

NCATE 2001 Annual Report (Part C of the AACTE Annual Report)

Section A. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

We have completed the revision of our Conceptual Framework to be in alignment with the NCATE 2000 standards. The document was written and approved by our NCATE Divisional Committee. The committee's composition is that of department chairs, faculty (university and school), and administrative staff from all departments from the School of Education and Allied Professions as well as representatives from Art, Music, Speech Pathology, and Arts & Sciences.

During the revision process, we have modified our institutional standards to be in closer alignment with national standards (INTASC), and state standards (Ohio Department of Education), and Praxis III™ Teacher Performance Assessments. Beginning with the graduating class of 2002, teacher education graduates will need to demonstrate proficiency in Praxis III as entry year teachers, to receive their initial five-year professional license in the state of Ohio.

Conceptual framework weaknesses cited as a result of the last NCATE review: N/A

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates include persons preparing to teach, teachers who are continuing their professional development, and persons preparing for other professional roles in schools such as principals, school psychologists, and school library media specialists, 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. "All students" includes students with exceptionalities, and of different ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, socioeconomic, and regional/geographic origins, learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Institutional standards are reflected in the unit's conceptual framework and include candidate proficiencies.

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard. (Refer to the NCATE 2000 Unit Transition Plan for information regarding the levels at which units should address Standards 1 and 2 during the first 4 years of NCATE 2000 implementation.)

We submitted our licensure programs for national review by the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) in September. Copies of the documents were also sent to the Ohio Department of Education. In addition, we reported to ODE (in separate, compiled documents) minor/major revisions made in all our licensure programs since approval was gained during the spring of 1998.

Alignment of assessments such as INTASC and Praxis III has been completed within our licensure programs. During the curriculum scanning process, program coordinators met with faculty teaching within their particular licensure program(s) and indicated overlaps and gaps in the implementation of the nineteen criteria of Praxis III and ten INTASC standards within required courses. This process fell into place nicely since we had just aligned our former certification-based institutional standards with the new licensure programs, as well as aligning them with national and state standards.

Multiple forms of communication has occurred with faculty and staff as a means of awareness regarding the NCATE 2000 standards as well as developmental in addressing the implementation of them in our work. The standards have been addressed in program, department, and divisional meetings. This has been facilitated through written, oral, and electronic formats. A website has also been established as a vehicle for communication for faculty and staff within the unit, as well as a source of information regarding accreditation.

In addressing the Transitional Plan we have done the following:

- a. make decisions about candidate qualifications and performance at program admission, at appropriate transition points (including clinical practice entry and exit points), and at program completion –

The assessment committee has created a timeline for the implementation of our newly designed assessment plan. We have in place benchmarks for candidates' progress within each of our programs but are now adding the portfolio review process as an additional requirement to ensure the meeting of national, state, and institutional standards. There are established benchmarks for entrance into: a program, methods, before student teaching, and before graduation can occur. Programs will determine the specific requirements regarding artifacts such as: what may be required artifacts from specific courses and site experiences; what artifacts may be the choice of the candidate; and within the portfolio review process, how will the growth and development of the candidate be demonstrated.

- b. demonstrate that admission requirements are related to candidate success. –

This has been previously in place for our different benchmarks. There has been an additional modification made since last year's report in the alignment of our candidates' portfolio components to the previously established criteria

of GPA within one's major and cumulative; required content courses; speech and hearing test; etc. Our programs are now determining the specifics regarding required artifacts at each benchmark and the procedures and structure of the different review panels to be used throughout the process.

Weaknesses related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review: Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses. N/A

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Please describe the unit's plan for and progress in meeting this standard. (Refer to the NCATE 2000 Unit Transition Plan for Information regarding the levels at which units should address Standards 1 and 2 during the first 4 years of NCATE 2000 implementation.)

- A. use the results from candidate assessments to evaluate and make improvements in the unit, its programs, courses, teaching, and field and clinical experiences. -

Besides the graduate surveys we have been compiling for many years. This past August we distributed a survey to superintendents and other school administrators. The purpose of the survey was to address the hiring and perceived effectiveness of Miami University's teacher preparation and other school personnel candidates as employees. Information derived from the surveys is in the process of being shared with faculty and staff. Improvements will be recommended based upon the compiled results, as deemed pertinent. Approximately 60% of those surveyed responded.

We have now designed uniform site/field experience forms instead of each program and/or department distributing a different form for each site/field experience. This modification will not only be less complicated for our partner school faculty to complete from the varied programs our candidates come from, but will also now better address the meeting of our institutional standards in a common format for the purpose of aggregating data.

- B. use results from assessments of unit operations (e.g. faculty evaluations, graduate surveys, employee surveys) to evaluate and make improvements in the unit, its programs, courses, teaching, and field and clinical experiences.

This has been done as noted above. One example of an improvement has been in the availability of advisors for graduate students who are only on campus for evening classes. Because of this need being indicated, some advisors are now available during evening hours to meet with these students and assist to address advising needs. Other areas that have been addressed include such things as course offerings and scheduling conflicts and modifications have been made as deemed appropriate to do so.

The Assessment Committee (a sub-group of the NCATE Divisional Committee) has designed a unit assessment plan. One of the preliminary stages was to do a curricular scan of the assessments in our licensure courses. The information acquired established the groundwork for the addressing of standards (national, state, and institutional) within our courses, programs, and unit.

The next phase was the development of our unit portfolio. This instrument was chosen for multiple reasons: (1) It would ensure that national, state, and institutional standards would be addressed and reviewed in an objective format through the implementation of a rubric system; (2) It would involve a developmental process of each candidate's growth within their chosen program by having candidates demonstrate growth over time in the meeting of each of the standards; (3) It would systemize across all programs formats for gathering data yet also allow flexibility within each program in determining the required elements/artifacts specific to their program and respective Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, at specific benchmarks established within each program.

Weaknesses related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review: Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses. N/A

Section C. Unit Capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

Student fieldwork is coordinated across eight blocked course semesters in the curriculum, and field experiences and student teaching are managed divisionally. Five full-time supervisors were utilized this year to support student teachers, and student teaching sites were clustered to facilitate travel.

The Office of Student Teaching and Field Placement is expanding diverse international sites for student teaching. Luxembourg and Germany host a full-time Oxford faculty member annually to supervise students and teach a capstone seminar. Guadalajara, Mexico, continues to serve students through a private university partner. A summer field course is co-sponsored at Cape Coast University in Ghana by the School of Education and Allied Professions, and a student-teaching option is available. Bunbury, Australia, became a student teaching site in Spring 2001 with 27 students. A full-time Oxford faculty member supervised and taught a capstone field experience in cultures of Australia.

Student teaching is to become available in Bermuda pending availability of student housing.

We have established a database of Pathwise-trained faculty and have worked closely with school districts to place our candidates with Pathwise™ or Praxis III™ trained cooperating teachers during their clinical experiences, whenever possible. Having a common vocabulary of best teaching practices has been an important plus in the implementation of the Praxis III criteria within our curriculum and assessment tools. In addition, we have trained 856 school and 77-university faculty (60 from Miami) in Pathwise™ Level I training and are beginning our third year as the fiscal agent for the Region 5 Praxis III™ site.

This semester we have implemented the pilot use of our new field/site experience forms, which addresses the meeting our institutional standards while our candidates are in field or clinical experiences. The use of the revised tool will continue to be refined from input gained from school and university faculty as it is being utilized.

Weaknesses related to standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review: Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses. N/A

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

The School of Education and Allied Professions (EAP) student-of-color enrollment is 169 students of a total undergraduate enrollment of 2,247 or 7%. An aggressive graduate student enrollment plan has been implemented in cooperation with our graduate school. Of 390 masters, doctoral, and education-specialist students, 48 or 12% are students of color. Twelve, or 11% of 104 full-time tenured or tenure-track EAP faculty are faculty of color. EAP has 53 women faculty (45.2% of divisional faculty), three of whom were hired in 2000-2001. Thirty women (26% of total faculty) are at assistant or associate professor rank.

Diversity initiatives included diversity benchmarking, assisting planning for the Center for American and World Cultures, its lecture series and director search, and planning a course for the new American and World Cultures requirement. EAP facilitated pre-college programs for diverse high school students and provided grants through project MIND, an initiative that received national attention in *US News & World Report*. The divisional Diversity Committee conducted a climate survey, Data from 1998 and 2000 surveys indicate continuing perception of acceptable tolerance within the School, with some concern about visibility issues for faculty of color and women. The EAP faculty

development series focused on diversity through discussion of inclusion and democratic values. An EAP workshop for area teachers was held in conjunction with the *Imagining Russia* festival in March.

Our faculty, staff and student teachers had multiple opportunities for engagement with African-American, Appalachian and Latino communities in nine partner school sites in Cincinnati, Madeira, Mason, Hamilton, Middletown, Monroe, and Ross, Ohio. An EDP class provided 288 hours of tutoring in Hamilton's Jefferson Elementary School, where there is a growing Latino population. Divisional sophomores completed early field/site work in 55 social agencies and 29 preschool settings in Ansonia, Edgewood, Fairfield, Hamilton, Mason, Middletown, Colerain, Ross and Oxford, Ohio. The Institute for Educational Renewal in cooperation with the Butler County Mental Health Board and Miami's Psychology, Nursing, Educational Psychology, Physical Education, Health & Sport Studies departments and the Graduate School implemented a school mental health grant in 13 Butler County schools.

There has also been a change in our Miami Plan (Liberal Arts) relevant to diversity at the university level. A 3-hour course requirement (new Foundation IIIB) will provide students with the facts, theories, and methods of inquiry needed to comprehend difference and to make informed judgments about the issues arising from difference. It is believed that the required course will help create a university-wide focus on diversity in the curriculum and community. FSW (Family Studies and Social Work), a department within The School of Education and Allied Professions, has submitted a course, FSW 261, to meet this requirement.

**Weaknesses related to standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:
Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses. N/A**

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performances, 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 and facilitates professional development.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

The 104 continuing EAP faculty reported these scholarly publications in 2000-2001: 41 books in print, in press or under contract; 51 book chapters; 97 refereed journal articles; 6 textbooks; 1 online publication; 81 papers read at professional meetings. A public reception was held on January 23 honoring Miami authors whose books appeared in 2000. Eight of the 48 published authors recognized (17%) were EAP faculty.

Additionally, the following scholarly or creative activities occurred: 22 faculty served on editorial boards of refereed journals; 19 faculty served as officers in professional organizations; an EDP professor was Past President of the National Association of School Psychologists; and EDL professor was selected for Harvard University's Summer Leadership Program; an FSW professor was named Miami Alumni Teaching Scholar; a PHS professor was given the Richard T. Delp Outstanding Faculty Award; An EDL professor held an Undergraduate Summer Scholar Award; and EDP professor was awarded membership in the Alumni Teaching Scholar Program; and 46 faculty engaged in CELT mentoring, grants, conferences, discussions, or service.

External funding for 14 grants or awards was reported. A total of \$1,593,789. was awarded from: Ohio Department of Education; National Science Foundation; Ohio Board of Regents; State of Illinois; State of Wisconsin; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Butler County Mental Health Board; and W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

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

(Initial Teacher Preparation only) Some secondary supervisors are not licensed nor have experience in the subject areas they are supervising.)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses:

Two of our secondary supervisors were former elementary principals. We also have some on-site supervisors in some of our partner schools with a designated university professor/supervisor as the main contact person. Additionally, we have refined our supervisors' assignments so that there is only one main contact per district. This has eliminated our former practice of having multiple supervisors coming and going within the same buildings. It has also permitted a smaller radius of travel time to and from each site, which results in more time within the classroom with our candidates and their cooperating teachers. This has been noted as a positive modification by both our supervisors and school faculty.

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes, and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in the unit this year:

Barbara Schirmer became Dean of the School of Education and Allied Professions on July 1, 2001. She replaced Curt Ellison who served a three-year term as Interim Dean for the division. James Shiveley is now serving as Acting Chair of Teacher Education for the 2001-2002 year, succeeding David Killian, who retired from Miami on June 30, 2001. Our division's organizational structure is currently being examined with modifications being recommended to better address the changing needs of the preparation of teachers and other school personnel.

Since 1998 divisional planning has sought to close out certification programs, phase in licensure majors across all EAP departments, and balance required curricular offerings with faculty resources and student enrollment in order to establish predictability for temporary staffing and priorities for tenure-track hiring. Key elements of this approach are managing admission to fixed-size curriculum cohorts in all licensure majors according to student quality and preparation, establishing standard section sizes and faculty workloads, and utilizing a mix of faculty types.

EAP successfully piloted wireless Internet access by students using laptop computers in the classroom. Project Mentor, a three-year \$519,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education, supported thirteen professional development faculty projects for integration of technology in instruction and initiated a video demonstration project. A web project partnership with Apple Computer, hosted by Apple, began developing an Integrated Curriculum Exchange Database. This Miami Partners in Learning Interchange showcased learning resources developed by Miami students from one graduate and five undergraduate courses.

We are presently piloting the use of *LiveText*[™] as one of four universities/colleges within Ohio. *LiveText*[™] helps faculty and candidates incorporate standards into curriculum planning, lab/field activities, and in assessments. The program provides solutions for standards, accreditation, portfolios, and collaborative teaching among faculty, candidates and partner schools and alumni, since it supports the alumni one year beyond graduation.

New laboratories and offices in Phillips Hall for the dietetic program were opened in 2001 and the phased renovation of Phillips continued through the year. Roudebush Hall occupants of McGuffey Hall south are scheduled to return to Roudebush in mid-year 2001-2002. At that point or earlier the McGuffey program of requirements will be revised and active planning for its renovation, which was suspended in 1998, will resume.

**Weaknesses related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:
Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses. N/A**

Other evaluations, changes or improvements during this year:

Our new dean has initiated a strategic plan for the School of Education and Allied Professions for 2001-2002. The plan is complementary to our university President's "First in 2009" initiatives established for Miami University. The eight goals of Dean Schirmer's plan are listed below, along with a brief description of priority.

- Goal 1: Strengthen the Academic Qualifications of Entering Students
 - (A) Develop of a new enrollment management plan
 - (B) Strengthening graduate programming
- Goal 2: Strengthen the Academic Qualifications of New Faculty and the Academic Support for All Faculty
 - (A) Recruitment of Faculty to Tenure-track Positions
 - (B) Provide Training
 - (C) Provide Faculty Development
- Goal 3 – Develop a Curriculum for the 21st Century
 - (A) Examine the Curriculum
 - (B) Engage in Partnerships with Professional Community
- Goal 4 – Strengthen Academic Standards and Enrich Campus Intellectual and Cultural Life
 - (A) Advance knowledge and practice through faculty and student scholarship
 - (B) Develop curriculum outcome measures
 - (C) Create a forum for discussing connections with EAP and between EAP and professional communities
- Goal 5 – Increase the Diversity of the Faculty, Staff, and Student Body
 - (A) Develop a diversity plan
 - (B) Carry out aggressive recruitment of faculty to tenure-track positions
- Goal 6 – Enhance the Campus, Buildings, and System
 - (A) Plan for McGuffey Hall renovation
 - (B) Complete Phillips Hall renovation
 - (C) Infuse technology systematically into instruction, communication, and problem solving
 - (D) Enhance web site
- Goal 7 –Strengthen University Revenue Base
 - (A) Increase the endowment
 - (B) Pursue external funding
 - (C) Manage current resources
- Goal 8 – Improve Benchmarking with Peer Institutions
 - (A) Link peer institutions to specific goals in the strategic Plan
 - (B) Develop a continuous improvement plan

Other weaknesses cited as a result of the last NCATE review: N/A
Please indicate how the unit has addressed these weaknesses.

Section 4. – Program Information from Title II, Appendix C, Institutional Questionnaire, Section II, Program Information.

(Note: The data reported here should be identical to what was submitted to your state on April 7, 2001)

A. Enrollment: What was the total number of students enrolled in your teacher preparation program during the academic year 1999-2000, including all areas of specialization? **2,081**
(total number of enrolled students; from Question A.1)

B. Supervised student teaching: How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000 (total students in supervised teaching: from Question B.2) **512**

Number of supervising faculty

	<u>1999-2000</u>	<u>Prior Year</u>
Appointed full-time faculty in Professional education	106	N/A
Appointed part time faculty in professional education and full-time in institution	12	N/A
Appointed part-time in professional education; not otherwise employed by institution	27	N/A
Total supervising faculty	32/145	N/A

Participation data: (question 5)

- The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: 34.5 hours.
- The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is: 15 weeks.
- The total number of hours required is: 490 hours.

Additional Changes in the Unit:

Enter the Name of the Person Filling Out the Report: Donna Hanby, NCATE Coordinator.