

## Philander Smith College

### NCATE Addendum Report

This Addendum and accompanying exhibits provide information in response to questions and concerns in the report from the off-site team's review of our Institutional Report.

The Teacher Education Unit has had twenty (20) total candidates during the Fall 2007 – Spring 2012 period. Ten (10) were Early Childhood Education (ECED) candidates, seven (7) were Middle Level (MCEA) candidates, and three (3) were Vocational Education/Business Technology (VOBT) candidates. Data for two (2) VOBT candidates are not included in this analysis due to structural changes involving this program. The VOBT program was initially housed in the Business and Economics Division. Currently, the VOBT program is housed in the Division of Education.

#### Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

##### CONCERNS:

1. **Data from key assessments were not available for all decision points for all programs. (Include total number assessed and percentage passing each transition point.)**

**Response:** Data from key assessments are available for all decision points for all programs. Data for all decision points for all programs has been disaggregated and can be found in Standard I folder. (See **ASSESSMENT DATA** [Assessment Data](#).)

2. **Employer/ alumni survey data and Praxis data were not available for all programs.**

**Response:** Employer/ alumni survey data and Praxis data are available.

Employer/alumni survey data for three of the unit's ECED candidates who graduated and obtained employment teaching since the last NCATE visit have been provided. (See **Employer/Alumni Data** [Follow Up Data](#).)

Praxis I, II, and III data have been provided for you in the folder for all candidates 2007-2012. (See **CANDIDATE PRAXIS DATA 2007-2012** [Praxis Data 2007-2012](#)). As a result of candidate performance, the unit provides study resources for Praxis I and II. The unit has developed courses for Praxis II: Content and PLT to proactively prepare candidates for success on these assessments and address any deficiencies identified in candidate results. [Praxis II course syllabi](#)

**3. Syllabi from all courses across all programs were not available.**

**Response:** Syllabi from all courses across all programs are available. All course syllabi across all three programs have been provided for you. (See folders marked **ECED SYLLABI**, **MCEA SYLLABI**, and **VOBT SYLLABI** [Syllabi](#) ).

**4. Data on candidates' impact on student learning were not available for all programs.**

**Response:** Data on candidates' impact on student learning are available for all programs. In each program of study, specific competencies are identified from key assessments (Level II and III Field Evaluation Forms organized by the Conceptual Framework competencies, college supervisor and cooperating teacher data) to enable the unit to track this component. Evidence supporting candidates' impact on student learning has been provided. In addition, some exhibits of candidate-designed rubrics to self-assess impact on student learning are available. (See Exhibit 4.3.c as well as folders marked **IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING** [Impact on student learning.](#))

**5. Evidence of alignment of all programs with state/national standards as well as the conceptual framework were not provided.**

**Response:** Evidence of alignment of all programs with state/national standards as well as the conceptual framework is provided. An alignment matrix with unit/program outcomes and assessments has been aligned with state/national standards as well as the conceptual framework. (See folder marked **STANDARDS ALIGNMENT MATRICES** [Standards & Alignments of Competencies.](#))

**6. Evidence for candidates' integration of technology with instruction was not clearly defined.**

**Response:** Evidence for candidates' integration of technology with instruction is clearly defined. Specific competencies that target technology were identified in each of the unit's key assessments and the data was disaggregated for each decision point across all programs. (See **TECHNOLOGY COMPETENCIES.** [Technology Competencies](#) )

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Student Learning: How does the unit use Taskstream in its course assessment system?*

**Response:** The unit's assessment system utilizes three essential components: Jenzabar™ (Version EX), Microsoft Access™ and Excel™, and TaskStream™. The TaskStream System serves as an online display resource for aggregated and analyzed data. These data are then converted into charts, tables, reports, and graphs, which represent the analysis and interpretation of data on the unit and its candidates. The unit's database manager oversees this process. The data, uploaded through Task Stream, is located at its own web address and is accessible by password to the division administrators, the unit's assessment committee, and the unit faculty. The unit utilizes Taskstream candidate data to identify areas for program improvement.

2. *Candidate Knowledge: How does the unit ensure program quality for the Middle School and VOBT programs due to the low program enrollment?*

**Response:** The Middle Level program quality is ensured through state review and adherence to state requirements for the Middle Level generalist. Required courses and hours are mandated by the state of Arkansas Department of Education, and we are in compliance with all licensure requirements. All course syllabi are aligned with the Association for Middle Level Education standards, Arkansas Licensure standards, the PSC Conceptual Framework, and Pathwise criteria for effective teaching. Likewise, the VOBT program adheres to state standards for vocational business technology educators and all coursework is aligned with the National Association for Business Technology Educators, Pathwise, state standards for licensure, and the PSC Conceptual Framework.

3. *Standard I (All elements): Interviews with candidates, clinical faculty, and school administrators to confirm key assessments and program quality.*

**Response:** Interviews with candidates, clinical faculty, and school administrators to confirm key assessments and program quality will be conducted by the BOE Team during the onsite visit.

4. *Student Learning: School visits to confirm instructional performance.*

**Response:** School visits to confirm instructional performance will be conducted by the BOE Team during the onsite visit.

5. *Performance of candidates in the program: Disaggregation of Praxis data for candidates by program.*

**Response:** Praxis data for candidates has been disaggregated by program. [Praxis Data 2007-2012](#)

6. *Data for Middle Childhood and VOBT programs showing the number of candidates assessed and percentage that passed at each transition point.*

**Response:** Data for Middle Childhood and VOBT programs showing the number of candidates assessed and percentage that passed at each transition point have been provided. [Assessment Data](#)

7. *Data on decision points across all programs regarding pedagogical content knowledge, including a total candidate count or total percentage of candidates passing the assessment.*

**Response:** Data on decision points across all programs regarding pedagogical content knowledge, including a total candidate count or total percentage of candidates passing the assessment has been provided. [Assessment Data](#)

8. *Information on how the unit assesses candidates' impact on student learning (key assessments) and data showing candidates' impact on the learning of their students.*

**Response:** Information on how the unit assesses candidates' impact on student learning (key assessments) and data showing candidates' impact on the learning of their students have been provided. [Impact on student learning](#)

9. *Information on alignment of key dispositions assessments: alignment with state/national standards or with proficiencies from the conceptual framework.*

**Response:** Information on alignment of key dispositions assessments: alignment with state/national standards or with proficiencies from the conceptual framework has been provided. [Dispositions Data](#)

## Standard Two: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

### CONCERNS:

1. **The unit did not provide aggregated/analyzed candidate performance data from the programs that were not nationally reviewed.**

**Response:** Aggregated data for the MCEA program which is state recognized but not a nationally reviewed program due to low program completer numbers has been aggregated/analyzed across key decision points. The data includes total candidate count and percentage passing. **(Please refer to AFI: Item 1, Standard One evidence [Assessment Data](#)).** Aggregated data for the VOBT program which is state recognized but not a nationally reviewed program because there is no corresponding national SPA has been aggregated/analyzed across key decision points. [Assessment Data](#)

2. **Employer and alumni surveys were not provided.**

**Response:** Employer and alumni surveys are provided. **(Hard copies of employer and alumni surveys for the 2009-2010 cohort will be provided to the on-site BOE Team. [Follow up Survey data](#))**

**3. Disposition data were not provided for all decision points across programs.**

**Response:** Disposition data are provided for all decision points across programs. Disposition data for all programs has been disaggregated for each of the five dispositions assessed in the programs. (See Disposition Data folder [DISPOSITION DATA.](#))

**4. It was unclear if program improvements were data driven.**

**Response:** Program improvements are data driven. Data are collected and analyzed to evaluate the efficacy of courses, instructional practices, assessment procedures, clinical experiences, and programs. Both formative and summative data are analyzed. Changes in the program/unit or the assessment process and instruments are initiated based upon the results of data analysis. Program improvements and restructuring have been made using assessment data through informal means. Specifically, changes have been made in degree plans to include Praxis II: Content and PLT courses to assist candidates in preparing for successful completion of those assessments, restructured degree programs , a new assessment tool for ECED candidates for their birth to three year-old placement (Pre-K Practicum) [New Birth to three assessment tool.pdf](#); [Meeting minutes](#) ; [Degree plans](#)

**5. Unit data and improvements were not provided.**

**Response:** Unit data and improvements are provided. Multiple assessments are used to evaluate faculty on a systematic basis. Faculty complete self-evaluations as well as student, peer, and division chair evaluations. Multiple assessments are used to determine the effectiveness of the unit and its faculty (**See Table 2.1: Assessments of Unit Faculty**). The Division Chair does assessments of faculty with assistance from peers within the unit and students. Faculty members are involved in a series of assessments that include: the faculty self-evaluation, student evaluation of faculty, peer evaluation and finally, evaluation by the division's chair. [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development](#) The chair uses the data from the other three evaluations as a part of the chair's assessment of the faculty. The chair then provides the summary data to the faculty member who uses it as a basis for the following years' plans for professional development and to prepare for improved teaching, research and service performances. The chair also examines the faculty member's professional development activities, service, and grantsmanship to determine if that faculty member is upholding the institution's mission. The chair also uses this data as a basis for recommendations for tenure and promotion. Student evaluations are part of the overall faculty evaluation process. The chair's evaluations are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs to review the

areas of concern. However, unfavorable peer evaluations are usually left to the unit chair for corrective action(s).

**Table 2.1: Assessments of Faculty**

Faculty Assessment Data	Time of Collection	Person Responsible
Student Evaluations	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of November & 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of May	Division Chair
Faculty Self-Evaluation	End of April	Division Chair
Chair's Evaluation	End of Year	Division Chair
Peer Review	End of Year	Unit Faculty Member

**Assessments of Unit and Program**

The unit also uses multiple measures, including those listed in the “Assessments of Faculty,” to assess and evaluate the unit and its programs. Unit administrators review course syllabi, directed teacher interview data and final evaluations, Praxis II and III data, follow-up surveys, and the Title II Report. These reviews are shared with the Teacher Education Committee, and jointly, decisions are made for unit and program improvements.

**Table 2.2: Assessments of Unit and Programs**

Programs and Unit Assessment Data	Time of Collection	Person Responsible
Exit Interview Form	End of each Semester	Field Experience Coordinator
Praxis II	End of each Semester	Division Chair; Director of Research and Assessment
Praxis III	Between 1 <sup>st</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year of Teaching	Division Chair; Director of Research and Assessment
Final Evaluations of Directed Teachers	End of Each Semester	Cooperating Teaching, College Supervisor and Coordinator of Field Experiences

First-Year Teacher and Principal's Follow-Up Survey	End of First Year of Teaching	Field Experience Coordinator
Title II Report	End of Year	Division Chair

Unit improvements include password-protected access to Taskstream for all unit faculty to review and verify that candidate data are properly collected, analyzed, and evaluated. Also, faculty members make recommendations for unit improvement through the unit chair who then presents them to the Teacher Education Committee for discussion and advisement.

**6. Unit assessment system policies and procedures were not clearly defined.**

**Response:** Dr. Jesse Hargrove, the unit chair, oversees implementation of the policies and procedures of the unit assessment system. Mr. Angelo Thomas acts as the database manager for the unit assessment system. His role is input of the raw candidate data into the Database Management System and preliminary analysis of the data. Dr. Melanie Kennon, Field Coordinator, collects hard copy assessment data on all candidates throughout all decision points. [Data Collection](#) schedule. Dr. Kennon keeps records on Praxis I and II assessment information on candidates acquired from the Director of Research and Assessment. At the beginning of each semester, the candidate data from the previous semester is entered into the Database Management System (DMS) by Mr. Thomas. Faculty, then, meet to review decision point data and make any necessary programmatic changes. Major program adjustments are brought before the Teacher Education Committee which meets once per semester or as needed to interview candidates and review candidate performance and discuss systemic changes brought forward by unit faculty to improve candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Survey data for first-year teacher and employing principals are reviewed and analyzed by the unit for program improvement. [Meeting minutes](#); [Faculty, Unit, and Program Assessment.pdf](#); [Unit Assessment System](#)

**7. Rubrics for some decision points are not aligned to conceptual frameworks/ state and national standards for example, Candidate Dispositions.**

**Response:** Rubrics for all decision points are aligned to the unit's conceptual framework, state, and national standards. Candidate Dispositions are aligned with conceptual framework.

[Standards & Alignments of Competencies](#) . Also, see sample Dispositions rubric with standards alignment. [DISPOSITIONS DATA](#))

8. *Policies and procedures to ensure the reliability and validity of the assessment system were not clearly defined.*

**Response:** (See explanation available in [Promoting Fairness.pdf](#))

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Data collection and analysis: What are the policies/ procedures for the assessment system? How are unit data collected and analyzed?*  
**Response:** (Refer to Response for Standard 2: Concern #6 above)
2. *Data Collection and Analysis: What do the records and documentation of student complaints indicate about the unit's resolution of complaints?*  
**Response:** The unit has no documented student complaints. Any concerns that students have had have been resolved positively working with faculty advisors. The unit has a comment/complaint form which is available for student use.
3. *Use of data for Improvement: How does Taskstream support the candidates and the unit?*  
**Response:** The Taskstream system serves as an online display resource for aggregated and analyzed data. These data are then converted into charts, tables, reports, and graphs, which represent the analysis and interpretation of data on the unit and its candidates. The unit utilizes Taskstream candidate data to identify areas for candidate performance and program improvement. Through information collected in Taskstream, faculty is able to identify areas for individual candidate improvement and provide additional assistance and support for candidate growth in these areas.
4. *Assessment System: How do the advisory groups support the Unit's assessment system? How and when do all of the advisory groups (The Teacher Education Committee) meet? What is their charge?*  
**Response:** The Teacher Education Committee supports the unit's assessment system by reviewing curriculum changes and evaluating candidate performance at decision points. [The Teacher Education Committee.pdf](#)
5. *Data Collection and Analysis Programs: What do the dispositions data indicate about candidates' performance and program quality?*  
**Response:** Dispositions data indicate that all candidates are performing at Target or Acceptable levels. See specific analyses in [G:\DISPOSITIONS DATA](#)



6. *Examples of student complaints and their resolutions.*

**Response:** The unit has no documented student complaints. Any concerns that students have had have been resolved positively working with faculty advisors. The unit has a comment/complaint form which is available for student use.

7. *Examples of how faculty are making sure that assessments are fair, reliable, and valid for the purposes to which they are applied.*

**Response:** [Promoting Fairness.pdf](#)

8. *Examples of faculty evaluations and course evaluations.*

**Response:** [G:\Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development](#)

### Standard Three: Field/ Clinical Experiences

#### CONCERNS:

1. **Clarify how candidates integrate technology with instruction in their field experiences.**

**Response:** Candidates have specific assignments in both Level II and Level III Field/ Clinical experiences which ask them to prepare and use technology in the teaching /learning process. In Level III Directed Teaching, candidates must document in lesson plans how they have used technology in their teaching and are assessed on their effectiveness. Most, if not all, classrooms at candidate placement sites have access to SMARTBOARDS, PowerPoint, classroom computers, and other instructional resources which candidates may use in delivery of instruction. Additionally, candidates are asked to compile appropriate Internet resources that can be utilized to supplement lessons taught. (See assignments in Directed Teaching and Internships I and II, for example.) These technological resources are documented in the candidates' reflective journals and portfolios. This ensures that candidates are systematically evaluated in their use of technology in the teaching and learning process at each decision point. (**Evidence:** Field/ Clinical Portfolios, lesson plans [Field and Clinical Experience Lesson Plan Format.pdf](#), course syllabi (objectives and assignments addressing the use of technology) [Syllabi](#) in the teaching/learning process. See also, Data Table on **Technology Competencies** , disaggregated across programs and across key assessment points [Technology Competencies](#) .)

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Clarification of field experiences for all programs: How will the unit be able to support the extensive requirements of the state, in particular, Common Core standards for mathematics and literacy?*

**Response:** Work with Arkansas public schools has just begun on the Common Core roll-out for the state. (See Dr. Tom Kimbrell, Commissioner of Education's letter to Arkansas Parents [Common Core Connections](#). "In 2011-12 school year, Arkansas schools began implementing the Common Core State Standards in grades K-2... Students in grades 3-8 will begin the transition to Common Core in the fall 2012, and full implementation will be in place for all grades in 2014-15.") As we transition to the Common Core standards for mathematics and literacy in Arkansas, cooperating teachers in field placement sites have been enlisted to work with our candidates to expose them to lesson planning which incorporate the new standards. Philander Smith College education faculty will work during the 2012-2013 school year to infuse Common Core into course requirements and take part in professional development to educate themselves about Common Core.

2. *Examples of revised curriculum for ensuring a 100% pass rate on examinations.*

**Response:** [G:\Praxis II course syllabi](#) and see highlighted courses in program degree plans [G:\Degree plans](#)

3. *Data related to student learning: How are candidates showing they can assess student learning?*

**Response:** See [Impact on student learning](#) data tables and candidate examples.

4. *Design and implementation of fieldwork: How is the fieldwork reflective of the five FORCE principles?*

**Response:** See Field Clinical Handbooks onsite.

5. *Design and implementation of field work: The PATHWISE instructional plan is referenced as Exhibit 3.3e; however 3.3e is the Field handbooks.*

**Response:** (See [Field and Clinical Experience Lesson Plan Format.pdf](#) and [Field Clinical Experience Instructional Profile Form.pdf](#))

6. *Design and implementation of fieldwork: Exhibit 3.3b does not contain the listed policies and procedure handbook.*

**Response:** See "Policy and Practices" document in [Exhibit 3.3b revised](#)

#### **Standard Four: Diversity**

**CONCERNS: NONE**

While there were no specific areas of concern for Standard Four, it was mentioned that no data was supplied to show the number of candidates, if any, who actually complete their clinical practice in partner schools with higher degrees of racial and ethnic diversity. A table has been supplied to show the racial and ethnic diversity in each partner school and the number of our candidates across programs which have completed field/ clinical experiences in these schools. **(See folder entitled CANDIDATE ASSIGNMENTS TO DIVERSE PARTNER SCHOOLS [Diversity Proficiencies](#)).**

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Faculty diversity. What steps is the unit taking to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of its faculty?*

**Response:** When the need for additional faculty arises, the unit will follow the institutional policy related to hiring as described on the Accreditation page of the Philander Smith College Course Catalog (2011-2013). The unit advertises locally and nationally to attract qualified diverse faculty.

2. *Candidate diversity. What is the diversity of the candidates in the education programs? What opportunities does the unit provide to candidates to allow them to interact with peers from diverse groups? Where are data showing diversity in socioeconomic status of the candidates in the education programs?*

**Response:** The Unit's candidates engage in educational experiences that allow them to interact with male and female candidates from different socioeconomic groups and ethnic/racial groups. A professional relationship has been developed with Lyons College, a HLDCU (historically less diverse college and university) located in Batesville, AR. Its student population is 85% white-non-Hispanic and is in an area where the nearest school that serves a diverse student population is 35 miles away. Initially, the plan was for the two institutions to offer a joint course focusing on the theme of educating diverse and exceptional learners. Two faculty members from Philander Smith participated in the course curriculum design and online discussions. To date, the partnership has not been formally adopted, however, students and faculty from both campuses currently engage in periodic reciprocal campus visits to make presentations and share their culturally diverse experiences. Pre-service teachers from colleges and universities across the state also participate in a training conference facilitated by the Arkansas Education Association. This conference is built around the National Education Association's (NEA) C.A.R.E (Culture, Abilities, Resilience, and Effort) materials. These materials focus on the themes of cultural, economic, and language differences; unrecognized and undeveloped abilities; the power of resilience; and the importance of effort and motivation. This training format allows pre-service teachers who are both culturally and ethnically diverse to study and dialogue together. Two faculty members from Lyons and one from Philander are N.E.A. C.A.R.E. trainers and facilitate this annual

training event. A third opportunity for interaction among ethnically/racially diverse candidates is provided through the Unit's candidate led Student-Arkansas Education Association Chapter's annual spring education conference. Pre-service teacher candidates from majority white and Historically Black Colleges and University campuses are invited to make professional presentations and dialogue regarding common challenges.

See 4.3.e [G:\4.3.e Data Table on Candidates' Demographics – Fall 2011.pdf](#).

3. *Data and explanation of figures that support the NSSE index.* (Information available in Office of Institutional Research.)

**Response:** Data and explanation of figures that support the National Survey of Student Engagement Index (NSSE) can be obtained from the Office of Institutional Research. These data include benchmark comparisons and the NSSE 2.0 Pilot 2012 Frequency Distributions.

4. *Assessments and data related to candidates' diversity proficiencies? What is the unit learning from these assessments?*

**Response:** We currently use specific competency to be found on our Field II (ECED: Pre-K Practicum, Primary Practicum; MCEA: Internships I and II; VOBT: Internships I and II; and Field III instruments (Pre-K Directed Teaching and Primary Directed Teaching; MCEA and VOBT (Directed Teaching I and II) to identify how well our candidates are performing in teaching racially and ethnically diverse students as well as their impact on student learning. Results from these assessments indicated that our candidates are performing at or above the acceptable level (2.0) and are moving toward target (3.0). The data, however, have indentified the need to use additional assignments such as lesson plan formats that identify specific strategies to be used for impacting the learning of ethnically and racially diverse student populations. As a result, candidates must indicate on all lesson plans how they will accommodate for ELL students, in particular and other students with exceptionalities. Instructional and Class Profile instruments have been designed for use by candidates that will require them to identify the racially and ethnically diverse student populations, to include those with specific exceptionalities.

[Diversity Proficiencies](#) ; [Impact on student learning](#)

### **Standard Five: Faculty Qualification, Performance, and Development**

#### **CONCERNS:**

1. *There was little evidence as to the engagement of faculty in scholarship activities*

**Response:** A summary and detailed evidence of faculty service and scholarship can be found in the folder labeled Exhibit 5.3.e in [Faculty](#) .

2. *There was little evidence as to how the faculty participates in professional development.*

**Response:** The unit systematically evaluates its' faculty through student evaluations, peer evaluations, and chairperson evaluations to improve their performances. Further, the unit provides for faculty development through grants, workshops, and seminars. Funds are set-aside in the institution's budget for the purpose of faculty development. 90% of the unit's faculty belongs to professional organizations and they attend and present at conferences in their areas of expertise. They also attend seminars, workshops, and other related activities. 100% of the Education full-time faculty participates annually in various professional development activities. (See faculty vita for professional development and listings of scholarly activities and service [Faculty](#). See also, Division of Education Professional development budget. [Professional Development Budget.xlsx](#))

3. *The unit did not provide evidence for the evaluations of faculty.*

**Response:** Evidence of faculty evaluations can be found in folders labeled "Faculty Evaluations" and "Excerpt from Faculty Handbook" in [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development](#).

4. *There was limited evidence provided on adjunct faculty.* Adjuncts hold master's degrees in their respective fields. Department/division chairs evaluate adjunct faculty members. Student evaluations are the primary source of information for chairs although peer observation is also encouraged. Adjunct faculty members meet with the department/division chairs each semester. They receive copies of all information and announcements either electronically or via a print medium. Adjunct faculty are invited to all departmental and unit meetings and involved in faculty development.

**Response:** Credentials and professional experience of adjunct faculty can be found in Exhibit 5.3.a. in [Faculty](#).

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Licensure of school-based faculty. Are school based faculty licensed in the fields that they teach and /or supervise?*

**Response:** Qualifications of Cooperating teachers/Clinical faculty assigned to PSC candidates in the public schools are guaranteed by the school district and building principal on the front end of the field assignment process. All Arkansas School Districts are held accountable by the Arkansas Department of Education Office of Standards and Assurances that they are assigning "well-qualified" teachers (as defined by No Child Left Behind) to their classrooms. School District Principals in our designated partner schools understand the importance of the placement of teacher candidates with "well-qualified" teachers in their building sites. Cooperating teachers for PSC are required to hold a standard or advanced professional license in the area of teaching for which they are assigned, have a minimum of three years of classroom teaching experience, and a consistent pattern of satisfactory ratings from their building supervisor. The building principal ensures that these criteria are met in working with the Field Coordinator to determine candidate placement each semester.

2. *Vitae from higher education clinical faculty documenting contemporary professional; experiences in school settings at the level they supervise.*

**Response:** Vitae for higher education faculty are provided in folder labeled "faculty vitae" in [Faculty](#).

3. *Qualifications of professional education faculty*

**Response:** Qualifications of professional education faculty can be found in folder labeled "clinical faculty vitae" in [Faculty](#).

4. *Faculty use of technology and systematic engagement in self-assessment. What surveys or other evidence show faculty engagement in these areas?*

**Response:** Faculty self-evaluate their performance annually. [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development\Faculty evaluations\Self Evaluation Performance of Faculty in the Teacher Education Unit Fall 2007-2012.pdf](#).

The opportunity for faculty to self-assess their use of technology can be found in the [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development\Faculty evaluations\TEACHING FACULTY SELF evaluation.pdf](#).

5. *The unit's evaluation of faculty performance and its facilitation of professional development. [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development](#); [Professional Development budget.xlsx](#)*

6. *Faculty evaluations. In what other ways than candidate evaluations are adjuncts evaluated? What professional development opportunities are provided to adjunct faculty? Are tenured faculty members evaluated?*

**Response:** Adjuncts are evaluated by semester using student and chair evaluations. Adjuncts are invited and encouraged to participate in all professional development opportunities offered through the college. Adjuncts participate in mandatory orientation and training activities conducted by the Office of Academic Affairs. Tenured faculty are evaluated annually using the same criteria for other full-time faculty [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development](#). [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development\Excerpt from Faculty Handbook Faculty Evaluations.pdf](#). [Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development\Faculty Handbook, 2010.pdf](#).

7. *How is the new Online Course (OCE) system used by faculty to reflect on their teaching performance?*

**Response:** Results of faculty evaluations from the Online Course Evaluation system are made available each semester so that faculty can reflect on their teaching performance and make any necessary adjustments.

### **Standard Six: Unit Governance and Resources**

#### **CONCERNS:**

1. *The unit's use of part-time faculty may impact the unit's ability to deliver programs. (Include % of full-time and part-time faculty and how adjunct faculty are evaluated.)*

**Response:** Education courses for MCEA and ECED are taught primarily by full-time faculty in the unit with the exception of perhaps one course per semester that must be covered by an adjunct because of faculty course loads. In the VOB program, most education-related courses are taught by the part-time faculty member; however, content courses are typically covered by full-time Business and Technology faculty. Adjunct faculty are evaluated using the same criteria as full-time faculty. (See pg 13 "Faculty Evaluation" in the **Adjunct Faculty Handbook**. [Faculty](#))

2. *The unit's budget does not delineate how scholarship and technological initiatives are funded.*

**Response:** Funding for scholarship and technological initiatives can be found in [Division of Education Budget.xlsx](#).

3. *Data regarding faculty overload were not clearly defined; therefore it is not clear as to the percentage of faculty with an overload.*

**Response:** Data regarding faculty loads can be found in [Faculty Teaching Loads\Faculty load grid 1032012.pdf](#)

A normal teaching load for a full-time faculty member without administrative duties is 12 credit hours per semester. Six credit hours is a normal teaching assignment during a five-week summer term. Overloads are considered based on the needs of the unit. Adjustments in load may be made on the basis of the following factors:

- 1) Administrative duties; 2) Direction of student co-curricular activities; 3) Release time for research and professional growth activities; 4) Duties pertaining to accreditation; 5) Special assignments by the Division Chair or Vice President of Academic Affairs; 6) Committee duties pertaining to faculty governance.

4. *The unit collaboration with other divisions of the college and faculty could not be determined.*

**Response:** The Unit collaborates with other divisions of the college to address candidate needs in preparation for Praxis I basic skills assessments, to align general education course requirements with expectations for knowledge and skills for education candidates, and to co-design courses that prepare our candidates for licensure in middle level content. [Collaboration](#)

5. *The unit did not provide information on support personnel.*

**Response:** The unit receives support from the Office of Academic Affairs. Dr. Annie Williams serves as NCATE Coordinator. The unit also gets support from Academic Success Center personnel for tutoring. The unit has one full-time administrative assistant, Mrs. Donna Collins, who supports the unit operations. Additionally, the unit has available 1-2 work-study students, typically education majors, per semester that are available to assist in unit projects, etc.

6. *The total funding for the unit is not clear.*

**Response:** Total funding for the unit can be found in [Education.Budgets.Teacher Education Unit Technology Budget.10.01.2012.pdf](#).

**EVIDENCE for onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

1. *Unit Budget: Is the unit's budget adequate to address its needs of faculty scholarship and technological advances?*



**Response:** Yes, the unit's budget is adequate to address its needs of faculty scholarship and technological advances. [Education.Budgets.Teacher Education Unit Technology Budget.10.01.2012.pdf](#).

2. *Unit Governance: Does the unit have an adequate budget and governance structure to effectively plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs? The team will need to **confirm** governance structure and funding needs through faculty and candidate **interviews**.*

**Response:** The unit has an adequate budget and governance structure to effectively plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs. The team will confirm governance structure and funding needs through faculty and candidate interviews. The unit has a governance structure and its system is structured so that all professional education programs are organized, unified, and coordinated. The chair of the division of education serves as the unit head. A full-time coordinator of field experiences supports the chair. The chair reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who in turn reports to the President of the College.

3. *Unit Resources: Does the evidence indicate adequate technology resources for preparing candidates for teaching and learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? The team will need to **confirm** technology and facilities.*

**Response:** The evidence indicates adequate technology resources for preparing candidates for teaching and learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century are available. The team will confirm technology and facilities.

4. *Professional Development and Technology Training: What types of professional development and technology training are provided to part-time faculty?*

**Response:** Part-time faculty may participate in all professional development and technology training on campus and locally. These opportunities include the faculty/staff institute, campus-wide faculty meetings, technology training offered by CIS (Computer Information Services), U-Compass, Jenzabar training, I-Tunes training, Arkansas Department of Education workshops, and faculty senate meetings.

5. *Unit Personnel: How does the unit manage its use of part-time faculty and adjuncts to ensure program coherence and quality?*

**Response:** Part-time faculty and adjuncts are expected to adhere to the unit's program curricula and professional responsibilities. Program coherence and quality are ensured through the faculty evaluation process as are full-time faculty. The Vice President for Academic Affairs conducts an adjunct faculty orientation each semester in order to share faculty fundamentals and college processes.

# Response to April 2008 NCATE Accreditation Action Report AFI's:

---

Dr. Walter M. Kimbrough Page 1



Philander Smith College  
Little Rock, Arkansas

April 2008

## ACCREDITATION DECISION

Accreditation is continued at the initial teacher preparation level. This removes the condition from Standard 2 and returns the institution to its regular accreditation cycle. The next on-site visit will take place in fall 2012.

*Please refer to the Board of Examiners report for strengths of the unit and for additional information on findings and areas for improvement.*

## STANDARDS SUMMARY

Standards	Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP)	Advanced Preparation (ADV)
*1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Met	n/a
*2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	n/a
*3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	n/a
*4 Diversity	Met	n/a
*5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	n/a
*6 Unit Governance and Resources	Met	n/a

## AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The following areas for improvement (AFIs) should be addressed before the unit's next on-site visit by NCATE. Progress made toward eliminating them should be reported in Part C of the unit's annual report to NCATE. The Board of Examiners (BOE) team will indicate in its report at the next visit whether the

institution has adequately addressed each of the AFIs.

If the accreditation decision is to remove a condition or provision, the AFIs for the standard that had previously not been met have been updated to reflect the changes as a result of the submission of documentation or a focused visit. The AFIs for other standards from the previous action report are listed below.

**STANDARD 1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

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

1	The middle childhood education program is not nationally recognized.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ITP <input type="checkbox"/> ADV
---	--	---

**STANDARD 5 - Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

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

1	Scholarship activity is not consistent across faculty in the unit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ITP <input type="checkbox"/> ADV
---	--	---

*NOTE: Neither NCATE staff, team members, nor other agents of NCATE are empowered to make or modify Unit Accreditation Board decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Unit Accreditation Board itself. This Accreditation Action Report is available to the public upon receipt of a request in writing.*

## April 2008 NCATE Report Areas for Improvement

### **Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Disposition**

The middle level program is not nationally recognized.

**Response** - See below the question from Dr. Hervey (Philander Smith College, Middle Level Coordinator) and response regarding the Middle Level Generalist Program from Dr. Lucas (Arkansas Department of Education Program Advisor – Teacher Preparation).

**Question (February 2010):** “When are we required to submit our SPA? We will not have accrued three years of data by 2012 (our next NCATE visit). What specific guidance can you give us in this regard?”

**Response(February 2010):** “Your SPA report for the MCE program will not be due until at least five candidates have completed the program during a 3-year period. NCATE is currently working on a process to handle low-enrollment programs such as this, and these programs are not required to report until the new process is implemented.”

### **Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

Scholarship activity is not consistent across faculty in the unit.

Please see the detailed evidence of faculty development in Standard 5 of the 2012 report.

[G:\Faculty\Exhibit 5.3.e Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools and community](#)