.4). For example, in spring 2014, the college began working with the state DOE to align student teacher evaluations with state standards on teacher effectiveness.

As detailed in the Assessment Handbook (AH) (2.4.a.14, pp. 10-13), the system collects data on multiple assessments from multiple sources targeting candidate, program, and unit performance. Key assessments are aligned with proficiencies and include a range of instruments or assignments appropriate to the level of candidates' programs, such as lesson plans, examinations, demonstrations, case studies, research projects, program evaluations, professional presentations, portfolios, and structured reflections (2.4.a.15). Other sources of assessment data include course evaluations, Praxis scores, and surveys from candidates, mentors, supervisors, and principals. This comprehensive approach ensures the system can improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations.

Data are collected at application to the program, subsequent transition points, and program completion (2.4.a.3). Data come from a range of sources, including program applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty, and the professional community (2.4.a.4). Assessments provide regular and comprehensive data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality (2.4.a.5).

As described in 2.4.a.14 (pp. 23-25), 2.4.a.13, and 2.4.c.1, steps are taken to eliminate bias and establish fair, accurate, and consistent assessments. For example, program faculty review all key assessments for face validity and potential bias. When inter-rater reliability questions surface due to differences between university supervisors' and mentor teachers' ratings, the mentor teacher, student, and university supervisor meet to review ratings, expectations, and to set goals for continuous progress toward meeting proficiencies (2.4.c.1.i, p. 3).

2B. DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION

The unit regularly collects comprehensive information on application qualifications, candidate proficiencies (2.4.a.14.i), competence of graduates (2.4.a.14.ii), unit operations, and program quality as shown in 2.4.a.14 – Fig. 5, p.13 and Fig. 6, p. 19. Assessment data are provided to faculty and administrators in reports to use as the basis for decision making (2.4.a.14.i). Details of the preparation and distribution of the reports are also provided in 2.4.1.14 – pp. 18-21.

Data are collected from multiple assessments from internal and external sources, including applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, student teaching mentors, supervisors and principals, are described throughout the AH, but specifically shown in Fig. 4, p. 12 and Fig. 5, p. 13 in 2.4.a.14.

Since 2008, every aspect of the CAS has experienced significant enhancements based on data or the recognition of the lack of data.

Details regarding the systematic annual operations of data collection, compilation, aggregation, summary, and analysis within the CAS are included in the AH (2.4.a.14, pp. 18-22, App. A, p. 26). The regular and systematic work is accomplished through the use of in-house expertise in informatics, university-provided IT resources, and externally contracted services appropriate for the size of the unit and institution (2.4.a.6 , 2.4.a.7). Records across components are linked when needed (2.4.a.11), with procedures and practices in place to ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and distributed to programs for continuous improvement (e.g. 2.4.a.14.i, 2.4.a.14.ii, and 2.4.a.12 , 2.4.d.1).

There is no disaggregation of assessment data required since there are not identifiable cohorts to compare within any given program. There are two programs in the College that offer a mixture of on-campus, online, or off-campus face-to-face courses. However, there are no cohorts in these programs that take all courses in one delivery system vs. another. The Educational Leadership candidates take courses on campus and face-to-face at locations around the state, according to course offerings and personal schedules. Teachers enrolled in the Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction program take five

core courses online and then complete their programs with additional courses offered on campus and/or online, again, according to course scheduling and personal preferences.

Students who believe they have been unfairly evaluated have several channels available to them (2.4.e.1, 2.4.e.2). Complaints can be directed to either the corresponding Department Chair or Program Coordinator. If a student is uncomfortable with either option or with the resulting outcome, they can bring their concerns directly to the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean maintains records of all formal student complaints and their resolution. These are reviewed annually by the Dean, Associate Dean, and Chairs in order to identify concerns.

Multiple and integrated technologies are used to maintain the assessment system, as described in detail in 2.4.a.14, pp. 13-18. The two major technologies include the Peoplesoft System used by the University of Maine System and TK20 used by the unit. Qualtrics is used to develop and manage surveys for students, graduates, mentors, and principals, with support provided by the College's Center for Research and Evaluation. The University's Office of Institutional Research manages the analysis and reporting the results of course evaluations, with bubble sheets for on-campus students and online forms for distance education courses. Data security procedures are described in 2.4.a.14, pp. 22-23.

In addition to candidate proficiency data from key assessments, the assessment system regularly and systematically uses candidate and graduate performance data to evaluate unit efficacy. As described in the AH (2.4.a.14), this includes the efficacy of courses (via Praxis exams and surveys of students, graduates, and employers), programs (via Praxis exams, and surveys of mentor teachers, graduates, and employers), and clinical experiences (via surveys of students, mentor teachers, graduates, and employers) (2.4.b.19). Section 1.2b of this report gives numerous examples of changes made to courses, programs, and unit operations as a result of assessment data.

2C. USE OF DATA FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Annual program reports detail the findings of assessments each year (2.4.b.2-18). These reports all have a final section pointing to changes made or planned because of assessment data. For example, the Secondary Education program identified students struggling with Praxis II exams in two content areas; faculty are using this information to plan strategies for improving performance, such as test preparation sessions. Other identified weaknesses prompted the Secondary Education faculty to increase the number of required field experience hours before admission to student teaching (2.4.b.18). The School Counseling program discovered that 100% of candidates did not meet expectations on a content knowledge assessment early in the program. Therefore, they subsequently revised the course 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 (2.4.b.15). The KPE program determined widespread dissatisfaction about skills courses based on both student course evaluations and feedback from cooperating teachers (partners), who reported that KPE candidates lacked training to properly teach sports skills to their students. These data were used to make systematic modifications in the delivery of skills courses, changing from UMaine athletic coaches as instructors to award-winning physical education teachers (2.4.b.11). In addition, data initially gathered

during the Dean's interview process in 2012, and subsequently through a yearlong analysis in 2012-13 year resulted in the creation of three departments. This was a huge change in unit operations since there had never been a departmental structure in the history of the College.

The Dean, department chairs, program coordinators, and the assessment team have broader access to TK20 than faculty and students, where access is limited to their courses. Faculty access to TK20 is appropriate to their instructional roles, as described in 2.4.a.14 – p. 14.

Each year, assessment data are used to generate a series of Continuous Improvement Reports for program review. This process includes annual reports summarizing the preceding year and multi-year trend-reports. Program faculty can focus on particular reports that address their own needs in order to make data-based program planning decisions. Program faculty meet each Fall to review the Continuous Improvement Reports and develop solutions to any issues noted. Program coordinators then submit a report to their Chair summarizing their findings and plans for the next year (1.4.x.x-z). Annual summaries of assessments are also provided to students, who can also access and monitor their own performance on key assessments through the Tk20 system.

[2.2.b - Continuous Improvement]

♣ **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

♣ **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.**

CHANGES

During the last several years every aspect of the CAS has experienced significant enhancements based on data or the recognition of the lack of data. Components of the assessment system are described below, noting their status at the last review and the subsequent changes. Further detail regarding the CAS is included in the AH (2.4.a.14). All of this work is now accomplished through the use of in-house expertise in informatics, university-provided IT resources, and externally contracted services appropriate for the size of the unit and institution (2.4.a.6, 2.4.a.7).

Status at Previous Review. Previously, proficiency data were collected via a home-grown data system with several significant limitations. Specifically, it did not (1) track individual students over time, (2) link to enrollment data in order to monitor whether all candidates were being assessed, or (3) store electronic copies of student work. Furthermore, the system was prone to errors that led to lost data.

****Continuous Improvement.** Therefore, as described Section 2.1, in 2010 the college re-evaluated the existing system and chose to build a true Comprehensive Assessment System. At the heart of this would be a new proficiency data collection and management system. In Fall 2010, college leadership attended an NCATE conference to review commercial products. Several vendors were subsequently interviewed and Tk20 was chosen for collecting and managing proficiency data. Tk20 was implemented in Fall 2011. Candidates in key assessment courses are required to upload work into Tk20, where the instructor

scores their material using the college's unique developmental rubric (2.4.a.1). Students are able to login, review, and update assignments. Instructors are able to login and evaluate student work and generate reports on submissions. A Tk20 help desk is staffed by trained assistants, and help is available in person, by phone, or by email. In addition, in-class Tk20 orientation sessions are available for introductory courses.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, limited UMaine information technology made it impossible at times to access reliable information regarding applicant and candidate characteristics, qualifications, and academic history.

****Continuous Improvement.** Recognizing this, UMaine has implemented MaineStreet, an Oracle/Peoplesoft system that includes student demographic information, academic history, and testing data from pre-enrollment through graduation. MaineStreet also includes information regarding unit operations, such as course offerings, loads, and instructor data. Information is now accessible from a single source, improving accuracy and timeliness when serving students.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, course evaluations were monitored centrally in the Dean's office and not readily accessible to programs for continuous improvement planning. Similarly, lack of departmental organization made course planning ambiguous and difficult to address at the program-level.

****Continuous Improvement.** The College has reorganized to more clearly delineate information flow, with Department Chairs and Programs Coordinators now reviewing course evaluation summaries. Evaluation summaries for courses taught by non-full-time faculty are also reviewed by program area faculty. This new process allows for administrators and faculty to make data-based decisions regarding course instruction, content, and quality.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, results from Praxis exams were used solely as a requirement at the student-teaching transition point, and not stored electronically. As a result, data were not used in program continuous improvement efforts.

****Continuous Improvement.** Praxis results are now electronically downloaded on a regular basis from ETS and linked with other data in the Assessment System. Summaries are provided to programs, allowing them to monitor pass/failure rates, distributions (i.e., how many students "barely" pass), and multiple attempts by students who do not pass. This is now an integral part of continuous improvement activities.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, Mentor Teacher Surveys were used solely for monitoring student-teaching placements and evaluating candidates in those courses. This consisted of paper surveys stored in paper files that were not directly used in program continuous improvement efforts.

****Continuous Improvement.** Mentor Teacher Surveys (2.4.a.8) are now conducted through the Tk20 system, with results directly linked to the student, their program, and other data in the Assessment

System. Consequently, this provides programs and the COEHD with additional data from external partners on student proficiency, skill and competency, as well as general program quality.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, recent graduates were not being surveyed.

****Continuous Improvement.** Following a 2013 pilot survey (2.4.a.9), online Recent Graduate Surveys will now be conducted annually one-year, two-years, and three-year's post-graduation. These provide valuable student feedback regarding courses, program quality, and unit operations. Surveys assess (a) the competence of graduates, including their evaluation of professional preparation offered; (b) unit operations, including course offerings and advising; and (c) program quality, such as faculty content knowledge and relevance of coursework.

Status at Previous Review. Previously, surveys of supervisors were not being conducted.

****Continuous Improvement.** Following a 2012 pilot survey (2.4.a.10), starting in Spring 2014 online Post-Graduation Supervisor Surveys will be conducted one-year and three-year's post-graduation. This will collect valuable data from external partners regarding the competence of graduates, including their content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and classroom/lesson management abilities. These key external partners are also asked questions related to unit operations, including suggestions for program enhancements, course offerings, and program quality.

PLANS

While there are plans to continue to develop and refine all components of the Comprehensive Assessment System, specific upcoming changes are worth noting.

As part of the continuous improvement process, in the Summer of 2013 the College concluded that the Assessment System would benefit by expanding input from current students. Previously, student input was limited to course evaluations. These did not directly address issues such as self-perceptions of proficiency or skill, nor do course evaluations address unit operations or program quality. Therefore, beginning Spring 2014 all current students are being surveyed annually online regarding (a) proficiencies, (b) competence, including pedagogy, content knowledge, and technology use; (c) unit operations, including course offerings, scheduling, and advising; and (d) program quality. The data from these surveys will be used in our current discussions about the reorganization of the undergraduate initial certification programs.

Beginning Spring 2014, faculty will work on two significant enhancements to the Tk20 system. First, beginning with Counselor Education, the system is being expanded to address program-specific certification and accreditation requirements. Existing key assessments are currently being revisited and will be aligned with requirements needed for CACREP accreditation. The goal is to streamline assessment, remove any redundancies, and seamlessly integrate the two within a single comprehensive system. Second, beginning in Spring 2014, faculty will revisit all key assessments. This will include developing new assessments that each address a larger number of proficiencies, reducing the total number of key assessments. It will also involve refining the language of the rubric for each key

assessment so that it directly relates to individual programs, as well as the nature and content of the specific key assessment itself.

In 2014 the Assessment Team will begin developing student-level reports and alerts for programs. These will help programs document and track individual student growth and performance, and will alert program faculty and advisors regarding specific students that appear to be struggling.

Beginning Summer 2014, the Assessment Team will work on significantly expanding the system's reporting capability, including adding reports that cross components of the system. For example, how does the pattern of proficiency performance for students who are rated highly by Mentor Teachers differ from that of students not as highly rated?

As detailed in the AH (2.4.a.14), beginning in 2014 the Assessment Team will conduct annual analyses examining the psychometric qualities of system measures and data. This includes psychometric studies, inter-rater reliability studies using a faculty Inter-Rater Reliability Team, and studies examining the relationship between different types of data within the system. This process will include examining the relationship between indicators of student progress and future post-graduation outcome data.

In Fall 2014, the Assessment Team will undertake annual statistical analyses evaluating the assessment system data, including comparisons to identify potential bias. Similarly, inter-rater reliability studies will be conducted on an annual basis each summer (starting in 2014) through an Inter-Rater Reliability Team that will re-assess samples of student work.

In spring 2014, the college began working with the state DOE to align student teacher evaluations with state evaluations on teacher effectiveness. This work encompasses aligning all current student teacher evaluations with the state's evaluations of teacher effectiveness. The state currently has approved five rubrics for evaluating teacher effectiveness (2.2.b.1). The college adopted the rubrics for fall 2014 but will change the anchors to reflect that the population being evaluated is pre-service teachers.

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

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

Three areas for improvement were cited in our most recent NCATE report. Significant progress has been made on all three, with two now completely resolved. These are described in detail below.

AFI 1: Systematic, comprehensive data for only one semester were available and reported at the time of the visit.

At the previous NCATE review, only limited data were available and reported. As noted in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, and detailed in the AH (2.4.a.14), since that time the assessment system has been dramatically expanded both in the breadth of data collected and the time frame covered. Even with the complete replacement of the information system used for collecting key assessments and student proficiency data, three years of data will be available for the onsite review in 2014.

Specifically, the CAS has been expanded to include multiple assessments from multiple sources targeting multiple areas of candidate, program, and unit performance. Data are now collected at application to the program, subsequent transition points, and program completion (2.4.a.3) from a range of sources, including program applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community (2.4.a.4). These assessments provide regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality (2.4.a.5).

The expanded Comprehensive Data System now includes the following sources and corresponding data:

- **Tk20:** Includes data on key assessments linked to individual student and courses. Also includes some information obtained from other assessment system components.
- **University of Maine System-MaineStreet/Peoplesoft:** Includes student demographic information (e.g., sex, race, ethnicity), prior academic history and testing (e.g., SAT or GRE scores, previous academic degrees, etc.), and academic performance throughout a student's history at the University of Maine. This includes time prior to entry into the NCATE program.
- **Praxis Exams:** Includes student-level performance on all Praxis exams, such as scores and pass/failure status for all examinations and re-examinations attempted.
- **Mentor Teacher Surveys:** Includes mentor teacher assessments of student proficiency and general student competencies. These surveys also assess general program quality and collect feedback regarding strengths and areas of potential improvement in teacher preparation activities.
- **Recent Graduate Surveys:** Includes perceptions by graduates one to three years post-graduation regarding (a) their own competence, including professional preparation; (b) unit operations, including course offerings and advising; and (c) program quality, such as faculty content knowledge and relevance of coursework.
- **Post-Graduation Supervisor Surveys:** Includes perceptions by supervisors of recent graduates regarding the graduate's competence, including content knowledge, pedagogical skill, and classroom/lesson management. Also addresses unit operations, including suggestions for program enhancements and course offerings; and general program quality.
- **Course Evaluations:** Includes aggregated summaries of student course evaluations, linked to course ID and instructor. Note that this is not at the student-level.
- **Student Surveys:** Finally, as part of the continuous improvement activities, student surveys will be conducted annually for all students in the College beginning Spring 2014. Surveys will assess (a) student proficiencies, such the use of both assessment and research in their teaching repertoire; (b) competence of graduates, including pedagogy, content knowledge, and technology use; (c) unit operations, including course offerings, scheduling, and advising; and (d) overall program quality.

AFI 2: The unit has not determined that key assessments are predictors of candidate success

Previously, the assessment system was incapable of estimating the degree to which key assessments were predictors of candidate success. This reflected a lack of outcome indicators measuring success, and a lack of data linkage across different potential sources of information. Specifically, there was no data collected regarding academic-related outcomes that were linked to student key assessments. Furthermore, neither recent graduates nor their employers/supervisors were being surveyed.

While still in the process of fully resolving this issue, several major steps have been taken. These will significantly enhance the ability of the college to examine the degree to which key assessments predict candidate success through a variety of measures. These changes are outlined below.

Complete overhaul of the assessment system

- As noted in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 and detailed in the AH (2.4.a.14), the entire assessment system has been reconstructed to make it a more truly comprehensive system. While this has taken considerable time to research, plan, and implement, over the next few years this effort will lead to more comprehensive and accurate information regarding program impacts on student outcomes and success.

Linkage of Praxis exams with key assessment data

- Previously, Praxis exams were only used as a requirement at the student-teaching transition point. Results were not stored electronically or aggregated and linked with student key assessment data. Praxis results are now electronically downloaded on a regular basis from ETS and linked with other data in the Comprehensive Assessment System. Praxis performance can now serve as one near-term measure of candidate success. As described in the AH (2.4.a.14), beginning in 2014 the Assessment Team will conduct a series of annual analyses examining assessment system data. This will include a variety of analyses regarding the relationship between student performance on key assessments and Praxis exams. As predictors, these will include (1) specific key assessments, (2) key assessment "types", such as portfolios versus reports, and (3) overall performance across all key assessments. As outcomes, these will include (1) Praxis scores, (2) dichotomized Praxis performance—pass/fail, and (3) Poisson or zero-inflated Poisson models examining the number of additional attempts required by some students. The latter may help programs identify students who are risk for struggling with Praxis performance.

Linkage of other academic outcomes with key assessment data

- As with Praxis exams, other academic outcome data were previously not linked to student key assessment data. With the inclusion of MaineStreet data as part of the Comprehensive Assessment System, academic outcomes, including graduation, time-to-graduation, GPA, and future testing (e.g., GRE) data will be available for analyses similar to those involving Praxis data.

Recent graduate survey outcomes

- Previously, recent graduates were not being surveyed; however, following a 2013 pilot survey, online Recent Graduate Surveys will be conducted annually starting in 2014 at one-year, two-years, and

three-year's post-graduation. These provide valuable student data regarding candidate outcomes post-graduation. Using this data, analyses will examine the relationship between key assessments and future employment, employment satisfaction and professional confidence up to 3 years post-graduation.

Post-graduation supervisor survey outcomes

- Similarly, supervisors of recent graduates were also not previously surveyed; however, following a 2012 pilot, online Post-Graduation Supervisor Surveys will be conducted starting in 2014 at one-year and three-year's post-graduation. These provide valuable data from community professionals regarding the performance of graduates. Using this data, analyses will examine the relationship between key assessments and employer/supervisor ratings of graduates' preparation, skill, performance, and expertise one and three-years post-graduation.

AFI 3: The Educational Leadership program assessments do not reveal if candidates are meeting unit proficiencies for other school personnel.

The third AFI specifically addressed the assessment of proficiency in the Educational Leadership program. Previously, data on proficiency assessment for this program were missing or incomplete. All proficiencies for the Educational Leadership program are now being systematically and consistently assessed within the Tk20 system. Assessments are aligned with the major themes of the conceptual framework, the four relevant NCATE domains, and one or more UMaine proficiencies at the three transition points in the program - the end of Years One, Two, and Three.

As shown in detail in the program's annual assessment report (2.4.b.4), there are data collected and analyzed from key assessments as a whole or from specific subsections of those key assessments.

Four examples provide highlights of this system:

- In relation to the Conceptual Framework theme of "Excellence in Teaching and Learning," the NCATE domain of "Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals," and designated UMaine proficiencies, the program has such key assessments as a multi-part paper focused on the four functions of a school's mission, programs and curriculum, teaching and supervision, and school culture and climate. This particular assessment demonstrates fulfillment of Proficiency #2 in Year One: "Candidates for other professional school roles know their fields and can explain principles and concepts delineated in professional state and institutional standards."
- An example that is aligned with the Conceptual Framework theme of "Synthesis of Theory and Practice," the NCATE domain of "Student Learning for Other School Professionals," and designated UMaine proficiencies, is a written articulation of beliefs about using research and data for making instructional decisions, coupled with the use of research for evaluation of a program's effectiveness. This assessment is aligned with Proficiency 15 in Year Two: "Candidates recognize the need to draw from educational research and scholarship to improve their practice."
- A third example is also aligned with the Conceptual Framework theme of "Synthesis of Theory and Practice" and the NCATE domain of "Student Learning for Other School Professionals." Candidates

must participate in a comprehensive and collaborative program evaluation and present the report of their findings and recommendations to constituents of the program, such as board members, administrators, and teachers. This assessment is aligned with Proficiency 9 in Year Two: "Candidates create positive environments that support student learning."

- The Conceptual Framework theme of "Collaboration and Mentoring" is most closely related to the NCATE domain of "Professional Dispositions." In Year Three, candidates develop a project where they must explicitly put into practice their beliefs about differentiation, equity, and justice, then reflect upon their own effectiveness. Program faculty align this assessment with Proficiency 13: "Recognizes the individual and group differences in their student and families and cultures, builds positive relationships and supportive interactions, and adjusts practice accordingly so that all students can learn."

[2. 4 - Exhibits for Standard 2]

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

[3.1 - Field Experiences and Clinical Practice]

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

3A. COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNIT AND SCHOOL PARTNERS

Both unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's conceptual framework and the school program.

The Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP) Teacher Preparation Committee (TPC), composed of unit and school-based faculty, meets monthly to discuss the design, implementation, and evaluation of the teacher education program, including review of College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) Conceptual Framework. (3.4.a.11) P-12 principals and mentors provide annual feedback about programs and candidate preparedness. (3.4.g.1&2)

They each participate in each other's professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates and for children.

Through PREP, COEHD collaborates with school partners in developing, participating, and evaluating a full calendar of professional development programs each year. (3.4.a.13)

School-based faculty teach COEHD courses.

COEHD faculty participate in school-based instructional programs for children, such as literacy nights and summer reading programs. (3.4.a.7&20)

The unit and school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice.

COEHD faculty and school partners implement conferences, workshops, and institutes and invite each other to participate. These varied, collaborative professional development activities build links between theory and practice that positively impact the learning of UM faculty, school-based teachers and administrators, candidates, and P-12 students. (3.4.a.13-19)

Organized by COEHD, two workshop days for student teachers include presentations by school-based educators, community resource experts, visiting Libra professors, and UM professionals. Sample topics are diversity, school law, application and interview skills, customized learning, working with parents. (3.4.a.10)

They each jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to provide appropriate learning experiences.

COEHD Office of Field Experiences and Certification (OFEC) collaborates with principals and mentor teachers to identify specific field experience and clinical practice placements at each stage in the initial teacher preparation program. (3.4.a.2-4, 3.4.c.1)

Advanced programs (teachers and other school professionals) collaborate with partner schools to place candidates in internships as necessary. These include working with a partner school principal to match literacy clinicians with students in a summer reading clinic and arranging with partner schools for specialized projects for candidates in the other professional roles. (3.4.a.6-7, 3.4.e.21&25)

3B. DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults. Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit's conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well-designed opportunities to learn through doing.

Initial program pre-candidates observe in P-12 schools and complete activities requiring reflection on their learnings about teaching and learning. Classroom teachers provide students with feedback. Reflection on this field experience is part of the candidacy application. (3.4.e.28)

Initial program teacher candidates complete varied field experiences in P-12 schools. (3.4.e.38-39) They observe and interact with students and mentors and complete assignments, aligned with Maine Beginning Teacher Standards (MBTS) and UM Teacher Candidate Proficiencies (UMTCP), that require application, analysis, and self-reflection in view of supporting student learning.

Advanced program candidates interact with experienced personnel and students in field experiences appropriate to their degree areas. They complete assignments requiring application of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. (3.4.e.40)

During clinical practice, candidate learning is integrated into the school program and into teaching practice. Candidates observe and are observed by others. They interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually. They reflect on and can justify their own practice. Candidates participate as teachers or other professional educators, as well as learners in the school setting. They are involved in a variety of school-based activities directed at the improvement of teaching and learning, such as collaborative projects with peers, using information technology, and engaging in service learning.

During student teaching, initial program candidates complete assessments/assignments that integrate learning of MBTS and UMTCP into school programs and teaching practice. (3.4.e.18, 3.4.f.3) These assessments/assignments require candidates to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge and skills, emphasizing reflection about and justification of their own practice and professional dispositions exhibited in placement settings. Mentor teachers, university supervisors, and other members of the education community observe and provide feedback to candidates. (3.4.e.44, 3.4.f.4) Student teachers have opportunities to be members of instructional teams, use instructional technology, interact with other teachers, administrators, and families of students, and implement service projects in their schools. (3.4.d.3, 3.4.g.1)

Advanced program candidates are involved in a variety of school-based learning activities that are integrated into the school program, require interactions with experienced personnel and students and families, as appropriate, and utilize technologies as applicable. (3.4.e.26) Program reports indicate candidates reflect on their learning with UM faculty and peers.

Candidates in advanced programs for teachers participate in field experiences that require them to critique and synthesize educational theory related to classroom practice based on their own applied research.

Advanced program teacher candidates engage in a range of research activities in their field experiences. They conduct action research projects and reflect on questions of professional practice, often in the classrooms or schools where they are currently employed. Candidates complete written reflections documenting their performance on a range of proficiencies and professional standards applicable to their specialties. (3.4.e.21, 24-25)

Candidates in programs for other school professionals participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to design, implement, and evaluate projects related to the roles for which

they are preparing. These projects are theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology, and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting.

Other school professionals candidates work with experienced field personnel to design, implement, and evaluate real-world projects applicable to field experience and clinical settings. Technology is integrated appropriately. Projects include ones aligned with comprehensive guidance programs, educational administration responsibilities, and instructional technology. (3.4.e.11, 20-22)

3C. CANDIDATES' DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS LEARN

♣ Candidates work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each other's practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice.

During field experiences and student teaching in initial programs, candidates interact with peers and clinical faculty through reflective assignments and discussions to improve practice. During student teaching, mentors, supervisors, and candidates formally assess candidates' progress in meeting MBTS and UMTCP, including impact of teaching on student learning. Mentors and/or supervisors discuss assessment results with candidates, especially related to candidates' professional development goals. (3.4.f.3-4, 3.4.g.2)

Advanced program candidates reflect and critique collaboratively through a variety of course and field experiences. Each program designs assignments and activities that require application in the field and reflective interactions with peers and clinical faculty. (3.4.e.40)

Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students. All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups.

During field experiences and student teaching in initial programs, candidates develop and implement lesson/unit plans based on analysis of a class profile and address adaptations to support all learners, particularly students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic groups. (3.4.b.2&4) Discussions with mentors, supervisors, and clinical faculty and assignments, all aligned to MBTS and UMTCP, require reflection on professional growth. (3.4.e.18, 3.4.g.5) Student teachers participate in professional development workshops that include legal, ethical, diversity, and standards-based topics. (3.4.a.10)

Candidates in advanced programs work in a variety of settings. For example, Counselor Education candidates work in schools with students of Asian ethnicity, and Literacy Specialist candidates work with low income students. Other candidates experience the diversity of the regional settings in which they are placed or employed. (3.4.b.2&5)

[3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement]

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

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

♣ **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.**

♣ **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level of performance.**

♣ **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.**

This summary links the standard's three elements with the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) Conceptual Framework as shown in parentheses after each element.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNIT AND SCHOOL PARTNERS (Collaboration and Mentoring)

COEHD works collaboratively with partner schools to implement and evaluate COEHD Conceptual Framework and programs and has numerous partnerships and written agreements with schools/districts in Maine. (3.4.a.1-9) In 2011-2012 Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP) Teacher Preparation Committee (TPC) worked to build a more collaborative understanding of COEHD Conceptual Framework; in 2012-13 the committee suggested revisions in the framework to align with UM's Blue Sky Initiative (strategic plan). (3.4.a.11)

PREP professional development opportunities, primarily facilitated by COEHD faculty or partnership teachers, focus on enhancing teachers' and administrators' knowledge and skills as do other opportunities in which both unit and school-based educators participate. (3.4.a.13-19) Participants routinely provide feedback. (3.4.a.12&14) Both unit and school-based faculty participate in COEHD workshops for student teachers. (3.4.a.10)

In addition to working with qualified UM faculty, partnerships provide opportunities for candidates to be mentored by clinical faculty in P-12 field experience and clinical practice settings appropriate to their degree areas. (3.4.a.1-6) COEHD Office of Field Experiences and Certification (OFEC) works with principals and mentors to arrange field experiences and clinical practice placements for pre-candidacy, initial programs, and Masters of Arts in Teaching in Secondary Education (MAT). (3.4.a.2-4) OFEC Program Director provides orientations and information for candidates in initial programs (3.4.e.30-31) and for mentor teachers prior to placements in field experiences and student teaching. OFEC also directs mentors to its webpage to access a training presentation and resources. (3.4.e.34) Candidates and school partners receive handbooks that include an introduction to expectations of field experience

and clinical practice, roles and responsibilities of candidates and clinical faculty, and timelines and evaluation tools that candidates and clinical faculty must complete. (3.4.e.1-8). UM supervisors review all these with mentors and candidates, answer questions, and provide contact information in initial meetings among the three. OFEC Program Director meets jointly with supervisors and seminar instructors to promote consistency. (3.4.d.1) UM faculty in Masters of Science in Teaching (MST) and advanced programs assist candidates in finding placements with qualified mentors. (3.4.c.2-3&6) Advanced programs provide handbooks and other guidelines to candidates and mentors. (3.4.e.10-14,19,21-22)

Principals, mentors, and candidates complete surveys with feedback about programs, instructors, and candidate preparedness. (3.4.d.2, 3.4.g.1-2) TPC and COEHD Program Coordinators review the feedback to identify and act on program improvement needs. (3.4.d.3, 3.4.g.1-2)

DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, and EVALUATION of FIELD EXPERIENCES and CLINICAL PRACTICE (Excellence in Teaching and Learning)

Candidates in all programs engage in a variety field experiences and clinical practice in a variety of settings. Embedded activities align with UM coursework and certification requirements for areas of specialty, requiring candidates to apply and refine their knowledge and skills and develop professional dispositions. (3.4.e.38-40).

In initial programs requiring teacher candidacy, undergraduate candidates begin by completing 30 hours of observation in P-12 schools. They observe mentors, analyze teaching and learning with them, and write a reflection on their learnings. (3.4.e.28) Next, candidates take courses that require observations in schools throughout the semester and complete coursework that often requires extension of earlier assignments, such as philosophy of education; designing a lesson with technology; implementing a lesson; participating in analytical discussions with mentors, instructors, and peers; and reflecting about such topics as classroom management, assessment, and professionalism. (3.4.e.1-3). In student teaching, such assignments and discussions are extended, and candidates leave student teaching with a professional development plan for their first year of teaching. Documenting proficiency in working with students, families, and community, including school community, requires candidates to engage in activities such as participating in team/faculty meetings, working with specialists, and connecting with home. Candidates also complete a service to the school project. (3.4.e.4). Throughout all field experiences, candidates receive feedback from mentors, instructors, and supervisors, as applicable.

In initial graduate programs (MAT, MST), candidates complete field experiences that require application and reflection. (3.4.e.5-6) MAT assignments and experiences parallel that of undergraduates in initial programs during field experience and student teaching semesters. MST is an interdisciplinary program in which candidates work with faculty from COEHD, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture, and

mentors in the schools.

Candidates in each advanced program engage with unit partners in a range of activities. For example, Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction candidates conduct school-based research projects on questions of professional practice. (3.4.e.25) Literacy Specialist interns work in a local school's summer reading clinic to design instruction, prepare clinical reports, participate in coaching sessions with faculty and peers, and participate in teaching sessions behind the glass. (3.4.d.4). Special Education candidates research evidence-based academic instruction and social skills behavior, and develop plans to implement one or more strategies with selected students in their schools, develop assessments and record forms to establish baseline, track progress in response to instruction, and reflect on the effectiveness of their plans for individual students. (3.4.e.19). Counselor Education interns observe, plan, and deliver the components of a comprehensive developmental guidance program including counseling, classroom instruction, consultation, program planning, and evaluation (3.4.e.11). Educational Leadership candidates engage in a Program Planning and Evaluation project in their schools in which they research theory, develop and implement the evaluation of existing educational programs for improvements, and collaborate with colleagues and clinical faculty. (3.4.e.20) Instructional Technology candidates job shadow, participate in internships in schools, and develop a digital portfolio aligned with national standards. (3.4.e.22)

CANDIDATES' DEVELOPMENT and DEMONSTRATION of KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, and PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS LEARN (Synthesis of Theory and Practice, Reflection)

Candidates work with a variety of student populations in field experience and clinical practice settings. Candidates participate in course-embedded field experiences, culminating in clinical practice experiences with related course work. (3.4.b.1-3, 3.4.e.38-40) Music and art candidates also participate in atypical programs: music candidates teach in a Montessori School, and art candidates teach students in an after school program at UM. (3.4.a.8-9) Counselor Education candidates work with students from a non-dominant culture in a field experience. (3.4.e.41) COEHD offers an elective course that includes visits to schools in the Bangor area and in central Maine that have diverse ethnic/racial student populations. (3.4.e.27)

All candidates complete key assessments aligned with program-specific proficiencies and field experiences and clinical practice, including ones that require demonstration of knowledge and skills, synthesis of theory into practice, and reflection about supporting student learning. (3.4.e.35-37)

Collaboration with mentors, UM faculty, and program peers extends opportunities for reflection as do components of evidence/reflective practice portfolios. Initial program candidates meet in seminar/discussion groups to reflect on clinical practice experiences. (3.4.e.4-6) Reflection with peers and faculty is a key element of the projects related to

advanced programs candidates' specialty areas. (3.4.e.40)

Focusing on collaboration and mentoring with school partners has resulted in extensive opportunities for candidates to transfer theory to practice and to learn and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions that result in excellence in teaching and learning. Much of this work has so far been done in the initial programs.

For initial programs, OFEC has provided guidelines and orientation sessions. The program director has developed handbooks, which are regularly revised. These handbooks are disseminated to candidates, mentors, instructors, and supervisors. KPE and art candidates also receive additional guidelines specific to their content areas. The MST coordinator distributes handbooks to MST students. (3.4.e.1-8, 15-17) The Student Teacher Handbook includes teacher candidate guidelines for professionalism. (3.4.e.9) OFEC has established criteria for mentors for candidates in initial undergraduate and MAT programs (3.4.c.1) and tracks data about mentor demographics. (3.4.c.7) Resources, including a mentor training video, are available on the new OFEC webpage.

OFEC and TPC analyze feedback from varied sources as part of programming review. These activities have promoted consistency and depth of experiences for candidates. Exiting teacher candidates report that having classroom experience (98%), working with mentors (99%), and working with supervisors (89%) are the most helpful aspects of their preparation. (3.4.d.3)

Requiring the study of diverse student populations through coursework (3.4.e.38,39,42) and requiring diversity of field experiences (3.4.b.1-2) is part of transferring theory to practice. Data indicate the following about placements in schools.

-In initial programs for which there is data (3.4.b.2), 72% to 100% (average = 79%) of candidates experience placements in more than one school and/or more than one grade span. The lower percentages occur in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Music programs where it is likely that candidates work in more than one classroom and/or grade level and/or school, but data are not yet reported in such a refined disaggregated format.

-In both initial and advanced programs, candidates work in schools that include ELL, non-white, low socio-economic (based on free/reduced lunch counts), and special needs student populations. For the following, thresholds are based on statewide data. (3.4.b.4&5)

-In initial programs, all programs place candidates in schools that meet or exceed the threshold for non-white and special needs students. Five of eight programs do so for ELL, and one does so for low socio-economic. (Typically placements are in schools within a 40 mile radius of UM. Maine's higher poverty counties are generally outside this radius.)

-In advanced programs, five of six programs place candidates in schools that meet or

exceed the threshold for special needs students. Four programs do so for non-white and low socio-economic, and three do for ELL. (Typically candidates are in schools in which they work. These schools are more likely to be beyond the 40 mile radius from UM.)

Initial undergraduate and MAT programs candidates also report additional experiences working with diverse populations. (3.4.b.3) OFEC worked with Bodwell Center and RSU#34 district to create a volunteerism handbook that candidates may use as guidance for additional experiences working with diverse populations. (3.4.e.43) In aggregate, initial and advanced candidates have opportunities to work in settings with diverse student populations. COEHD continues to examine ways to collaborate with P-12 partners to support a breadth of experiences for candidates.

Initial programs candidates must meet requisite criteria (3.4.f.1), attend all required orientation sessions (3.4.e.29-31), and complete formal applications at transition points (3.4.32-33). Candidates must also meet PRAXIS II requirements before student teaching. (3.4.g.3). They graduate achieving mean GPA's of 3.21 (3.4.g.4) and exceeding minimum target level scores (minimum target = 2.7) in Maine Beginning Teacher Standards (MBTS) and UM Teacher Candidate Proficiencies (UMTCP), based on mentor, candidate, and supervisor ratings (aggregate range = 2.85 to 3.45). (3.4.g.5).

Advanced program candidates experience similar learning opportunities. Collaboration with school partners for mentoring and specialized experiences that result in transfer of theory to practice and reflection are part of all advanced programs as described previously. (3.4.e.40)

Consistency has been promoted through development and implementation of scoring guidelines and rubrics for assessments, providing clarity of expectations to candidates and enhancing inter-scorer reliability. Examples include pre-candidacy portfolio rubric, key assessment descriptions for initial field experience and clinical practice, student teaching assessment scoring guide, mid-term and final evaluations forms for field experience and student teaching, Literacy Specialist peer protocols and self-assessment guidelines, Special Education portfolio rubric, and Educational Leadership rubric. (3.4.f.1-9)

Data related to key assessments aligned to MBTS and UMTCP enable COEHD to study candidate preparedness and program effectiveness. Key assessments are embedded within courses; proficiencies are assessed multiple times over program progressions. Instructors score key assessments using rubrics embedded into the Tk20 Unit Assessment System. Reported by program, by course, and by categories related to Conceptual Framework elements, data for exiting levels indicate that initial programs candidates demonstrate meeting or exceeding target levels, the lowest percentage (94%) being for use of technology and the highest (99%) being for diversifying instruction to meet the needs of all learners, demonstrating effective classroom management strategies, and understanding ethical/legal responsibilities. (3.4.g.6&9). Advanced programs candidates demonstrate meeting or exceeding standards at 100% for the majority of proficiencies assessed. The rare exceptions

have resulted in program or course changes, except for those needing further investigation because of small numbers of candidates assessed. (3.4.g.7-9)

With input from program representatives and review of data, Standard 3 writers have developed an action plan for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance. COEHD will review this plan and approve a final plan in spring 2014. (3.4.a.21)

[3. 3 - Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review]

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

1. (Initial) In some programs, field experience and clinical practice are not sufficiently broad to prepare candidates for the areas in which they will be licensed. Rationale: Some candidates complete significant field experiences and clinical practice in the same building, and in some cases the same classroom, and thus do not receive experience across the grade range for which they will be licensed.

The Office of Field Experience and Certification (OFEC) has made it a high priority and practice to place candidates in initial programs in field and clinical practice experiences in multiple school and classroom locations to cover the full range of their certification. The goal for undergraduate and graduate secondary candidates is to divide their field experiences and clinical practice between middle and high school placements. Elementary Education (K-8) and Early Childhood initial teacher certification candidates are also expected to experience two to three different grade level and/or school placements in their field and clinical practice experiences. In addition, art, music, and KPE initial teacher candidates have two to three field and clinical practice experiences across the K-12 range of their certification.

In 2012-2013, OFEC established a formal system for tracking data about field experience and clinical practice placements for all initial programs. Percentages, by program, for candidates who completed student teaching with experiences in more than one school and/or more than one grade span are as follows (3.4.b.1): Early Childhood = 72%; Elementary = 86%; Secondary = 96%; MAT = 100%; Art = 100%; KPE = 100%; Music = 81%. Collection of this data is new. Study of the data reveals the need to track data for each candidate throughout the entirety of his/her UM career to determine more accurately the depth of diversity of field experiences and clinical practice placements. As noted in the action plan (3.4.a.21), the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) will continue to increase percentages in all programs as needed. OFEC has already begun to track placements more comprehensively to identify multiple grade spans. For example, data have not always reflected that music candidates work with mentors who often teach at more than one grade span and in different schools.

Beginning in 2011-2012, candidates complete a report of their hours and experiences in the field, including non-placement activities working with diverse populations. These self-selected experiences

can include working with students in age groups different from those in candidates' placements. (3.4.b.3) OFEC uses all this data in continuous efforts to ensure that candidates gain a breadth of experiences in their placements to prepare them for their licensure areas.

2. (Initial) The unit's expectations for and monitoring of some pre-student teaching experiences are not sufficient. Rationale: P-12 teachers reported unclear communication regarding placement and expectations for candidates and lack of monitoring of candidate attendance and participation.

This area for improvement, initially identified in the 2005 NCATE report but not cited in the 2008 NCATE Accreditation Action Report, is one that COEHD considers an ongoing priority. Collaboration is an essential part of the college's Conceptual Framework. [OFEC, the Advising Center, and faculty in COEHD have developed new processes, activities, and outcomes to improve communication with field experience sites at each stage of the teacher preparation program. These new tools and processes are designed to provide more structures and guidelines for placements, to clearly identify expectations for candidates and mentor teachers in each field experience, and to monitor more effectively candidates' attendance and participation].

Before students are admitted to Teacher Candidacy and take upper level courses, they must follow a specific process developed by the Advising Center of COEHD and submit an electronic portfolio (eFolio) to demonstrate that they are developing the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to become effective beginning teachers. In this eFolio, students provide evidence that they have successfully completed prerequisite courses, have had a criminal history records check with fingerprinting, passed the PRAXIS I, and completed an initial field experience. (3.4.f.1) Prior to participating in the field experience, students complete a placement application and attend a workshop to guide expectations and activities during their field experience. (3.4.e.29) For all placements for this initial 30-hour field experience in local schools, OFEC makes personal phone calls to principals of partner schools to place UM students. Students who seek these initial field experience placements in schools outside the UM local area receive a letter of introduction to give to the principal of the school that they are requesting. This letter, provided by the OFEC, identifies the specific expectations and outcomes for the field experience and provides contact information for the school if there are any questions or concerns regarding this field experience. (3.4.a.2)

As soon as principals have talked with potential mentor teachers and approved placements, students contact and meet with their mentors. Students provide mentors a packet of specific information about the classroom activities that they are expected to observe during the field experience and about the summary report and reflections that they will need to complete for their eFolio. (3.4.e.28) This information is also available on the OFEC webpage. Mentors complete an evaluation form to monitor the UM students' attendance and participation during the field experience. UM students include all these reports and forms in their eFolio, which is evaluated with a rubric by the Advising Center. (3.4.f.1)

During the Pre-Education Semester (first level of candidacy), UM faculty in methods courses, such as ERL319, contact host schools and collaborate with school partners to make specific placements

for teacher candidates. Faculty observe and work in these schools while their students are meeting the course expectations and have regular written and verbal contact with mentors for any of their course embedded field experiences. These faculty also provide handouts for mentors that detail specific field expectations for the teacher candidates during that course. (3.4.a.22) Faculty in other methods courses such as CHF203 and 303; MUE210, 320, and 321 (3.4.a.8); and AED373 and 473 (3.4.a.9) have course embedded field experiences in laboratory school programs every semester.

Before the start of the Education Semester (second level of candidacy, prior to student teaching), OFEC requires all Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary candidates to complete an application for the field experience and to complete a profile sheet that will be given to school partners when placement requests are made. (3.4.e.32) Using the information on the candidates' applications and profile sheets, OFEC aims to identify tentative placements in different schools and grade levels from their previous field experiences to provide candidates with a broad range of learning opportunities. OFEC then sends written requests for placements to principals of partner schools and collaborates with them to make placements. When potential mentors receive the placement requests from principals, they also receive information about their responsibilities during the field experience and information about their potential teacher candidates. (3.4.a.3) After interviews with candidates, mentors decide their willingness to work with candidates.

In addition, prior to the start of EDG400/CHF304 Field Experience and Seminar in the Education Semester, candidates attend an orientation led by OFEC program director, where they review a handbook describing specific expectations for them during their field experience as well as procedures and evaluation forms for their mentors. MAT and MST candidates receive handbooks and review expectations in their practicum seminars. Candidates meet with their mentors at the start of their field experiences to discuss expectations responsibilities, and guidelines. Seminar instructors also contact mentors by email or in person to answer any questions, to clarify expectations, and to monitor attendance and participation of candidates. Additionally, mentors provide feedback to candidates and complete evaluation forms to monitor and evaluate candidates' performance, including attendance and participation. (3.4.f.5)

In the semester prior to candidates' student teaching, OFEC, MST coordinator, and MST coordinator review student teaching applications (3.4.e.33) to determine placements and collaborate with principals of partner schools to identify potential mentors. Student teacher candidates also attend an orientation where they receive and review a handbook. (3.4.e.4-8) Candidates meet with their potential mentor teachers at the end of the semester prior to student teaching to review expectations, guidelines, checklists, and evaluation forms with mentors. Mentors must agree to accept the student teachers after the interviews before the placement is finalized.

To continue to improve communication and specify expectations during field experiences, OFEC has employed an Internship Coordinator and has developed an online training video for mentors. The Field Experiences Handbooks, the Student Teaching Handbook, and mentor training video are available on the COEHD webpage. (3.4.e.34)

[3. 4 - Exhibits for Standard 3]

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

[4.1 – Diversity]

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

CONTEXT

The mission of UMaine's College of Education and Human Development (COEHD), adopted Spring 2013, pursuant to the University's Blue Sky Strategic Plan, states in part: "Collaborating with external partners and experts across the University of Maine, we prepare our graduates to engage in ethical conduct, reflective practice, meaningful inquiry, and data-driven decision making in order to meet the increasingly diverse needs of our state and the world in which we live." In addition to the Blue Sky Plan, the theme, vision, and mission adopted in 2013 build on earlier documents adopted by COEHD to address diversity. The Conceptual Framework, adopted in 2005 and now undergoing revision, contains a diversity section (4.4.b.1, pp. 5-6). The unit adopted a Diversity Action Plan in May 2006. In May 2011, the College adopted a document revising our vision, mission, core principles, goals, and strategies. The 2006 Diversity Action Plan was updated and incorporated as goal #6 in this May 2011 document, with eight strategies under that goal (4.4.b.4).

Two important facts about Maine influence our institutional policies and practices re: diversity:

(1) 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; and

(2) the candidates at the University of Maine reflect the rurality and poverty found in Maine, especially northern Maine where the university is located.

While UMaine's status as a state institution and our geographic location have a major impact on our mission, we also operate in a broader context. About 20% of UMaine students come from outside of Maine, including 4.1% who are international students. When surveyed soon after graduation, 27.8% of the 2011 graduates of COEHD who had found full-time jobs were working out of state (4.4.e.5). As an Education faculty, we seek to impact our state, the nation, and the world through our 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).

CURRICULUM

The unit has three candidate proficiencies, P8, 13, & 17, aligned with curriculum and assessment with regard to diversity in initial (IP) and advanced programs (AP) for teachers. For programs for other school professionals (OSP), the diversity proficiencies are #8, 13, & 18 (4.4.c.1). Each degree program specifies the levels and courses in which these proficiencies are assessed (4.4.c.2-5).

Categories of diversity addressed in various courses, and the activities through which these aspects of diversity are 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.

Candidate performance with respect to the diversity proficiencies is assessed in undergraduate IP courses (4.4.c.2), graduate IP courses (4.4.c.3), AP courses (4.4.c.4), and OSP courses (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). In summary, the data reports from TK-20 indicate that, for each diversity proficiency, over 90% of candidates in most programs meet or exceed expectations (4.4.a.5).

DIVERSE FACULTY

In Fall 2013, the unit employed six individuals who are of diverse racial backgrounds (4 Asian, 2 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% campus-wide. Faculty are knowledgeable and skillful in preparing candidates to work with diverse populations (4.4.g.13). The university as a whole currently employs 636 full-time faculty, of whom 43 (6.8%) are faculty of color (4.4.d.1).

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). 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).

DIVERSE CANDIDATES

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 IP candidates (4.3%), 10 of 285 AP and OSP candidates (3.5%). 13 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.

COEHD 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% of the child and family development students were of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds, as were 8.7% of exercise science students. Also, 9.9% of the candidates in the KPE teaching/coaching concentration, and 7.5% in the KPE exercise science concentration are international students.

Campus-wide, in Spring 2013, 786 of 9,722 candidates (8.1%) are persons of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds (not including international students) (4.4.e.1), and 420 are international students. This compares to 4.8% of the population of the State of Maine and 6.7% of students in PK-12 schools statewide who are persons of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds. The Education Trust recognized the University of Maine as "the highest overall performer" on equity measures of access and success for under-represented minority and low income students (Pell grant recipients) among the nation's flagship campuses (4.4.e.2, 3). In 2011-2012, UMaine ranked highest among the New England land grant universities in Pell grant recipients, at 34% (4.4.e.4).

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.

DIVERSE STUDENTS IN P-12 SCHOOLS

The unit places IP 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 AP and OSP 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).

An analysis of diversity in placement schools, compared to all schools in the state of Maine, shows that UMaine initial and advanced programs have made a good faith effort 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.b – Continuous Improvement]

♣ **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

♣ **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.**

CHANGES

CURRICULUM

- The unit's conceptual framework, including the section on diversity, has been and continues to be updated. The Diversity and Difference Standing (DDS) Committee has recommended substantial revisions to the diversity section (4.4.b.17).

- Through Project Reach, a new specialization in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) has been added to the list of academic specializations in the Elementary Education program. Candidates

with the TESL specialization earn an endorsement on their State of Maine teaching certificate upon graduation (4.4.b.18).

- Adapting Instruction for Students with Special Needs (SED 302): The scope 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 Literacy Specialist program, the teaching of English as a Second Language has been incorporated into Clinical Practices: Teaching Children with Difficulties in Literacy (ERL 569) (4.4.b.19).
- Education in a Multicultural Society (EDB 202): In this required course for all undergraduate Education majors, 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 UMaine 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).
- 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 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 collection for 2012-13 was greatly improved.
- Compared to the previous system, the use of TK-20 has greatly improved the assessment information available regarding candidate performance on the diversity proficiencies.

DIVERSE FACULTY

- 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% 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 our 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).

DIVERSE CANDIDATES

- The College has recently revised and updated a Candidate Recruitment and Retention Plan, in cooperation with the UMaine 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 College 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 COEHD 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.

DIVERSE STUDENTS IN P-12 SCHOOLS

- The College 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 TK-20 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 ten 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, COEHD 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).

PLANS

CURRICULUM

- The College has recently increased its attention to the impact of poverty on educational attainment. The College hosted a public, 1-day conference on Friday, October 18, 2013 on the topic "Impacts of Poverty on Education," which has prompted initial work on a concept paper to review the literature on poverty and education as well as past college efforts, and to chart plans for future curriculum work (4.4.b.13-15).
- Programs will continue to infuse diversity content and skill development into their courses. For example, the Educational Leadership program will highlight the notion of cultural proficiency more explicitly by assigning the text *Cultural Proficiency: A Manual for School Leaders* (Lindsay, Robins & Terrell, 2009) and engage students in the analysis of ethical situations teachers and leaders face in schools like those in *Now What? Confronting and Resolving Ethical Issues in Schools* (Mackenzie & Mackenzie, 2010).

DIVERSE FACULTY

- The unit will review the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Plan and pertinent literature in Fall 2014 to determine what improvements may be needed and implemented (4.4.g.15).

DIVERSE CANDIDATES

- The new Candidate Recruitment and Retention Plan will be implemented, as described above. The unit will collaborate in this effort with a particular focus on attracting candidates of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds. One aspect of this effort will be to improve the unit's web pages.
- We will explore creating an academic mentoring program based in the unit for candidates of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds that gives these candidates the mentoring they need in a way that is appropriate to their needs and cultural backgrounds, while also providing culturally diverse experiences for candidates who are white.

DIVERSE STUDENTS IN P-12 SCHOOLS

- The unit will implement a placement policy that strongly encourages candidates in both initial and advanced programs to participate in volunteer activities in schools and community agencies in which the PK-12 students enrolled are diverse with respect to race/ethnicity, gender, social class, disabilities, and languages.
- Increased emphasis will be given to placing candidates in schools and other organizations which meet the state reporting thresholds (n=10) for students of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and for English language learners, as well as in schools that exceed the state average of 48% for students receiving Free/Reduced Lunch.
- Increasing the Practicum field experience for Secondary Education from 60 hours to 100 hours in classrooms, with the additional 40 hours intended to target schools with diverse students, will be reviewed further.
- The new field experience for urban and rural education that was piloted in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 will be considered as a requirement for one or more degree programs (4.4.i.4).

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

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

Two Areas for Improvement (AFIs) were identified in 2008, as follows:

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

- **Areas for Improvement:** Advanced candidate interaction with racially diverse faculty is limited in some programs and cohorts.

- **Response to AFI:**

There have been four tenure-stream faculty hired since 2010, with 25% of the new hires being non-white. Dr. Yung-wei (Dennis) Lin was hired effective in Fall 2011 as a tenure track faculty member in the Counselor Education program. Dr. Lin 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.

Efforts have been made 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. In 2006, the College adopted a Faculty Recruitment and Retention policy (4.4.g.1) which includes the addition of diversity language in position announcements (4.4.g.2). As a result, other racially diverse applicants for graduate faculty positions have applied and in some cases have been interviewed and even offered positions. For example, a lecturer position in Curriculum/Social Studies was offered to an Arab-American scholar, who initially accepted, and then declined upon being offered a position at the Institute of Education, University of London (U.K.). An Asian-American woman was brought to campus and interviewed as a finalist for a tenure track position in Science Education, although she was not found to be the strongest candidate and hence was not offered the position. Efforts to fill fixed-term clinical faculty positions through national searches have sometimes resulted in failed searches. Some searches for fixed term lecturer positions have been limited to the State of Maine, which may result in less racially diverse applicant pools.

To supplement full-time faculty appointments, the University of Maine has a Libra endowment for bringing professors from other universities to campus (4.4.g.6), and the Diversity and Difference Standing Committee used this endowment to identify professors from other institutions in other states to come to UMaine to focus on multicultural education. Specifically, the College has invited four Libra visiting professors in the past four years, three of whom have been from racially diverse backgrounds. These are: Dr. Sonia Nieto (Latina, Spring 2010)(4.4.g.7, 8), Dr. Denise Patmon (African-American, 2011-2013) and Dr. Stephen Gordon (2011-2013)(4.4.g.9, 10), and Dr. Aretha Marbley (African-American, Spring 2014) (4.4.g.11). All four Libra professors were invited to campus because of their expertise and extensive experience in the field of multicultural education. These visiting professors have been guest lecturers in a variety of both graduate and undergraduate classes, as well as presenting at other events for students and faculty, engaging in faculty development activities, and meeting with faculty in specific program areas.

Since our 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 our 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).

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

♣Areas for Improvement: 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.

• **Response to AFI:**

An analysis of diversity in placement schools, compared to all schools in the state of Maine, as reported to the Maine Department of Education, demonstrates that UMaine 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).

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).

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).

In the Special Education program, professional dispositions - particularly the belief that all students can learn - are a cornerstone of all coursework and field-based requirements. Candidates are expected to develop knowledge, skills and dispositions with respect to race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, language and disabilities. They have opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in these areas through courses and field-based experiences, frequently in their own classrooms or schools. Candidates must complete out-of-classroom assignments that require collaboration with family and/or community to enhance student learning, and leadership in collaborating with colleagues (4.4.b.24).

[4. 4 - Exhibits for Standard 4]

4.4.a	Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning
4.4.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.4.c	Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.4.d	Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)
4.4.e	Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)

4.4.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)
4.4.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.4.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.4.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

[5.1 - Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development]

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

5A. - QUALIFICATIONS

Professional Education Faculty have doctorates, expertise, and/or certification in fields they supervise that qualify them for their assignments. In Fall 2013 the unit employed 85 Faculty: 42 full-time at UM and full-time in professional education with 32 (76 %) holding a terminal degree; 19 full-time at UM and part-time in education with 15 (79 %) holding a terminal degree; and 24 part-time at UM and part-time in education (adjunct) with 6 (25%) holding a terminal degree (5.4.a.1). Another gauge of the faculty's ability to contribute to the development of educators is that faculty have experiences in P-12 schools. Faculty do such things as provide professional development, sit on school boards, and consult with or coach teachers and school leaders (5.4.a.1). Clinical Faculty are either certified in the fields in which they supervise or have terminal degrees and are on the university faculty. Also, they have professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise such as conduct professional development experiences, consult in schools, or are P-12 practitioners (5.4.b 1). The job description for clinical faculty is Exhibit 5.4.b.2. All school faculty, referred to at UM as cooperating mentor teachers, who supervise student teaching interns in Fall 2013 hold a certificate for the field that they teach (5.4.b.3).

5B. - TEACHING

As mentioned above, the professional education faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach. The faculty are deeply engaged in helping students develop the proficiencies outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards and assessing candidate performance as shown by their commitment to developing and using the Key Assessments for each area's candidate assessment system. Faculty guide candidates in their application of theory, research and current developments in their teaching fields. Also, their teaching

encourages candidates' development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions. Professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles and the importance of technology, including such approaches as small group discussions, online course organizational software, independent and group projects, simulations and role playing. See course syllabi (5.4.f.1). The College's commitment to diversity is highlighted in its conceptual framework and brought to life in individual courses as shown by syllabi and lesson plans. We seek to support each other in this area via Diversity Dialogues (5.4.g.1) and in technology demonstrations and workshops (5.4.g.2). Technology plays a large role as all the pre-service education students have laptops and are expected to know how to use them appropriately to support their teaching. The College supports both Blackboard and Moodle as course management systems; such applications as google docs are also useful not only for organization purposes but also as demonstrations of good practice. These applications are used by faculty as they model how schools effectively support student learning with technology. Faculty assess their effectiveness as teachers, including the positive effects they have on candidates' learning and performance by administering mid course evaluations (5.4.f.2) and final course evaluations (5.4.f.3), examining the results of these items, and reflecting on them in the materials they submit for peer review (5.4.f.4).

5C. - SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty are engaged in different types of scholarly work, based in part on the missions of their programs and departments. The recently revised COEHD mission and vision have aided Faculty in relating their research to practitioners as well as to fellow scholars (5.4.d.1). Scholarly activity is most closely measured by publication in peer-refereed books or scholarly journals, followed by presentations at meetings of international/national/regional scholarly associations, and internal/external grant funding. During 2012-2013 full and part-time COEHD Faculty had 25 articles, 33 proceedings and reports, and seven books published or accepted for publication. They conducted 89 presentations at international, national, or regional conferences, a ratio of three scholarly productions/faculty member (5.4.d. 2). A specific example of the research conducted that fulfills the mission of the College is An Efficacy Study of Online Mathematics Homework that involved four full-time Faculty in the COEHD as well as two graduate students and a research associate. This study is funded by the U. S. Department of Education in collaboration with 17 school districts last year and another 28 school systems added this year for a total of 75 teachers. The Center for Research and Evaluation staff have been instrumental in recruiting schools and also assisting in the professional development for teachers as they implement the online math homework system. The College announces the publication and presentation of research in faculty meeting agendas (5.4.d.3). Faculty generated \$4,841,085 in external funding in 2013.

5D. - SERVICE

Service is an integral responsibility of Faculty in the COEHD and includes participation on various committees of the college and university, as well as service to student or community groups, schools, state agencies, and professional organizations. Since the University is the land grant institution of Maine and has a distinct mission with regard to ensuring high quality education and educator preparation to the entire state, we maintain a map of Maine (5.4.e.1), showing the regions of the state in which we regularly offer outreach graduate programs and professional development opportunities for teachers, school counselors and administrators. Exhibit 5.4.e.2 summarizes service and collaborative activities with P-12 schools, other post-high school institutions, and professional organizations. An example of service provided to P-12 schools is the Penobscot Region Professional Development network (PREP: PDN). Another example is the Maine Principals' Association Mentoring New Principals Program. This program has involved more than 60 practitioners in 50 school districts across the state (5.4.e.2).

5E. - EVALUATION

The College is firmly committed to excellence in teaching and adheres to University faculty evaluation standards and procedures in keeping with the Affiliated Faculties of University of Maine (AFUM) agreement. Clinical Faculty are guided by a job description (5.4.b.2) and receive programmatic and individual feedback from students (5.4.c.1, 2). Similarly, educators in our Internship experiences for School/Mental Health Counselors and School Superintendents are guided by sets of expectations that are routinely revisited and revised as necessary (5.4.c.3-6). The unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance to ensure the competence and intellectual vitality of the professional education faculty. Faculty are expected to model excellence in effective teaching, as demonstrated by end-of-course student evaluations and other evidence such as teaching observations, teaching awards/recognition, curriculum development, or student advising. End-of-course student evaluations (5.4.f.3) are completed on full-and part-time Faculty on a scale of one (lowest) to five (highest). Spring 2013 semester aggregate data for graduate faculty showed a mean score of 4.61 for course ratings and 4.66 for faculty ratings. At the undergraduate level the mean scores were 4.46 for course ratings and 4.57 for faculty ratings.

Evaluations of professional education faculty are used to improve the faculty's teaching, scholarship and service. The College places a premium on descriptions of teaching and curriculum development as well as thorough analyses of student evaluations both quantitative and qualitative at mid-semester and at the end of the semester. The peer review process requires both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to submit portfolios containing data and reflections on teaching and advising as well as evidence of scholarship and service over a specified period (5.4.d.5). Faculty also submit concrete plans for professional development and

teaching enhancement. Forty full and part-time faculty of the College (78%) hold positions of responsibility as officers or conference planners for professional organizations.

5F. - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Faculty are encouraged to enhance their knowledge and skills through a variety of professional development opportunities. Within the University there are many professional development activities available to faculty. Some of these opportunities include: Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment (CETA) offerings, Project Reach offerings in the field of English Language Learners, and Women in the Curriculum/ Women's Studies research presentations. In addition, University funds are available as Faculty Technology Stipends, which support Faculty in developing online courses or creating units in courses that involve video or audio technology. To support the diversity and research dimensions of the conceptual framework, COEHD sponsors Diversity Dialogs (5.4.G.1) and Research-in-Progress presentations and discussions. Visiting Librarian professors give diversity presentations and consult with faculty about diversity curriculum and assessments. Faculty attend a variety of Instructional Technology skill-building sessions (5.4.G.2); performance assessment is enhanced and supported by TK-20 and other providers who sponsor webinars and training sessions. COEHD offers Brown Bag conversations and talks by prominent educators on current topics. This past year, the Shibles professor for 2011-12, Dr. Cathy Pratt, returned to the campus to discuss the latest evidence-based practices for autism. COEHD makes travel funds available to faculty to attend conferences (5.4.g.3).

[5.2.b - Continuous Improvement]

♣ **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

♣ **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.**

CHANGES

Dean Nichols is committed to rebuilding the numbers of faculty lost over the last few years due to limited funding. During academic year 2012-13, two tenure track Faculty were hired in Counselor Education and Kinesiology/Physical Education. In Fall 2013, the College was authorized to fill a tenure track position in Educational Leadership.

As part of his entry plan, Dean Nichols held meetings in Summer 2012 with individual Faculty, seeking their views on what is working well in the College and what are challenges to its effective functioning. Lack of communication and input were seen as major issues. Faculty also mentioned the need for greater transparency and equitable treatment across programs. Similar

views were expressed in a report conducted in 2005 by a faculty member who is now the director of institutional research for the University (5.4.d.4).

Every other college in the University is organized into departments. Such organization is in keeping with the University faculty's desire, as expressed by the faculty Senate, to have input and authority over aspects of their teaching lives. This year, the College has been engaged in restructuring itself into departments (5.4.a.2). Implementation of the new department structure began in Fall 2013, so the work of the first year involves a significant amount of conversation and piloting of new ways of organizing peer review, prioritizing budgets, and collaborations in scholarship and service.

The College employs many adjunct faculty in order to offer the array of courses needed for both undergraduate and graduate students. The Associate Dean, as supervisor of all of these individuals, expressed the need for an explicit process for seeking and then employing adjuncts. A small team of faculty initiated the process of developing the College's first Adjunct Faculty Handbook in fall 2011 (5.4.a.3). The handbook describes not only the expectations of adjunct faculty but also those for the faculty in departments and programs employing adjuncts. It was implemented in January 2014. Since COEHD has many Faculty who are not full time in the College, the audience has been expanded to include these instructors also. The document contains reminders regarding such things as confidentiality and syllabus construction. It also describes the responsibilities for mentoring and supervisory support for part time instructors by full time Faculty in a particular program.

The College values diversity and seeks to recruit a diverse candidate pool and employ diverse candidates as much as possible. We follow our recruitment plan, which indicates the College's commitment to recruiting and retaining diverse candidates. The College places announcements of openings in national publications and makes contacts at other institutions. In our analyses of candidates' dossiers, we work closely with the Human Resources department to ensure we are careful to provide equality of opportunity to all candidates (5.4.a.4). Also, The ADVANCE Rising Tide project provides valuable resources and strategies for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty (5.4.a.5).

Since the last review, COEHD has made several efforts to enhance faculty performance. The COEHD Faculty Handbook was revised beginning in 2011. Implementation began during the 2013-14 academic year. The handbook, among other things that have been referenced, includes an appendix that outlines the qualifications and selection process for the College's teaching awards (5.4.a.6).

In the past the Associate Dean had regularly linked new tenure track Faculty with informal mentors. Peer review committee members have also provided support for new faculty. In 2012,

the provost, based on research done by a member of our Higher Education faculty, required all colleges to develop, submit, and implement a mentoring plan for all new Faculty. Data from the University of Maine and other institutions show how important ongoing mentoring is for acclimating new employees to the university culture and keeping new faculty on track toward tenure (5.4.a.7).

A former dean was concerned about how few faculty, having earned tenure, had gone on to seek full professor rank. In 2005, a faculty member conducted interviews with all Faculty regarding their needs regarding conducting and publishing scholarship. Findings included: A major barrier to being able to do much significant research after tenure is College faculty must teach three courses each semester. Also, there are major demands on time for service to the local and state education communities. The report led to several whole faculty discussions and helped to flesh out the College's strategic plan, the implementation of which has been somewhat thwarted by diminishing resources.

Significant suggestions from the report were to differentiate faculty positions and provide grant-writing support to faculty (5.4.d.4). The College made a commitment to enhance opportunities for scholarship, beginning in the 2013, by establishing the position of grant writer to coordinate and support the work of Faculty in seeking external funding for research. This individual has helped to relieve some of the responsibility currently shouldered by faculty and to reinforce the College's commitment to "strengthening research and scholarship." To strengthen research and scholarship, further, a Human Development faculty member holds weekly Write-Ins where faculty share strategies for research and pieces of writing.

The ADVANCE Rising Tide initiative of the University, which supports clarifying expectations for tenure, led to the revision and implementation of a new promotion and tenure policy (5.4.d.5). The Provost requested that the College clarify expectations for post -tenure. The Post-Tenure Review Policy was developed, revised, and will be voted on by the faculty in Spring 2014 (5.4.d.6).

Several other ideas arose from Dean Nichols' initial meetings with faculty. Among them was that Faculty desired to provide more service to local schools, but monetary support was required for them to do so effectively. In Fall 2012, Dean Nichols inaugurated a mini-grant program wherein faculty in collaboration with teachers and/or school systems competed for funding for resources, research, or professional development. A total of \$12,415.79 was awarded in 2012-13.

PREP: PDN, one of the most encompassing collaborations with local schools and districts is constantly seeking to add new school districts. This year, it added Bangor, the largest school

district in its geographic area. Also, Faculty regularly canvas the school superintendents and principals in the organization regarding their needs.

Again as a result of the Dean's information and perspective gathering in Summer 2012, the Dean created a new award, the Dean's Service and Engagement Award.

As the peer review process had not been revised since the late nineties, during the last two years the Peer Review Committee of the College has reexamined the previous policy and made substantive revisions. The procedures for review of tenure and non-tenure track faculty have been clarified. The policy was implemented in the 2012-13 academic year. And, as indicated, the post-tenure review process and expectations have been revised and clarified.

As noted, the Dean sought input from faculty about concerns and suggestions they had for improving the functioning of the College. To ensure communication each faculty meeting agenda contains a lengthy list of recent articles, presentations and awards of Faculty (5.4.d.3).

To promote communication regarding sabbatical leave accomplishments, the Associate Dean developed a detailed sabbatical report form (5.4.g.4).

Since 2011, the University's ADVANCE Rising Tide Center, has been instrumental in supporting new Faculty (5.4.g.5). To ensure support for new faculty, the Provost asked each college to create a mentoring plan (5.4.a.7). In Fall 2013, several workshops sponsored by the ADVANCE Rising Tide Center were held including one on faculty mentoring (5.4.g.6) and the other on fostering collegial faculty relationships.

The College held a conference, featuring Donna Beegle, on poverty and schools (5.4.g.7). Diversity Dialogues continue to heighten awareness of such issues.

The College supports technology use and offers workshops on effective use of hardware and applications. As a result of the accreditation process and the creation of departments, college faculty are more focused assessment issues as we work to make them meaningful.

PLANS

The College is committed to following through on its restructuring plan. The three departments offer opportunities for cross-fertilization of ideas as well as prioritizing needs. We recognize how systematic we must be in monitoring the implementation and effects of this new plan to be sure that it realizes goals. Such monitoring and evaluating are important for the implementation of the Adjunct Faculty Handbook and the peer review and post tenure review processes. COEHD wants to foster connections with schools; seven mini-grants grants were awarded in 2012-13 in order to build relationships with schools.

COEHD plans to improve and expand the Professional Development School model to more school systems in the coming years. Already members of different programs, e.g., Literacy and Educational Leadership, have been engaged in helping to develop and support the important connections to schools.

The dean established two task forces: One is examining curriculum to ensure its relevance to P-12 schools. The other task force is to explore ways to differentiate staffing.

The Graduate School offers assistance to faculty with developing assessments and understanding assessment data; COEHD faculty will be participating in these sessions.

COEHD will continue to take advantage the ADVANCE Rising Tide Center's research, advice, and support as we fill positions.

[5.4 - Exhibits for Standard 5]

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

[6.1 - Unit Governance and Resources]

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

6a. LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

The College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) is one of 6 Colleges at the University of Maine (6.4.b.1, 6.4.a.3). The provost has designated the COEHD as the leader of professional educator preparation efforts (6.4.b.5). Educator preparation is shared across three colleges: COEHD, Liberal Arts & Sciences (CLAS) and Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture

(NSFA) and is coordinated through the university-wide Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC) (6.4.a.2). All course and curriculum proposals that impact educator preparation include a consultation with the COEHD dean and action by the Teacher Education Council (TEC). COEHD governance is shared between standing committees (6.4.a.1) and the dean's office.

The Unit's recruiting and admission practices are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs. Initial admission requirements are consistent with university requirements (6.4.d.18). The Admission to Teacher Education process is described on the COEHD website and in Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs, the Teacher Education Handbook, graduate program handbooks, and program guides (6.4.d.1, 6.4.d.8-10,13,15,17). The Unit, along with the Division of Marketing and Communications and the Enrollment Management Office, develops and approves all brochures, calendars, advertisements, catalogs and student recruitment efforts. Recruitment efforts are guided by the University of Maine Recruitment Plan, which emphasizes recruitment of highly qualified students, recruiting candidates from traditionally underrepresented groups and second-career professionals (6.4.d.2-7, 20).

The unit's academic calendars (6.4.e.1-2), catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are updated annually or biennially for currency and accuracy. The COEHD website provides information on academic programs, student services, research and outreach (6.4.e.3). The university website describes services offered, as well as providing the university catalog, calendar, and student handbook, (6.4.c.1-13).

Professional education candidates have access to a robust array of student services. The Office of Teacher Recruitment, Advising, and Licensure (TRAL) serves pre-education majors, transfer students and MAT candidates (6.4.c.2). The Unit offers workshops and tutorials for Praxis exams. Teacher Education candidates have departmental faculty advisors. Secondary education majors also have advisors in CLAS and NSFA. Art, Music, and Foreign Languages provide additional advising to fine arts, music education and foreign language candidates. Strong supports are in place through multiple University centers and offices (6.4.c.6-15).

Through the TECC/TEC the COEHD, CLAS, and NSFA collaborate on program design, delivery and evaluation of the Unit and its programs (6.4.a.1-2). A primary source for collaborative partnership with P-12 practitioners is the Penobscot River Educational Partnership (PREP), which includes superintendents, principals, curriculum coordinators, teachers and Unit Faculty (6.4.b.6). The Dean is also a member of the PENQUIS superintendents' organization (6.4.b.8). The Unit works closely with the University's Assessment Director to align its assessment system with the University's Learning Goals.

6b. UNIT BUDGET

The Unit receives funding comparable to other colleges at the University of Maine. Over the past five fiscal years, COEHD has taken a 4.52% base budget cut versus a campus average reduction of 2.35% during the same time period (6.4.g.1). Base budgets are adjusted each year for compensation increases, benefit rate adjustments, commitments and base reductions, as well as changes in College department structure and sales and service base revenue adjustments.

Although the College has been faced with budget cuts each year for the last fifteen fiscal years, total E&G budgets for the College remain relatively flat over the last three fiscal years due to increases in the budget that offset the cuts. However, there have been significant funds reallocations amongst each of the College's departments (6.4.f.2).

The College operates on base E&G funding and one-time funding from lapsed salaries and carry-forward funds from the prior fiscal year. However, these one-time monies are used to offset diminishing returns to the College in base funding and course revenue generated from courses taught through our Center for Responsive Training, which includes Reading Recovery and Maine Partnerships in Comprehensive Literacy. The College utilizes one-time money to fund non-base funded salaries such as fixed-length lecturers, temporary employees, and soft money faculty and staff. The College has flexibility in the utilization of vacant faculty salaries to offset other operating expense budgets (6.4.f.3). Some of the one-time funds recognized from lapsed salaries have supplemented the base funding commitments for assessment, technology, professional development, and distance education (6.4.f.1).

The budget for curriculum, instruction, faculty, staff, clinical work, and scholarship sufficiently supports high-quality work within the Unit and its school partners (6.4.f.1). Each faculty member is afforded the opportunity for professional development. COEHD resources support clinical work, which is differentiated by the amount of candidates' supervised clinical practice. To enhance and strengthen university/school partnerships, the Dean made available mini grant funds (6.4.f.6). The College is well supported by gift accounts, scholarships, and lines for visiting professorships (6.4.f.4, 5)

6c. PERSONNEL

Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty engage in a wide range of professional activities, including teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, work in schools, and service, and to contribute professionally on a community, state, regional, or national basis. The Unit complies with university policy relative to graduate and undergraduate teaching loads, including class size consideration for distance learning (6.4.h.1-2). The Unit

studies pedagogy demands when setting course size and considers exceptional assignments for large enrollment courses.

The unit's judicious use of part-time faculty is designed to strengthen programs through their content and professional expertise (6.4.b.7). Clinical faculty participate in orientation meetings prior to the beginning of each semester and professional development activities offered through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment (CETA) (6.4.f.1).

Unit provision of support personnel significantly enhances the effectiveness of faculty in their teaching and mentoring of candidates (6.4.b.9).

Adequate funds are available to support professional development activities for all faculty (6.4.f.7). Professional development is on-going in the area of instructional technology and uses of technology to enhance learning. Training has been provided throughout the year via Webinars, e.g., use of TK-20, and other technology topics (6.4.f.8).

6d. UNIT FACILITIES

The Unit has outstanding facilities on campus and with partner schools. Appropriate equipment and materials are purchased for pedagogy courses. The most recent developments in technology allow faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use. Most classrooms are equipped with Smartboards, a projector, and a docking station. Sufficient bandwidth for wireless connectivity is available in all classrooms (6.4.i.5). The number of iPads used by faculty for classroom instruction has increased (6.4.f.1). On campus and online library resources are superior (6.4.c.17)

The Unit uses web-based software, TK-20, for managing the assessment system. Blackboard and FirstClass are available to all faculty, enabling both traditional and online learning to occur. Undergraduate classes can take a blended approach to learning or be completely online when appropriate.

6e. UNIT RESOURCES

The Unit aggressively and successfully secures resources to support exemplary programs and projects. The Unit receives a basic budget to meet its administrative needs. The dean has an endowed discretionary fund to assist in special functions. A Distance Education Fee apportioned to the College helps support distance education courses. A distance student teaching fee supports travel for supervisors. A graduate practicum fee supports travel for graduate supervisors. The Provost's office maintains a fund for accreditation expenses. The annual budget process allows for requests to support additional staff, faculty, and future projects.

COEHD has an instructional technologist to assist in all areas of technology. The unit's TK-20 assessment software is funded through student fees and maintained by the TK-20 Unit Administrator. The Unit maintains an independent database as well as using the University database PeopleSoft.

Faculty and candidates have access to exemplary library, curricular, and electronic information resources. Online web resources are a major focus for the teaching faculty, and the library meets COEHD requests (6.4.c.16).

Resources for distance learning programs provide exceptional reliability, speed, and confidentiality of connection in the delivery system that is maintained and fully supported by the Information technology (IT) staff (6.4.c.17). Candidates have access to all materials via Blackboard and FirstClass. All access and help desk availability is 24/7.

[6.2.b - Continuous Improvement]

♣ **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

♣ **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.**

CHANGES

UNIT LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

Since the last NCATE visit, the most significant change impacting continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality was the reorganization of the COEHD structure (6.4.b.7). The convergence of moving toward data-driven decisions via a new data system, Tk-20, along with a new Dean that was promoting currency and relevancy as well as shared faculty governance, led to the development of the three departments and a more uniform way of evaluating the effectiveness of each program area, which will enhance candidate performance and program quality. Decision-making and programmatic control has shifted from centralized to decentralized and clearly identifies programs, allowing a more focused view and control of programs and candidate learning outcomes.

With a data management system and department structure in place, COEHD was able to design a new theme, mission and vision that was more closely aligned with the University Blue Sky strategic plan (6.4.b.10). The changes in the mission and vision of the college also was a catalyst for going back into the conceptual framework and editing that document (6.4.b.2-4). Since the last NCATE visit, the COEHD has had a complete change in the upper administration (i.e., Dean, Associate Dean, & Assistant Dean, administrative and fiscal coordinator), and the

upper-level administration of the University of Maine has also seen significant change (i.e., President, Senior Advisor to President, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, VP for Enrollment Management, VP for Research, VP for Innovation and Economic Development, Associate VP for Human Resources and Administration, VP for Development and Alumni Relations, and a New Athletic Director). These changes in leadership and authority have enhanced the image of UMaine as the flagship university in the state, reaffirmed our commitment to stewardship of place through increased community and regional engagement and fostered collaboration across campus and throughout the community. These changes have also resulted in student growth, increased student diversity, and greater use of data-driven decision making.

Another significant change based on feedback data was the transformation and combination of several committees. Prior to the College reorganization, the Professional Education Unit relied on the Teacher Education Faculty (TEF), Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC), and a Unit Assessment System Committee (UASC). Each of these committees had the purpose of sharing information, and implementing recommendations based on continuous improvement. However, it was deemed that having three different committees was leading to confusion and misinformation about Professional Education. As a result, the TEC was formed and combined the various committees under one heading (6.4.b.11). This change has improved communication and decision making and led to a redesign of the professional core.

The adoption of Tk-20 has led faculty to look closely at student performance and how their programs affect these performances. The collection of exit data on undergraduate learning goals has led to confidence that these goals are being achieved. Student exit polls and administrative surveys indicate that the programs are functioning well. After reviewing two years worth of learning outcomes data, faculty have made changes in programs that better prepare candidates for teaching. In regard to change and continuous improvement, the faculty identified that we had too many key assessments and that the developmental rubric that was designed is too cumbersome and not adequately useful in data analysis. A task force has been formed to re-evaluate the key assessments, transition points, and rubrics so that programs can have more useful, consistent and refined data.

The creation of the Teacher Recruitment Advising and Licensure center has improved candidate advising, consistency in communication, and the updating of program guides and licensure requirements. This formation has also strengthened the connection between advising and the Office of Field Experience, helping COEHD form stronger connections with our candidates from declaration of major through graduation and beyond.

As a result of recent analysis of data and ongoing feedback from our school partners, a task force was appointed by the Dean to examine curricular concerns for teacher preparation. As a

result, the overall GPA for candidacy has increased, the number of content concentrations has narrowed to pathways that will lead to highly qualified status and enhance relations with faculty in other Colleges. The task force is currently reviewing the professional core, the key assessments aligned with INTASC and ISTE standards, and revisions to the key assessment rubrics. The task force is also ensuring earlier field experiences to increase the diversity of experiences that are candidates are exposed to. These changes are significant and allow programs to address professional concerns in a much more robust manner.

With all of the changes to the College this was also an opportunity to develop several handbooks. COEHD now has a faculty handbook that includes revisions to the peer review process, the development of mentoring plan, recruitment of diverse faculty guidelines, adjunct handbook and college awards. As the college moved toward a model of data-driven decision making an Assessment Handbook was also developed (6.4.b.14).

One of our biggest commitments as a college since our last review was a strengthened commitment to diversity and putting forth a focused effort on increasing experiences and awareness about diversity for both our candidates and faculty and staff. As a result of this Commitment to Diversity the college invested more than \$300,000 in our diversity effort (6.4.f.9).

In an attempt to strengthen faculty governance and shared leadership as well as improve communication a Leadership Team was formed (6.4.a.2).

UNIT BUDGET

Starting in fiscal year 2014, the College introduced the department budget structure, thereby creating three new E&G budgets and allocating existing resources to each department to provide faculty salaries and fringe benefits, supplies, and faculty travel and professional development.

The COEHD has seen a 39% decline in tenure track positions over the past decade. As a result of these reductions, the College has engaged in Program Prioritization in order to allocate resources to signature programs and high need areas and to suspend programs that have limited resources or show a disconnect to the College mission (6.4.f.4). Base funding in lapsed salaries will be used for future faculty hires based on the priorities of the College.

PERSONNEL

While there have been budget deficits in the college since our last review and we have had a decline of 10 positions since 2007, we have recently started an upward trend and have replaced 5.5 positions from 2012 to present. While our overall numbers are down since our last visit we

have hired 15 new full-time faculty. In addition, as our budget has been reduced, we have found greater opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside of the college and have several joint and cooperating appointments with faculty in RiSE, CLAS, NSFA, and Engineering (6.4.b.15, pp. 37 to 50). In addition to hiring two new faculty during the last fiscal year, COEHD also hired a grants coordinator, which has already resulted in several successful acquisitions of extramural funding and collaborative partnerships (6.4.f.4), and a new TK-20 coordinator.

Another significant change since our last visit is the Dean joining/founding Teacher Education Alliance of Maine (TEAMe). (Deans and Directors of Education throughout Maine meet regularly to address chapter 114, common core standards, teacher evaluations, mass customized learning, performance-based education and other accreditation standards).

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES IN TECHNOLOGY

During the past five years, the COEHD increased its technology resource in classrooms and for faculty. For example, several classrooms are equipped with interactive whiteboards and other technological accessories; faculty are equipped with laptops and iPads, the COEHD web site was redesigned; we adopted TK-20; and faculty members in several initial and advanced programs offer several courses online (e.g., Blackboard, FirstClass). A new science lab was designed to meet COEHD's growing commitment to STEM education. In order to enhance candidates' experiences in early childhood education, high tech video and observation equipment was installed in Merrill Hall's early childhood lab. Renovations to Lengyl gym include additions of smart boards, and equipping a neuromuscular function laboratory.

PLANS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

UNIT LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

Hire new Associate Dean and Assessment Coordinator.

UNIT BUDGET

Increase development efforts, program prioritization, and strategic planning. Currently, departments are undergoing program prioritization to meet the Blue Sky Initiative.

PERSONNEL

The college began the current academic year with five active searches; however, recent budget cuts forced the college to put four of the positions on hold. The search in educational leadership is ongoing, and interviews are underway. We hope to search the other four positions next year, including positions in CA&I and Counseling.

FACILITIES

The college is spread among four buildings: Shibles Hall, Merrill Hall, Lengyl Gym, and Chadbourne Hall. The university is currently in the planning phase for a new building which will bring everyone together in one building, thus enhancing communication and collaboration.

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

Standard 6 had one AFI cited in the last report "Collaboration between College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and unit faculty is not systematic (Initial and Advanced)."

At the time of the last visit, the college had one jointly appointed faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Dr. Michael Wittmann (Initial and Advanced Programs) in The Department of Physics and Astronomy. Since then, the college has taken steps to address this concern by first, adding one other jointly appointed faculty member Dr. Natasha Speer, a math educator in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Dr. Wittmann and Dr. Speer (Initial and Advanced Programs) are also members of The Maine Center for Research in STEM Education (RiSE Center).

Second, the college has increased the number of cooperating faculty. Cooperating professors are similar to joint appointments, except that the home department is responsible for their salary. They are expected to meet normal academic criteria and participate in the normal activities of the department, including research, public service, teaching in the instructional program, advising students, participating in program development, and other appropriate committees, and attending faculty meetings in which they may vote unless the appointing unit decides otherwise. Current cooperating faculty include:

Dr. Daniel Capps – RiSE Center (Initial and Advanced Programs)

Dr. Jon Shemwell - Physics and Astronomy (Initial and Advanced Programs)

Dr. Mackenzie Stetzer – Physics and Astronomy (Initial Programs)

Dr. Michelle Smith – Biology & Ecology (Initial Programs)

Dr. John Thompson – Physics and Astronomy (Initial and Advanced Programs)

Dr. Steve Elmer – Mechanical Engineering (Initial and Advanced Programs)

Shelly V. Chasse-Johndro – Project Reach (Initial)

Third, the "Teacher Education Coordinating Council" (TECC) was formed to foster collaboration between the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Education and Human Development. TECC is composed of the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, the Associate Dean of Instruction, the Co-chair of the College's Unit Assessment Systems Committee, and Chair of the Teacher Education Faculty, as well as the Associate Dean and faculty member from Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, and cooperating faculty from NSFA (6.3.a.1). The Committee meets twice per year to discuss annual program

reports and updates regarding NCATE accreditation and Tk20. An agenda is posted and minutes are recorded for each meeting (6.3.a.2).

Fourth, as detailed in the Assessment Handbook (6.4.b.14, pp. 4-5), the college established a "Unit Assessment Steering Committee" which includes representatives from NCATE programs in both the College of Education and Human Development and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as well as representation from the College administration and the Center for Research and Evaluation. The Unit Assessment Committee oversees the design of assessment tools and rubrics, the structure of system reports and metrics, and the direction of future growth and development of the assessment system.

Fifth, as part of the President's Blue Sky Initiative, the college submitted 13 of the 58 proposals under the "Signature and Emerging Areas" program (6.4.b.13). The joint proposals enhance relationships between our college and the other colleges on campus. We will learn the result of these proposals before the end of the current academic year.

[6.4 - Exhibits for Standard 6 – 2014]

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