Graduate Council Program Review
Teacher and Counselor Education
Reaction/Response to Report of Review Team and Actions Taken to Address Recommendations
August 30, 2010

The faculty and staff welcomed the opportunity to conduct a self-study and participate in an open and thorough review of the program and hope to embrace and utilize the recommendations set forth from the review team. The recommendations come at an opportune time as the University is asking for realignment and restricting to focus more specifically on the Strategic Plan and to address the potential economic impacts to higher education in Oregon.

Several University level initiatives are in play that in addition to the recommendations of the Graduate Review will have long term and significant impact on the College of Education. Additionally, the OUS Task Force on Teacher Education has identified the following as priorities for the state: Follow up surveys of employers of OUS institutions, New Teacher Induction, and a focus on preparing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) teachers all of which support the refocus of this new unit. Efforts are also underway to expand programs at the OSU Cascades campus with a focus on education and counseling. Through the university realignment process the College of Education is located within the Division of Arts and Sciences. The new organization of the college will reflect a faculty of the whole including Adult and Higher Education, Teacher and Counselor Education, Science and Mathematics Education (formerly in the College of Science), and the Science and Math Investigative Learning Experiences Program with a focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics and cultural and linguistic diversity. The faculty from Youth Development Education (YDE) has been moved to the College of Health and Human Sciences).

A preliminary draft of the proposed reorganization/restructure was submitted to the Dean in March (refer to Appendix A). This proposal included a proposed mission statement, research agenda, and organizational structure. The planning group will revisit this proposal in the fall and develop a timeline and implementation plan as part of a modified Category I with the intent that these changes will be effective July 1, 2011. The findings from the self-study and the recommendations of this graduate review will provide useful data for this group and the tasks forces addressing focused issues (refer to Appendix B). Several of the implementation tasks and decisions address concerns raised by this review. The list is by no means complete, but provides the reviewers an idea of the process involved in this restructuring of particular interest to the review committee are the questions related to strategic staffing and programming:

1) Align tenured-line and instructor faculty job descriptions to meet the mission of the college and research expectations.
2) Pathways for yearly evaluation & Tenure/Promotion reporting structure for all (tenure-line and instructor) faculty.
3) Build and strengthen synergies of collaborations on research and programs within college, division, and university.
4) Construct infrastructure to support effective and efficient program clusters
5) Program sustainability – what number of faculty, graduates, and enrolled students are necessary to make a program viable?
6) Where do you invest in programs to sharpen focus?
7) What programs are shifted to Cascades or let go?

The approved structure (refer appendix C) would include a Dean, three Associate Dean (one for Research and two for Academic Affairs (Corvallis and Cascades campus). At the time of the preliminary proposal, the Associate Dean position at Cascades did not exist. The Search for the position is currently underway. This position will take the lead on for the administrative, licensure, and accreditation responsibilities for teacher and counselor education at the Cascades campus. The three department chair positions will be eliminated. The programs will be realigned by focus and the expectation is that faculty will work across at least two focus areas. The three focus areas are teaching and learning (doctoral programs), community and organizational leadership and education, and licensure and teacher education.

The Associate Deans of Academic Affairs will have oversight for scheduling and operations, human resources (promotion and tenure, personnel issues, adjunct and term-to-term faculty), accreditation, curriculum reviews, graduate reviews, handbooks, and course catalogs. The Associate Dean of Research will have oversight for establishing and guiding the research agenda, review and approval of proposals, grant administration, and doctoral programs.

The Dean of the College of Education (in collaboration with the Dean of the College of Science) has assigned faculty in the Department of Science and Mathematics Education (SMED) the College of Education (COED) to continue work on realignment and to develop a strategic plan for the transition that will be effective July 1, 2011. To this end the Deans have charged this group with completing a Category I (modified, see Appendix B for details) proposal to address the reorganization/realignment of the college by January 1, 2011.

Additionally the Dean of the College of Education has charged the following groups:
1. Search Committees and hiring of three tenure track positions for 2011-2012 academic year (Elementary Science Education, Education Policy, and Cultural and Linguistic Diversity)
2. M.A.T. Task Force
3. Counseling MS Task Force
4. Cascades program expansion Task Force
Counselor Education Emphasis

Overall Recommendation

Reduce and/or restructure with attention given to recommendations from the self study and the graduate school review team’s recommendations

Departmental Actions

- A Task Force was formed to review the status of the MS Counseling program on the OSU campus, recommendations (attached, Appendix D) are being sent to the Dean for review on 9/01/2010; and
- The Task Force recommendations address several of the issues raised by the Graduate Review; strategic staffing, delivery method, and refocusing of program.

Response to Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Comment: OSU’s Counseling Academic Unit (CAU) recently passed a rigorous national accreditation site visit (CACREP) and passed with no deficits on the 186 standards, an almost unheard occurrence. The CAU has nine core faculty spread across two campus. Both the MS and PhD are fully enrolled with rejections rates that run up to 75%.

Action: During the self-study year two tenure track faculty left the unit, one for another position and one for health reasons. The Counseling Task Force has made recommendations to the Dean to address staffing and delivery concerns, this report will inform the recommendations made by the reorganization work group and be incorporated into the unit’s strategic plan.

Quality of Students and Admissions Selectivity

The admissions process seems to be missing a pre-screening piece. Currently the admissions process seems to be more oriented toward a self-selection experience, for applicants identify their interests, meet with faculty to discuss their intentions, and then the majority of applicants who follow through are admitted. It may be more beneficial to establish an application and pre-screening process.

College of Education website:

Master’s Candidates (MS with a Major in Counseling)

The minimal prerequisite is a bachelor's degree. Academic background, personal and emotional suitability, volunteer or paid experience in the helping professions, and the educational and professional goals of each candidate are evaluated before admission is granted. Screening includes, but is not limited to, a minimum GPA of 3.0 on the last 90 hours of undergraduate work, three letters of recommendation, and a writing sample. A personal interview is required for
those applicants who meet the initial application criteria. Prior counseling-related academic work from an accredited institution may meet some of the program requirements; however, the core requirements for the M.S. must be taken at Oregon State University. For more information, please consult the Master’s Handbook.

Comment: We were confused by the points made in this section given our extensive pre-screening process. A few years ago we rejected the grand-daughter of a powerful state legislator at the pre-screening stage. The state legislator asked for a detailed description of our pre-screening process. After his in-depth review, he accepted our decision without further comment. We usually invite 40% of the paper screenees to campus for an extensive day of interviews including counseling demonstrations. We are unaware of any counseling program that employs a more extensive admissions process. Perhaps we did a poor job describing our admission process to the evaluators from the graduate school.

“The admissions standard for the master’s programs is low, with students who earn an undergraduate grade point average of 3.0 being admitted; if they have a lower GPA they may still be considered for admission.” We found this statement in contrast to our experience of high rejection rates for our programs. Last year, only 25% of the applicants to the MS program in Corvallis were admitted.

Level of Financial Support for Students
An area of concern expressed by students was the minimal level of funding available. The programs are presented as part-time graduate programs available to students who are currently employed in relevant work settings.

Historical context: OSU offered their first course in counseling in 1916; only five years after Harvard University presented the first counseling course in the country. In 1932, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education exclusively charged OSU with the mission to provide access to counseling training to the citizens of the State. Following this charge, OSU began a master’s degree with a major in Counseling in 1941 and a doctorate with a major in Counseling in 1950. In 1986, the PhD with major in Counseling was one of the first counseling doctorates in the nation to receive the prestigious program accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational program (CACREP). In 1993, Oregon State Board of Higher Education reasserted its charge to OSU to provide access to counselor training and made a special financial allocation to support the program despite the era’s severe financial crisis. In 2001, the College of Education began to offer the PhD with a major in Counseling through E-Campus in order to create access to advanced counseling training for working professionals within the Mid-Willamette Valley. In 2008, the College of Education decided to transition the PhD with a major in Counseling to a hybrid format in order to (1) extend access to advanced counseling training to all Oregon citizens no matter where they resided, and (2) extend access to advanced counseling training across the United States in order to further promote the national
impact of OSU. To assist with this transition, E-Campus provided grant funding to convert all of the courses in the PhD with a major in Counseling to a hybrid format.

Comment: The advanced preparation model, adopted in 2008 is based on a cohort of part-time practitioner leaders who will be employed in the field of counselor education. This model provides practitioners the opportunity to engage in graduate level work while remaining in the field of their chosen area of study.

Comment: A growing number of both established and newly developed doctoral programs are focusing on the preparation of practitioners rather than career researchers (Willis, Inman, & Valenti, 2010). According to Willis, et al. professional doctorates are the fastest growing segment of doctoral education.

**Action:** The Department will continue to work with Ecampus and the Graduate School to redefine what it means to be a graduate student in the 21st century and how the university structure can support students in these programs. Both Counseling and Teacher Education are state and nationally accredited programs which indicate they meet or exceed standards in their respective fields. Graduate school scholarships are not currently available to students in Ecampus programs, given the growing number of programs perhaps this is an area that should be reconsidered.

**Quality of Personnel and Adequacy to Achieve Mission and Goals**

**Action:** The CAU defines “core faculty” as a member of the faculty who possesses a contract that ranges from .49 FTE to 1.0 FTE and includes the following: (1) graduate advising responsibilities, (2) attend faculty meetings on a regular basis, (3) program leadership responsibilities, and (4) graduate faculty status. Under this definition the CAU has nine core faculty spread across two campuses. We do acknowledge that due to unexpected resignations, the CAU faculty is a bit “light” on tenure-track faculty. There are plans to reshuffle the faculty mix and add tenure track members. During the 2010-2011 school year, the CAU will employ five term-to-term instructors. All are experienced OSU instructors with one having 17 years of experience teaching in the CAU. These plans will be provided to the reorganization group and be used to inform the strategic plan of the unit.

Comment: The manuscript option for a thesis is common in the sciences, agriculture, and forestry and is being adopted by the College of Education for the same sound educational reasons; it is a process that prepares candidates to write publishable articles. Upon completion of the thesis or dissertation candidates have two to three articles ready for submission to peer reviewed scholarly journals. Additionally, the Graduate School supports this practice and requires that these articles are related and connected with an introductory chapter, a literature review, and a final chapter that discusses the results and implications of the research.
We did not have sufficient information about the three faculty in Bend, such as what credentials they possess, who oversees their work, whether they are tenure track or term-to-term instructors, and the degree of collaboration among the faculty of the various programs. This should be clarified.

Comment: The three Cascades Counseling faculty are Instructors (Dr. Kathy Biles, Dr. Joyce Mphande-Finn, and Dr. Daniel Stroud). The Cascades faculty and Corvallis faculty have a strong collaborative relationship and meet once a week to talk about curriculum, programming, staffing, etc. Their vitas were part of the appendices and are also available at the following link: http://oregonstate.edu/education/accreditation/vitae.html.

Level and Quality of Infrastructure

The counseling programs need to establish a more sophisticated data utilization system.

Action: The restructuring of the College of Education includes reassigning work responsibilities to the five support staff in the unit. This process is part of the overall reorganization and should result in increased efficiencies. The current College of Education database is quite robust and capable of handling the type of data inquiries required for data driven decision making and continuous program improvement. However, as part of the restructuring the task force has recommended that the Assessment Coordinator review a number of the software systems that have been designed to support NCATE and CACREP accreditation. In the short term support (0.25 FTE) is being provided to support program leads in managing their data.

Quality of Organizational Support

Action: The PhD program with a Major in Counseling utilizes a three-part instructional architecture. Each of the following parts represents approximately a third of total instruction time:

- **Asynchronous Web. Platforms:** Blackboard & OSU Media Manager.
- **Face-to-face. Platform:** Twice quarterly day-long classes located off-campus at a setting near a major airport (given the nationwide student population).
- **Synchronous Web. Platform:** Adobe Connect Pro with a Talking Stick Add-in and Integrated Telephony.

The primary uses of synchronous web are clinical instruction and supervision. In addition to instruction, Adobe Connect Pro is used for oral exams, faculty meetings, faculty training, and student advising sessions. Some of our Ph.D. students will be able to assist in teaching classes in the weekend format and via asynchronous and synchronous instructional technologies. Ph.D. students are currently providing distance supervision to MS students utilizing the HIPAA compliant secure synchronous technology (Adobe Connect Pro). The CAU is, therefore, not only able to provide our Ph.D. students with experience in teaching graduate classes but also in
utilizing two online technologies for instruction and supervision.

**Action:** As per the Provost, the Department of Teacher and Counselor Education, Adult and Higher Education and the Department of Science and Mathematics Education will merge into one unit. Conversations and strategic planning are underway. This restructuring provides an opportunity to address some of the concerns raised by this review. Refer to introduction and documents in appendices for detailed explanation of this restructuring process.

**Conclusion:**

*A strategic review of the programs, students, faculty, procedures, and resources would be beneficial for examining ways of aligning the missions, objectives, goals, and outcomes of each of the programs with the University, the College, and the individual programs.*

**Action:** CAU’s mission statement is the operationalization of a specific long-standing mandate of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to the CAU. In 1932, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education exclusively charged OSU with the mission to provide access to counseling training to the citizens of the State. Following this charge, OSU began a master’s degree with a major in Counseling in 1941 and a doctorate with a major in Counseling in 1950. In 1993, Oregon State Board of Higher Education reasserted its charge to OSU to provide access to counselor training and made a special financial allocation to support the program despite the era’s severe financial crisis. Over time, CAU has worked the meet this OSBHE mandate through innovative instructional architectures such as (1) summer sequential instructional platform, (2) expansion to a branch campus, and (3) use of hybrid instruction. Faculty sees a strong interlinkage between the evolution of the instructional architecture choices and the shifting access needs of Oregon communities. Additional note: the present three-part hybrid instructional architecture has at its base the synchronous web platform Adobe Connect. Our use of Adobe Connect was inspired by the extensive use of this instructional platform by our sister land-grant university: Penn State. In sum, our selection of our present instructional architecture was driven by our specific OSBHE mandate.

**Action:** College restructure and reorganization through a modified Category I process will address issues raised in this review, the self study and the university’s strategic priorities and the OUS recommendations.
Teacher Education Emphasis

Overall Recommendation
Reduce and/or restructure with attention given to recommendations from the Self Study and the graduate school review team’s recommendations.

Action: As indicated previously the College of Education will submit a modified Category I proposal addressing issues raised in this and other review processes.

Response to Summary of Findings

The unit has a doctorate in Teacher Leadership, but the Teacher Education Self Study Notebook did not address this degree and the review team only acquired this information about it from interviews.

Action: Dean Stern and Dean Francis agreed that this program would be reviewed for the 2011-2012 Self-Study that includes the Community College Leadership program. The Teacher Education Leadership program is not accepting candidates for the 2010-2011 academic year and will be reviewed as part of the realignment and restructuring of the College and programs.

Action: As part of the reorganization, the task force is reviewing the mission statement and engaging faculty in conversations about the focus and direction of the unit. An all faculty meeting in spring of 2010 included a draft mission statement as well as the other reorganization documents to start the conversation and gather feedback from the larger unit.

Quality of Students and Admissions Selectivity

Admission requirements for the MAT are clearly identified and consistent with many other programs found in the State of Oregon. Team members commented that unit rejection rates appeared low, questioning if the criteria were discriminating.

Interviews with faculty suggest that low rejection rates at admission are associated with a discernment process during the pre-admission advising sessions.

Comment: Graduate level programs in the Teacher and Counselor Education follow the graduate school guidelines for admission. In addition to these guidelines students must have at least 90 hours of experience in a classroom, three letters of recommendation that address the candidate’s academic ability, interaction with children, and disposition. A transcript analysis documenting a grade of B or better in all prerequisite and content courses is completed as part of the admission screening process. The review process requires that three faculty individually review the applicants file. During the onsite interviews candidates are required to answer questions related to the unit’s conceptual framework.
Action: Although the CBEST has been a required state exam for licensure, it has not been used as an admission requirement. Effective for fall 2011 admissions all applicants into the M.A.T. programs must have a passing score for full admission into the program.

The online EdM program in addition to the graduate school requirements requires applicants to hold a teaching license (meaning they have already passed the required tests), are currently teaching in a K-12 classroom, three letter of recommendation that address the applicants classroom teaching, academic ability, and disposition. Each applicant must write an essay that addresses his/her understanding of diversity and equity in education and a research-based paper on a current educational issue. The admission files are reviewed individually by three faculty members.

Level of Financial Support for Students

The Self Study indicates that there are no graduate assistantships and graduate students enrolled through Ecampus are not eligible for scholarships. Graduate students applying for on campus graduate programs are eligible for scholarships and the financial support is through the College of Education.

Comments: The initial teacher education programs require extensive internship and practicum experiences in class rooms and do not typically offer assistantships. Advanced programs require that the candidate hold a teaching position in a K-12 classroom. Most of the graduate programs in the College of Education are offered through Ecampus as either a full-time program with students immersed in classroom settings or a part-time program where the students are full time practitioners. Both of these options provide student access to a master’s program that they might not otherwise have access; an access that is strongly supported by the Land Grant mission of OSU. The immersion program provides students the opportunity to be immersed in school with a student population that reflects the changing diversity of K-12 students in the state and nation. The two-year program provides access to those who are place bound and/or are instructional aides in a district and would not be able to obtain their license in another way.

Action: While there is some financial aid available to these students through sources outside of the University, it is limited. Both Ecampus and the College of Education acknowledge that lack of scholarships is an issue and are committed to seeking ways to support students in these programs. One issue in play is the traditional definition of what it means to be a college student in the 21st century. All of the programs offered through Ecampus and the College of Education are approved graduate programs and are accredited at both the state and national levels. Students in these programs are eligible for federal and state financial aid as well as College of Education scholarships. The scholarships they are not eligible for are graduate school scholarships. These are OSU students in approved programs, why they no longer eligible for graduate school scholarships is a question that warrants further research and conversation.
Curriculum Strength

The curriculum in the M.A.T program appears to address national and state standards and reflect solid professional practice. Curriculum strength at the course level appears well planned with syllabi providing adequate information about the course.

The team recommends that each program be reviewed for alignment and that the data related to the various assessments be collected, analyzed, and used in driving program direction. This should precede any program or service expansion endeavor. The graduate survey was the only assessment with data provided, beyond enrollment and exit statistics. The team also had questions about the quality of the survey data. Data from multiple assessments for each assessment benchmark are necessary to reflect current best practice.

Action: During preparation for this graduate review and other external evaluations the faculty redesigned its assessment system, revised various assessment tools, and created a syllabi template reflecting these changes. The exit surveys have been redesigned and reflect the unit conceptual framework. There are multiple assessment measures with clear metrics that were in place during the review and being used to compare across the various programs. The five key assessments are aligned to the conceptual framework and state and national standards all of which are linked to the program goals and outcomes (See appendix E for conceptual framework, alignment documents, and key assessments). All assessment data is now available (effective 2008-2009,) at the unit level (aggregated, Appendix F) and at the program level (disaggregated, Appendix G).

Quality of Personnel and Adequacy to Achieve Mission and Goals

Action: The unit is currently involved in conversations at both the division and college level about restructuring and staffing. At both levels there is a commitment to retain and recruit quality faculty as financial constraints allow. In discussions at the college level with the potential of moving towards a faculty of the whole (merging three departments) there is increased opportunity to have faculty teaching across programs. The proposal for restructuring of the unit includes developing a strategic plan for the unit that will address the staffing and faculty concerns expressed in this review.

The team did not have sufficient information about the three faculty members in Bend related to the OSU unit. For example, it was unclear who oversees their work, whether they are tenure track or term-to-term instructors, what budgetary resources are available, what governance structure exists, and the degree of collaboration among the faculty of the various programs. This warrants clarification.

Comments: At the time of the review there were two faculty in teacher education, one tenure-track (Dr. Kathleen Cowin) and one tenured (Dr. Jay Casbon). There are now two additional fixed term faculty, one with a doctoral degree and one with a master’s degree. Tenure and
promotion comes from the Corvallis campus. Issues of curriculum, accreditation, licensure, and assessment are part of the departmental process as one unit. This information was available during the review as part of the appendices and was also available electronically at http://oregonstate.edu/education/accreditation/vitae.html

Level and Quality of Infrastructure Education Hall is over 100 years old. The facility appears to be held together by a complete exterior wrap in cyclone fencing material.

Comment: The fence was to make the building earthquake compliant. Education Hall is currently undergoing major revisions and the College has been temporarily relocated to the 4th floor of Waldo Hall.

A robust data system would assist the faculty in program evaluation and candidate assessment from pre-admission to post-graduation benchmarks. Currently, assessment information and data are limited and therefore the use of data in making data driven decisions are limited and or compromised.

Action: The data system is being upgraded as part of the process of creating a unit wide assessment system. We are in a three-year cycle to revise and refine our process and product based on accreditation reviews and anticipated needs.

Productivity

Viability of Scholarly Community Within Which Students Can Interact

A scholarly community exists within which students may interact. The quality of the community is stretched by inadequate numbers of full-time tenure track faculty, a reliance on part-time fixed term faculty, and the admission of too many candidates for faculty size.

Action: As part of the Provost’s initiative, the College will search for three new tenure track faculty: elementary science education, education policy, and cultural and linguistic diversity. These three new faculty will join the College, fall of 2011.

Action: Strategic staffing will be a part of the unit restructuring. This will include but not be limited to a review of current position descriptions, assessment of staffing, and a review of the program offerings in the unit (refer to restructuring document in Appendix B). The creation of an Associate Dean of Research moves forward a strong research agenda for the unit as well as to provide support in grant development and implementation.

Action: Professional programs in teacher and counselor education have historically relied on practitioners as a part of the overall staffing of a unit. This practice is grounded in research and supports both students and faculty in the program as it nourishes the linkage between theory and practice and supports the philosophy of theory into practice.
Appendix A Draft Proposal to Dean Stern, March 2010

College of Education Proposal for Strategic Alignment and Budget Reduction

March 15, 2010

1. Overall plan for strategic alignment and budget reduction

In addition to the strategic alignment and budget reduction guidelines, the College of Education proposed changes have been influenced by the university charge to focus on STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) education and other strategic areas; the need to expand programs at the Cascades Campus; the OUS Task Force on Teacher Education; and a number of state and national education initiatives.

Currently, the College of Education serves about 1,600 students, about 1,300 undergraduates and 300 graduate students. All of the undergraduate students are enrolled in the Education Double Degree, OSU’s second largest undergraduate major. As currently organized, the College of Education has three departments and two other units, the Western Center for Community College Professional Development and SMILE (Science and Math Investigative Learning Experiences Program).

Given that one of the College’s departments (Youth Development Education) will move to the College of Health and Human Sciences, and another (Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership) is considerably smaller than prescribed by the planning guidelines, it is proposed that the College be organized as a “faculty of the whole,” including faculty currently in the Department of Science and Math Education in the College of Science (through a joint venture with the College of Science). Academic and research programs would have a focus on STEM and cultural and linguistic diversity, both areas of great importance to teaching and learning in and out of schools. Research activity will be advanced through a new Center for Research on Lifelong STEM Learning (a joint venture with the College of Science) and the existing Western Center for Community College Professional Development.

The College’s mission would be to conduct research and deliver programs toward the improvement of learning and teaching environments situated in multiple social and cultural contexts across the lifespan. In particular, the research efforts and practices focus on STEM learning to produce educated citizens and professionals who are prepared to work on science, mathematics, and technologically challenging societal issues. The program will (a) focus research on understanding STEM learning over a life span in increasingly complex learning and teaching environments, (b) design research to improve educational practices with a focus on cultural and linguistic diversity, and (c) offer compelling academic programs in learning and teaching at the undergraduate (including teacher licensure) and graduate levels informed by research. The focus on STEM learning represents a significant partnership with the College of Science and the Center for Research on Lifelong STEM Learning, building on the expertise of faculty throughout
the university. (See Appendix B for the faculty planning group report on the reorganization of the College. Note that the consideration of a new name for the College has been proposed.)

2. Summary of alignment with academic and administrative guidelines

- The proposed organization of the College of Education (and Learning Sciences) would be a “faculty of the whole,” which, including SMED faculty and education faculty at the Cascades Campus would be about 45 faculty on annual appointment with an FTE of at least 0.5. In addition to the College “faculty of the whole,” there would be two other units, the existing Western Center for Community College Professional Development and the proposed Center for STEM Teaching and Learning.

The Western Center has five fixed-term staff, all of whom are funded through projects, the largest of which is a recurring annual contract of about $425,000 from the Oregon Department of Education in support of professional development for Oregon community college faculty. Faculty formerly associated with the Department of Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership and others engaged in research related to community colleges will be affiliated with the Western Center.

The Center for Research on Lifelong STEM Learning would promote a holistic, university-wide approach to understanding and supporting cradle-to-grave STEM learning that would accomplish the following:

- Creatively build a nexus and critical mass of inquiry around lifelong STEM learning.
- Build a core partnership among the Colleges of Science, Engineering and Education (and Learning Sciences) to leverage opportunities for external funding of research and programs.
- Re-conceptualize the meaning of STEM learning research by tapping into and supporting the signature areas of scientific and technological distinction at OSU.
- Substantively involve colleagues from across the university in leveraging resources and providing the interdisciplinary base for tackling large STEM-related problems.
- Significantly raise OSU’s profile as a national/international leader in STEM learning research. OSU would become the central source of STEM education information in the state for the legislature, the Oregon Department of Education, and other institutions of higher education.
- Significantly, enhance OSU’s ability to compete for government and private funding in this growing area of national concern and support.

The Center would draw on faculty from multiple colleges (Science, Education, Engineering, COAS, Agriculture, and others) who are already engaged in research on STEM learning and teaching. We do not anticipate substantial first year costs for starting up this Center, as many of the resources and faculty time are already committed in this area. The workgroup is continuing to develop an implementation plan. The Colleges anticipate that the returned overhead from this work will provide the necessary funding for growth of the program (See Appendix C for the faculty planning group report on the proposed Center for Research on Lifelong STEM Learning).

In the proposed organization, SMILE would continue to be a unit within the College of Education, but would transition to be affiliated with the new STEM Center, a university-wide Youth Outreach Center that is being proposed by the SMILE Director and others, or other unit.
All undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered by the College meet the enrollment guidelines and, with relatively few exceptions, all graduate and undergraduate classes meet the class enrollment guidelines.

The proposed organizational structure meets the administrative guidelines (levels of management, minimum number of reports).

3. Rationale for exceptions/disconnects

SMILE, a unit with less than six direct reports, will continue to operate as a College unit through the 2011-12 year, as plans are made for SMILE to be affiliated with the new STEM Center, a university-wide Youth Outreach Center, or other unit.

4. Budgetary implications

Over the past two years, the College of Education has made strategic cuts in anticipation of targeted investments. The College will end this fiscal year with a modest fund balance and is prepared to make investments in faculty positions in STEM and other strategic areas. Budget implications of the proposed reorganization include start-up investment in the proposed STEM Center (in partnership with the College of Science), some overlap in College administrative positions during the transition, and opportunity costs associated with the change process.

5. Decision making process

Discussion and decision making engaged the College Advisory Board, Dean’s Council, Department of Science and Math Ed./College of Ed. Planning Committee, and Division of Arts and Sciences Planning Committee. Faculty and staff were engaged in the process through meetings, email, and a BlackBoard web site.

Addendum on planning for the expansion of education offerings at the Cascades Campus

Planning for the expansion of education offerings at the Cascades Campus has been informed by the College Advisory Board (which includes the Bend School Superintendent and a member of the Cascades Campus Advisory Board), discussion of the Dean’s Council (which includes Jay Casbon of Cascades Campus), and the results of interviews with Central Oregon school superintendents conducted by Kathy Persing, a member of both the College and Cascades Campus Advisory boards.
Currently, there are five faculty on annual appointment (two tenure-track and three instructors) and about 100 students enrolled in education programs at Cascades Campus in the Counseling MS, Elementary MAT, and Language Arts MAT programs. Plans for expansion include modification of the Language Arts MAT to include social studies education, addition of a science and math MAT, and a series of courses to address continuing education needs of regional teachers. Those courses, when combined with other on-line graduate Education courses, can be used to earn a master’s degree in education. With the addition of social studies, science, and math (and expansion of the counseling masters enrollment), enrollment in education programs at the Cascades Campus will grow to about 150 students by 2013. Given the relatively large number of Cascades education students and complexity of their professional programs, it will be especially important for Cascades Campus to plan for additional faculty and a leadership position for education programs with responsibility for curriculum coordination/liaison, scheduling, staffing, and assessment.

Another possibility for expansion of Cascades education programs is in counseling. Currently, the same master’s degree in counseling (with school counseling and community counseling options) is offered at both the Cascades and Corvallis campuses. A doctorate in counseling is also offered through Ecampus, managed by faculty at Corvallis. With changes in national accreditation requirements and a suspension of enrollment in the master’s degree at the Corvallis campus for the 2010-11 year, we are commissioning a joint Corvallis/Cascades planning group with responsibility for providing analysis and recommendations regarding the future of counseling programs at the Cascades and Corvallis campuses. Specific options to be considered are the consolidation of masters programs (on and off campus) at the Cascades Campus with the doctoral program managed by the Corvallis Campus or clear distinction between the master’s programs at the two campuses. It is expected that the planning group will submit their analysis and recommendations to the Dean of Education and OSU Vice President for Cascades Campus before the end of spring term.
Appendix A: Current and Proposed Organizational Structure

Current Organizational Structure

Dean
Associate Dean

Department of Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership

Adult Education EdM; Community College Leadership EdD, PhD; College Student Services EdM, MS

Department of Teacher and Counselor Education**

Education Double Degree BA/BS; Counselor Ed. MS, PhD; Elementary Ed. MAT; On-line EdM; Teacher Leadership PhD; Professional Development (non-degree); University Teacher Licensure

Department of Youth Development Education (4-H)

Science and Math Investigative Learning Experiences (SMILE)

Western Center for Community College Professional Development

*Elementary Ed. MAT, Secondary Language Arts MAT, and Counseling MS degrees are offered at the Cascades Campus

*Elementary Ed. MS, Music MAT, Physical Ed. MS, Science and Math Ed. MS are offered in partnership with other colleges
Proposed Organizational Structure

The proposed organization of the College of Education (and Learning Sciences) would be a “faculty of the whole,” which, including Department of Science and Math Education faculty and education faculty at the Cascades Campus would be about 45 faculty on annual appointment with an FTE of at least 0.5. In addition to the College “faculty of the whole,” there would be two other units, the existing Western Center for Community College Professional Development and the proposed Center for STEM Teaching and Learning. SMILE would continue to operate as a unit in the College of Education while transitioning to an affiliation with the proposed STEM Center, proposed university-wide Youth Outreach Center, or other unit. The College of Science would fund positions in the College of Education (and Learning Sciences) and provide support for those positions as at present. Accountability for the productivity of those positions would be from the Dean of Education to the Dean of Science. The College of Education would manage strategy, assignments, and personnel. Promotion and tenure evaluations for jointly funded positions would include both Deans.

During the 2010-11 year, the College will transition from departments to faculty clusters intended to advance curricular development, research, and academic communities. Administrative functions will transition from departments to the central college level. A proposed infrastructure for the College is described in Appendix B.

The College will continue to represent all university teacher education programs, including those at the Cascades Campus, for state licensure, program approval, and national accreditation.

Appendix B: College of Education/Science and Math Ed. Planning Group Report

Proposal for College of Science and College of Education Faculty Collaboration (Preliminary Draft)

The President and Provost provided an image of how learning research might be transformed in a research extensive university. We (the working group for college organization) have taken this invitation seriously to consider how faculty might put forward a mission that positions the unit as a regional, nation, and global leader in research on lifelong STEM focused learning. We also have adhered to the Provost’s recommendations to create synergies of work suggesting that this new unit is a college of the whole. To reflect a research-focused unit and position the college as a partner in a research-oriented division within the university, we propose a new name for this unit of the whole, the College of Learning Sciences (CLS). Through consultation with numerous faculty and former and current administrators, the college working group committee, convened by Deans Sherm Bloomer and Sam Stern, are charged with creating a structure that supports this new vision of a STEM-focused research unit. We propose the following missions and research agenda of the college as well as organizational structures to support them.
Mission Statement

The CLS’ mission is to conduct research and deliver programs toward the improvement of learning and teaching environments situated in multiple social and cultural contexts across the lifespan. In particular, the research efforts and practices focus on STEM learning to produce educated citizens and professionals who are prepared to work on science, mathematics, and technologically challenging societal issues. We balance research with the responsibility to serve the learning and teaching professions. We accomplish this balance by (a) focusing research on understanding STEM learning over a life span in increasingly complex learning and teaching environments, (b) designing research to improve educational practices with a focus on cultural and linguistic diversity, and (c) offering compelling academic programs in learning and teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels informed by research. The focus on STEM learning represents a significant partnership with the College of Science and the Center for the Study of STEM Learning, building on the expertise of faculty across divisions.

Guiding Principles of Organization

- Focus on research in STEM learning and teaching building on the university’s land grant mission.
- Organizational support for research agendas that put forward national and internationally recognized scholarship and faculty who are positioned to make serious progress on regional, national, and global issues in lifelong learning and teaching situated in diverse social and cultural contexts.
- Programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels embodying the College’s research agenda of lifelong learning in culturally and linguistically diverse environments.
- Leverage the research of faculty to coordinate and collaborate within division and across division to inform undergraduate STEM education.
- Strong partnership between tenured-line and instructor faculty to ensure high quality research informed programs for all students.

Infrastructure of College

As a college of the whole, we are proposing the following structure and positions for the College of Learning Sciences. Titles for positions are placeholders and will need to consider the University, Division and College reporting structures.

The Dean’s office will be supported by (1) Associate Dean of Research and (2) Associate Dean of Academics & Operations. These two Associate Deans will oversee three clusters of programs with support structures to be determined to successfully direct and administer programs in the three clusters. These clusters are: Professional Programs, Doctoral Programs, and Professional Teacher Education Programs. The Associate Dean of Academics will also work closely with the Head Advisor of the undergraduate program and a similar position overseeing initial advising in all graduate programs.

The Associate Dean of Research will focus primarily on assuring faculty are positioned to engage in research and programs to fulfill the College’s mission and produce graduates to become scholars in their fields. The Associate Dean will also be a liaison to faculty-affiliated Centers within the college (Western
Center), in the division (Center for Research on STEM Learning), and across the University. Duties include, but not limited to:

- Initiatives for interdisciplinary research efforts and collaboration with other colleges such as engineering, forestry, etc. and national and international institutions
- Infrastructures for increasing the number of grants and contracts submitted and funded
- Expanding the opportunities for non-tenure track faculty to be part of funded research proposals/programs
- Research seminars and professional development
- Scholarship of faculty -- Encourage and track indicators of faculty distinction
- Scholarship of PhD students – Support for doctoral student research publications and scholarly inquiry.
- Fundraise--Expand business and industry partnerships, enhance/increase alumni relations and major gifts, ensure internal funding for pilot projects leading to larger awards

The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs oversees programs, policies, procedures, and initiatives related to undergraduate students and graduate students in professional degrees. These include:

- Recruitment, enrollment, and retention—including initiation and participation in diversity initiatives, support for OSU recruitment efforts and events, enrollment coordination, oversight of college and university graduation requirements, coordination of scholarships and fellowships, oversight of student petitions and grievances, coordination of student clubs and the Honor Board, and coordination of student employment opportunities.
- Coordination of curriculum and advising—including articulation with universities and community colleges, curriculum coordination with OSU, undergraduate degree program, and accreditation by professional societies including teacher licensure.
- Enhancement and assessment of instruction—including student assessment of teaching and advising and program evaluations.
- Coordination of student-related international academic exchanges and agreements

Implementation Tasks and Decisions

Faculty

8) Align tenured-line and instructor faculty job descriptions to meet the mission of the college.
9) Pathways for yearly evaluation & Tenure/Promotion reporting structure for all (tenure-line and instructor) faculty.
10) Build and strengthen synergies of collaborations on research and programs within college, division, and university.
11) Construct infrastructure to support effective and efficient program clusters

Programs

12) Program sustainability – what number of faculty, graduates, and enrolled students are necessary to make a program viable?
13) Sharpen focus on Corvallis campus to Cascades and constructing MS in elementary education.
14) Where do you invest in programs to sharpen focus?
15) What programs are shifted to Cascades or let go?
Appendix C: Proposed Center for Research on Lifelong STEM Learning

Proposal for a Center for Research In Lifelong STEM Learning (Preliminary Draft)

Sharpening the foci of strengths in the University affords a unique opportunity to forge a high profile alliance between the College of Science and the College of Learning Sciences in the formation of a Research Center for building knowledge about lifelong learning in science, technology, engineering & mathematics (STEM). By establishing one of the first and arguably the most comprehensive centers in the world devoted to research on lifelong STEM learning, this Center would position OSU at the forefront of information and innovation in Oregon on issues related to STEM learning and education.

A Center, embodying a substantive partnership among the science, mathematics, engineering, psychology, health, business, policy and education communities and building on existing expertise in STEM learning research, would be a national and international model for fostering productive affinities between scientific research, policy and the learning sciences.

Optimizing lifelong learning research in STEM at OSU will directly support the guiding principles of the Phase II Strategic Plan: (1) maximize student learning and success; (2) maximize recruitment and retention of faculty to advance student success and signature areas of distinction; and, (3) use the strategic plan as a guide to current and future opportunities.

Arguably, all of the complex STEM-related issues facing society in the 21st Century have a significant human component; research on how humans come to understand and behave relative to these issues needs to be part of any solution space. Accordingly, basic and applied STEM learning research must be an integral component of each of the three signature areas of scientific and technological research at OSU.

Mission

A holistic, university-wide approach to understanding and supporting cradle-to-grave STEM learning would accomplish the following:

- Creatively build a nexus and critical mass of inquiry around lifelong STEM learning.
- Build a core partnership among the Colleges of Science, Engineering and Learning Sciences to leverage opportunities for external funding of research and programs.
- Re-conceptualize the meaning of STEM learning research by tapping into and supporting the signature areas of scientific and technological distinction at OSU.
- Substantively involve colleagues from across the university in leveraging resources and providing the interdisciplinary base for tackling large STEM-related problems.
- Significantly raise OSU’s profile as a national/international leader in STEM learning research. OSU would become the central source of STEM education information in the state for the legislature, the Oregon Department of Education, and other institutions of higher education.
- Significantly, enhance OSU’s ability to compete for government and private funding in this growing area of national concern and support.
**Metrics & First Year Operation**

- No first-year costs; Appoint a point of contact for Center
- Grant expenditures per STEM tenure-track faculty
  - FY09 $130.5K; with Math $140K
  - FY10 (to date) $114.3K [projected $150K]; with Math $143K [projected $190K]
  - FY11 $300K (est.)
- Prepare Category I proposal and develop business plan
- Develop job descriptions for director and support services
- Engage stakeholders across campus and in the state
  - Oregon Department of Education & Other State Government Departments
  - Major STEM-related institutions and businesses

**Need**

There is a growing consensus nationwide for a greater focus on understanding and promoting *lifelong* STEM learning; the need for improvements in STEM learning are apparent at both the state and national levels; within the formal school structure grades K to 16 and within the public in general.

- Recently, the National Governor’s Council concluded: “Effectively integrating...(STEM) education and its impact on the economic opportunity into the culture is more important today than anyone ever anticipated. Our nation’s recent economic struggles, coupled with concerns about career readiness and 21st century jobs, have refocused our attention on infrastructure improvement--both physical and human. At the heart of rebuilding our nation’s intellectual infrastructure is a STEM-literate society, students equipped with the STEM skills needed to succeed both in school and career and citizens capable of understanding and making good decisions related to the myriad challenges facing the nation.”
- In 2009 an Oregon State Task Force commented: “The State of Oregon, currently ranking 4th in the United States for high tech arena business volume, recognizes the crucial need to generate its own human capital of scientists, engineers, technology leaders, teachers and STEM...-literate citizens.”
- Improving college-level instruction in STEM areas, including how to better attract and retain quality students from historically under-represented groups at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, requires high quality research and development.
- While there are over 100 separate STEM education programs supported by the federal government, primary support for STEM educators and students comes through the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation with approximately $1.2 billion in funding proposed in FY11.

**Selected Collaborative Partnerships with Current Funding (Out of about 70 total partnerships)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>State/Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Research Council</td>
<td>Beaverton School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Long Beach</td>
<td>Chemekata Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chonchon National University of Education</td>
<td>Eugene School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctr. for Advancement of Informal Science Education</td>
<td>Lincoln County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation</td>
<td>Oregon Coast Aquarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Science Ctr/National Aquarium, Baltimore</td>
<td>Oregon Museum of Science &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>Oregon Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education</td>
<td>Redmond School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory</td>
<td>University of Washington Mathematics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>Vernier Software &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected OSU Faculty (out of approx. 60) Invested in Conducting STEM Learning Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept. of Science &amp; Mathematics Education</th>
<th>Other Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Baek, free choice learning, science</td>
<td>SueAnn Bottoms, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derron Coles, EOP mathematics</td>
<td>Dan Cox, engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Dierking, free choice learning, science</td>
<td>Dedre Demaree, physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebekah Elliott, mathematics</td>
<td>Tom Dick, mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Enochs, science education</td>
<td>Tevian Drey, mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Falk, free choice learning, science</td>
<td>Barbara Edwards, mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Flick, science</td>
<td>Terri Fiez, engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam Hwa Kang, science</td>
<td>Henri Jansen, physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Niess, emeritus mathematics</td>
<td>Karen Higgens, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Rowe, free choice learning, science</td>
<td>Milo Koretsky, chemical engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily van Zee, science</td>
<td>Bob Lillie, geoscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corine Manogue, physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn Wright, geosciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Charge from Dean Stern, August 2010

Strategic Planning Retreat: Minutes

Thursday, August 19, 12:00 – 3:00

1. Overview of our outcomes for the day

- Articulate planning assumptions for College “transition year” (2010-11)
- Develop enhanced plan for reorganization activities during transition year (what, why, who, by when)
- Discuss transition year governance process

2. Review of Sam’s 2009 – 10 goals’ assessment and 2010 – 11 goals

Draft

1. Provide leadership for the development of an abbreviated Category I proposal for College reorganization and associated revisions to College governance.
2. Collaborate with OSU Facilities and architects on the refurbishment of Ed Hall.
3. Prepare for College leadership transition.

Comments: Consider combing #3 and #4. Add goal related to Division and collaboration with Colleges of Science and Liberal Arts on STEM and cultural and linguistic diversity.

3. Conversation about planning assumptions that inform the College reorganization

Assumptions from Dean’s Council (* for priority)

***New and different relationship between SMED and College of Ed.

**College will look different structurally

**Focus on research

**There will be strategic personnel opportunities (retirements, new positions)

*Will reorganize as “faculty of the whole”

*Focus on STEM and cultural and linguistic diversity
*Continue existing programs while considering changes/collaborations

*Continuing association with accrediting bodies is important (NCATE, CACREP, TSPC)

*Continuing development of Cascades Science/Math MAT

*Increase collaboration with Cascades Campus

*Remain open to emerging opportunities

Ongoing refurbishment of Ed Hall

Unfolding developments regarding Division operations

4. Discussion of Planning Group recommendations (handout)

5. Development of enhanced plan for transition year reorganization planning groups

Recommended groups


B. **STEM Center Planning/Advisory Group.** Charge: Develop Category I proposal for the creation of the STEM Center. Seek engagement and support from within and outside of OSU. Members: TBD. Timing: TBD

C. **MAT Elementary Task Force.** Charge: Develop Category II proposal describing changes to the Elementary MAT that addresses the College focus on STEM and cultural/linguistic diversity; NCATE/TSPC recommendations; and Graduate School Program Review recommendations. Members: Sue Helback, Ken Winograd, Karen Higgins, Kathleen Cowin. Timing September – November 2010.

6. Follow up...

- Communication with faculty/staff regarding roles/responsibilities during transition year for central administration (Dean, Associate Dean, Advisors, Department Heads (Darlene, SueAnn), and all staff.)
Appendix C Proposed Organizational Chart

Proposed New Structure

Note: Size of bubbles is arbitrary.

SMED-ED Faculty Collaboration Group: SueAnn Bottoms, Kathryn Ciechanowski, Donna Drake-Clark, Rebekah Elliott, John Falk, Larry Flick, NamHwa Kang, Rick Orozco, Darlene Russ-Eft
Appendix D Recommendations to Dean from Counseling Task Force

September 1, 2010

Dear Dean Stern,

You requested the Counseling Academic Unit prepare a report examining the benefits and costs associated with two scenarios:

1. A Ph.D. in Counseling program with an MS in Counseling program at Cascades only.
2. A Ph.D. in Counseling program with MS in Counseling programs offered through both the Cascades and Corvallis units.

The report from the Counseling Academic Unit Task Force is attached. Dr. Deborah Rubel, Dr. Kathy Biles, and Dr. Gene Eakin were the members of the Task Force preparing this report. We obtained input from staff members Dr. Cass Dykeman and Dr. Lorie Blackman as well as from Teacher and Counselor Education Chair, Dr. SueAnn Bottoms. As per your recommendation, we also had external reviewers examine this report and provide their reaction. The external reviewers were Bryn Browning, Assistant Superintendent of the Hermiston S.D., and Marlys Alger, retired school counselor/administrator from the Jefferson County S.D.

The Counseling Academic Unit Task Force, upon analysis of the benefits and costs associated with the two scenarios as outlined on these next five pages, proposes the MS in Counseling program at the Corvallis Campus:

1. Be offered through e-campus as a three-year part-time program and incorporate the Division/College focus on cultural and linguistic diversity as well as a focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
2. Utilize a hybrid instructional model such as that utilized in the Ph.D. program. Classroom instruction to be provided in the Salem area and augmented by asynchronous instruction (Blackboard) and HIPAA compliant secure synchronous instruction (Adobe Connect Pro).
3. Admit nine students per cohort into the school concentration (75 credits) and nine students into a child and adolescent clinical mental health concentration (90 credits).
4. Recruit students for both concentrations and particularly the school concentration from rural Oregon and from under-represented populations.
5. Admit students on the normal MS in Counseling program admission timeline of 10/15/10 – 1/15/11 and conduct interviews in 3/11 for a cohort starting date of June, 2011.
6. Apply for an E-Campus Course Development grant during fall quarter, 2010 such that the grant proposal will be approved in time for the course development of the first two classes to be completed in spring, 2011 and offered in summer session, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,
Counseling Academic Unit Task Force
The Task Force believes the history of the counselor education program at Oregon State University is unique in a number of respects and informs the direction the Counseling Academic Unit should advance the MS in Counseling program. We, therefore, provide you with a summary of that history:

OSU offered their first course in counseling in 1916, only five years after Harvard University presented the first counseling course in the country. In 1932, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education exclusively charged OSU with the mission to provide access to counseling training to the citizens of the State. Following this charge, OSU began a master’s degree with a major in Counseling in 1941 and a doctorate with a major in Counseling in 1950. In 1986, the PhD with major in Counseling was one of the first counseling doctorates in the nation to receive the prestigious program accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational program (CACREP). In 1993, Oregon State Board of Higher Education reasserted its charge to OSU to provide access to counselor training and made a special financial allocation to support the program despite the era’s severe financial crisis. In 2001, the College of Education began to offer the PhD with a major in Counseling through E-Campus in order to create access to advanced counseling training for working professionals within the Mid-Willamette Valley. In 2008, the College of Education decided to transition the PhD with a major in Counseling to a hybrid format in order to (1) extend access to advanced counseling training to all Oregon citizens no matter where they resided, and (2) extend access to advanced counseling training across the United States in order to further promote the national impact of OSU. To assist with this transition, E-Campus provided grant funding to convert all of the courses in the PhD with a major in Counseling to a hybrid format.

Scenario 1: Ph.D. Program Only

The Corvallis Campus of the Counseling Academic Unit (CAU) drop their offering of a MS in Counseling to focus on the PhD with a Major in Counseling offering and the MS with a major in Counseling to be offered only at the Cascades Campus.

1. Benefits:
   d. The myriad of TSPC, CACREP, NCATE, OBPLCT administrative requirements as well as the MS student advising demands originally handled by five tenure track faculty would be reduced by no longer offering a Corvallis based MS in Counseling degree. The two tenure track staff thus could devote their full attention to the very successful Ph.D. in Counseling program.

2. Costs:
   d. Loss of potential MS program revenue: In the current format, i.e., dissertation credits being paid for via regular campus tuition rather than e-campus (a loss of approximately $116,812.80 revenue to the College of Education annually), the Ph.D. program is generating $200,000 revenue for the College of Education annually. The proposed e-campus based MS in Counseling program would provide the College of Education with an additional $116,812.80 per MS cohort (18 students) or $350,000 per year when all three MS cohorts have been admitted. This revenue would not only pay for the FTE required for the MS program but also assist in defraying the costs of hiring the tenure track staff needed for the instruction and advising in the Ph.D. program.
e. **Possible loss of CACREP Accreditation**: Based on the CACREP Accreditation program review team’s comments (2008), the CAU believes CACREP will be very concerned that Corvallis-based staff teach at the Ph.D. level but not at the MS level while at the same time those teaching in the MS in Counseling Program at Cascades have limited involvement with the Ph.D. program. Please note that our Ph.D. program would not have nearly the interest it currently has if the program were not CACREP accredited. Graduates seeking positions in counselor education after 2012 need to be graduates of counselor education programs and preferably CACREP counselor education programs. Oregon State University is the only CACREP Ph.D. program on the West Coast. Students apply to our program specifically because it is CACREP accredited.

c. **Loss of a “lab school” experience for PhD students**: A number of our Ph.D. students intend to seek employment in counselor education. Providing these students with counselor education internship experiences with our staff is an important part of their preparation as counselor educators. With the MS in Counseling program in the part-time format as proposed, some of our Ph.D. students would be able to assist in teaching classes in the weekend format and via asynchronous and synchronous instructional technologies. Ph.D. students are currently providing distance supervision to MS students utilizing the HIPAA compliant secure synchronous technology (Adobe Connect Pro). The CAU is, therefore, not only able to provide our Ph.D. students with experience in teaching graduate classes but also in utilizing two online technologies for instruction and supervision.

d. **Loss of core faculty attached to the MS program to assist with unit-wide tasks and campus-wide tasks**: The administrative workload for NCATE, TSPC, and OBLPCT will undoubtedly be diminished without the MS in Counseling program, there will remain, however, CACREP and Graduate School administrative tasks to be dealt with but with far fewer staff to do so.

e. **Loss of positions for staff who teach MS classes who can also contribute to the Ph.D. program**: If Dr. Dykeman and Dr. Rubel are no longer providing instruction in the MS in Counseling program, they and a tenure track staff we propose be hired in 2012 will teach almost all of the Ph.D. classes. This staffing pattern presents several limitations:

i. With three staff members teaching in the Ph.D. program, the unit’s flexibility to hire additional staff that has experience teaching courses in which the core staff does not have experience becomes very limited.

ii. A staffing pattern that limits Ph.D. student contact to interaction with just a few instructors can lower the credibility of the Ph.D. program. Students have indicated they prefer to interact with a diverse set of professors each with unique professional interests, skill-sets, and research/publishing backgrounds.

f. **Diminished OSU College of Education identity in K-12 education**: The OSU Counselor Education Unit has been educating school counselors for over 60 years and part of that well-established “footprint” in our State’s public educational system will begin to disappear.

**Scenario 2**: The Corvallis Campus of the Counseling Academic Unit (CAU) offers an MS with a Major in Counseling as well as the PhD with a Major in Counseling. The MS with a Major in Counseling program
will feature the characteristics outlined on the cover letter of this proposal.

**Fiscal Considerations and Benefits:**
1. The E-Campus Grant will provide approximately $172,000 revenue of which half will be used to reimburse staff for course development and half retained for administrative costs.
2. The revenue stream of $116,812.80 per cohort or $350,000 when three cohorts have been admitted will provide the revenue to not only cover the costs of staffing the MS program but will also provide revenue to assist with staffing the Ph.D. program.

**Curricular/Instructional Considerations and Benefits:**
1. All courses for the clinical mental health (CMH) program have been approved through the Category II process. The Cascades campus initiated this concentration starting in June, 2010. Some modification of courses will occur as the Corvallis CAU focuses the CMH concentration on child and adolescent counseling.
2. Dr. Dykeman has already led the CAU full- and part-time staff in examining how courses could be offered in a variety of formats in the new hybrid program. The CAU is committed to provide training to all course developers in the use of asynchronous (Blackboard) and HIPAA compliant secure synchronous (Adobe Connect Pro) instructional/supervisory technologies as well as training on each of the following elements that will inform the development of their courses:
   a. 2009 CACREP Standards.
   b. Cultural-linguistic competency.
   c. Science, technology, engineering, math career awareness and counseling interventions for math/science anxiety, etc.
   d. Issues specific to schools and communities in rural Oregon as identified by the Oregon University System as concerns to be addressed by the OUS, e.g., lower college-going rates for graduates from rural communities.
3. The CAU is rapidly becoming an exemplar in the use of a HIPAA compliant secure synchronous platform (Adobe Connect Pro) for instruction and supervision at the Ph.D. level. Utilization of this technology in the MS in Counseling program will further the CAU’s capacity to become a leader for other university programs as well as state agencies and educational entities on the use of this platform for communication, instruction, and supervision for and with individuals and programs throughout the State.
4. Once the CAU has fully implemented the program, it becomes possible to expand the program to offer:
   a. Licensure Only programs.
   b. Programs to school districts such as Salem-Keizer to assist their Child Development Specialists in meeting qualifications for the Initial I School Counselor License.
   c. Licensure II and Continuing Licensure classes for counselors throughout Oregon and the United States.
5. As previously noted, the MS in Counseling program will provide Ph.D. students an opportunity for a counselor education “lab experience.”

**Staffing Considerations and Benefits:**
1. We propose adding a fixed term position in the summer or fall of 2011. This individual will begin to assume administrative responsibility for the MS in Counseling program and assist in instruction and advising in the Ph.D. program.
2. We propose adding a Tenure Track position in the fall of 2012. This individual will teach classes
in both the Ph.D. program and the MS program and assume an advising load in the Ph.D. program in which we currently have two full-time advisors and forty advisees.

3. Note that even with the addition of these two additional positions, during the 2011-12 academic year, 14/52 or 1/3 of classes will need to be taught by part-time staff and during the 2012-13 academic year and each year thereafter, 20/62 classes will be taught by part-time personnel.

Social and Political Capital Benefits:
1. Oregon State University will maintain its well-established “footprint” as a preparer of school counselors.
2. The College of Education would fulfill the OSU Land-Grant mission of meeting the educational needs of citizens throughout the State as well as fulfill the charge the Oregon State System of Higher Education issued on two occasions that the Oregon State University Counseling Academic Unit provide a counselor education program for the State. You will recall that when the Counselor Education Unit had a “summer-sequential” program, students from locations such as Eagle Point, Klamath Falls, Medford, Grants Pass, Newport, Pendleton, LaGrande, and Boardman attended. The proposed MS in Counseling program in a hybrid format will make it even easier for students from “remote” locations to earn an MS in Counseling degree.
3. Child and Adolescent Clinical Mental Health concentration:
   a. The Task Force would like to acknowledge Dr. Lorie Blackman, Program Lead for the Community Concentration and a school psychologist in the Salem-Keizer S.D., for reminding us of the mental health needs of children and adolescents throughout our State. Statements such as the one below are just one of many we could cite that support Dr. Blackman’s assertion:
      i. Many mental disorders have their beginnings in childhood or adolescence.
      ii. The National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey found that 13 percent of children ages 8 to 15 had at least one mental disorder, a rate that is comparable to diabetes, asthma, and other diseases of childhood. Yet, mental disorders often go undiagnosed and untreated for years.
   c. The child and adolescent focus will be unique to the Corvallis Counseling Academic Unit and, thereby, differentiate the Corvallis clinical mental health program from that offered at Cascades.
   d. The CAU also believes the child and adolescent clinical mental health program will become a signature program: In our awareness there is no other program in the Pacific Northwest with this concentration.

Costs:
1. Though there are staffing costs associated with this program, we have already noted that program revenue should be more than sufficient to cover these costs, help defray the additional staffing requirements of the Ph.D., and any increased infrastructure costs associated with the addition of the program.
2. The NCATE/TSPC and CACREP requirements for data collection, data entry, data processing, and data analysis have increased incrementally in just the past few years and will only continue to increase. Though the need for the infrastructure to accomplish these NCATE/TSPC data tasks is already visibly apparent to Teacher and Counselor Education faculty and Chair, the MS in
Counseling program data requirements reinforce the need for additional infrastructure to meet these data needs.

**Additional Considerations:**

1. **Employment Projections for School and Clinical Mental Health Counselors:** While the current economic times make it challenging to estimate employment prospects for graduates of this proposed program, there are at least two sources of information that indicate graduates are likely to find positions:
   
   a. A New York Times article *Report Envisions Shortage of Teachers as Retirements Escalate* provides a map of the fifty States showing the percentage of teachers nearing retirement age. The report indicates that Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are States with over 50% of teachers being over fifty years of age.  
      

   b. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that from 2008-2018 there will be increases in jobs for counselors ranging from 13% to 24%.
      
### PTCE Unit Assessment Framework for Initial Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE Domains</th>
<th>PCTE Conceptual Framework (Knowledge, Skills &amp; Dispositions)</th>
<th>Professional Teacher Preparation Assessment Framework - Initial Programs Proficiencies Key Assessments</th>
<th>TSPC Required Proficiencies for Initial Licensure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>• Content knowledge (GPA) • CBEST or PPST • Praxis II or OREL A MSE Subtests I &amp; II • OREL A Civil Rights</td>
<td>1) Candidates plan instruction that supports student progress in learning and is appropriate for the developmental level (INTASC 1, 2, 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Subject Matter Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>• Teacher Work Samples (2) • Field experiences: Three-way Evaluations (2)</td>
<td>3) Candidates engage students in planned learning activities (INTASC 5, 6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge** | Teaching and Learning                                         | • Teacher Work Samples (2) • Field experiences: Three-way Evaluations (2) | 1) Candidates plan instruction that supports student progress in learning and is appropriate for the developmental level (INTASC 1, 2, 7).  
2) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning (INTASC 3, 4, 5). |
| **Student Learning** | K-12 Learner Assessment                                       | • Teacher Work Samples (2) • Field experiences: Three-way Evaluations (2) | 2) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning (INTASC 3, 4, 5).  
3) Candidates engage students in planned learning activities (INTASC 5, 6).  
4) Candidates evaluate, act upon, and report student progress in learning (INTASC 8). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions</th>
<th>Ethics &amp; Professionalism</th>
<th>5) Candidates exhibit professional behaviors, ethics, and values (INTASC 8, 9, 10).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Practitioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifelong Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Field experiences: Three-way Evaluations (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capstone (undergraduate) or Portfolio (graduate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>COLLECTING DATA</td>
<td>SUMMARIZING AND REPORTING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator:</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator, Technology Specialist &amp; Data Analyzer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will disseminate follow-up candidate survey data; collect employer survey data</td>
<td>- Will generate the reports through the COED data base on the following assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by end of October.</td>
<td>- Employee survey data by November 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licensure and Field Services Coordinator:</td>
<td>- Admission Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will ensure that that first field experience evaluation entered into the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>base by end of term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Leads:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will instruct Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers to complete appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluations at the mid-term and end of the term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will ensure that that field experience evaluations and work sample evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are collected and work sample evaluation entered into the data base by end of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions &amp; Department Chairs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will collect assessment data according to specific program admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>admission timeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator:</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator, Technology Specialist &amp; Data Analyzer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Oversees data collection process</td>
<td>- Will generate the reports through the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licensure and Field Services Coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Coordinator:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Coordinator, Technology Specialist &amp; Data Analyzer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator:</td>
<td>Will send out reminder for exit survey by 8th week of term</td>
<td>Will generate the reports through the COED data base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Services Coordinator:</td>
<td>Will ensure that field experience assessments are complete and entered into data base.</td>
<td>• Field Experience Evaluation II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Leads:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Sample I &amp; II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Leads:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Leads:**

Will instruct Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers to complete appropriate evaluations at the mid-term and end of the term.

Will ensure that field experience evaluations and work sample evaluation are collected and work sample evaluation entered into the data base by end of term.

Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions & Department Chairs:

Will collect assessment data according to specific program admission timeline.

**COED database on the following:**

- Admission Data
- First Field Experience Evaluation
- Work sample I

throughout the term with:

- Licensure faculty
- Admissions Committees and Advisors
- TSPC Consortium
- Students and other stakeholders

Summary of findings

Questions raised by data

Action steps for improvement

NCATE Part C Annual Report (January)

AACTE PEDS Annual Report (January)

Minority Education Report (February)
| SUMMER | **Will instruct Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers to complete field experiences and work sample evaluations at mid-term and end of term.**  
Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions:  
Will collect the assessment data according to the specific program admission timelines | **Will prepare and turn in by end of term the yearly program report to Assessment Coordinator (template)** | **Summary of findings**  
**Questions raised by data**  
**Action steps for improvement**  
**Title II A IHE Report (April)** |
| Assessment Coordinator, Technology Specialist & Data Analyzer:  
Will generate reports through the COED database on the following assessments:  
- Candidate Exit Survey  
- Field Experiences Evaluation II  
- Work Sample Evaluation II  
Will prepare the yearly PTCE Unit Assessment Report based on the following information coming from programs at the end of the academic year, admission, mid-point (field experiences), completion (Capstone or Portfolio), and follow-up transition points:  
- the summary of findings  
- the questions raised by the data  
- action steps to be taken | Assessment Coordinator:  
Will share Exit Surveys, Field Experience Evaluation I & II, Work sample I & II findings from programs in aggregated and disaggregated summaries:  
- Licensure Faculty at Retreat in September  
- TSPC Consortium fall meeting  
Field Services Coordinator:  
TSPC Annual Report |
Professional Teacher Education Conceptual Framework

**Ethics & Professionalism**
- Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior in interactions with students, colleagues, families, and... 

**Reflective Practitioner**
- Adopt and enact classroom practices that reflect broader educational & social issues that have an impact on schools
- Apply reflective practices to practice and to teaching and learning in the

**Lifelong Learners**
- Participate in professional development
- Collaborate with colleagues in learning communities

**Teaching & Learning**

**K-12 Learner**

**Assessment**

**Subject Matter**

**Diversity & Equity**
- Believe everyone deserves the opportunity to learn and can learn
- Possess knowledge, skills, & dispositions to serve as professionals who

---

**Preparing for a World of Possibilities**

OSU Oregon State University
Appendix F Sample of aggregated data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>% over 3.0</th>
<th>CBEST (passing score = 123*)</th>
<th>PPST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>% pass</td>
<td>total score mean</td>
<td>Reading (174*) Writing (171*) Math (175*) % pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Ed</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49 40 52 141 100%</td>
<td>181 176 185 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling -</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65 41 60 166 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Elem</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56 45 56 156 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Sec</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59 47 60 165 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Two year*</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54 47 57 158 96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Immersion*</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>52 39 53 145 96%</td>
<td>184 177 184 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Cascades</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64 49 62 174 100%</td>
<td>183 180 182 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57 47 55 159 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55 44 50 149 100%</td>
<td>184 179 179 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>ORELA MSE</td>
<td>ORELA ESOL</td>
<td>Praxis</td>
<td># Students Completing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subtest I</td>
<td>subtest II</td>
<td>% pass</td>
<td>subtest I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Ed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling -</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Elem</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Sec</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Two year*</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Immersion*</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-Cascades</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G Report template of disaggregated data at program level

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Instructions:
1. Review the attributes of each element (the bulleted items in the box) for NCATE Standard 1. This report contains five elements: 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1f.
2. Read the questions in each element.
3. Review program data for accuracy and analyze based on the questions below.
4. Refer to analysis questions to help you discuss data.
5. At the end of each element, complete the program summary questions to provide an overall analysis.
6. Send completed report electronically to SueAnn

Reference Program Data:
- GPA, CBEST, and ORELA and/or Praxis*
- Work Sample I & II program data*
- Three-way Evaluation program data*
- Candidate Exit Survey Results 2008-09**
- Employer Follow-up Survey Results 2008-09***

*from program spreadsheet
**attachment
***PTCE unit data (not program specific)

Scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Sample Scale: 0 to 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 lacking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three-way Evaluation Scale: 0 to 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 lacking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Exit Survey Scale: 0 to 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Questions 1-3

- Teacher candidates know the content that they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.
- Eighty percent or more of the unit’s program completers pass the content examination.

1. What is the overall content knowledge of candidates entering the initial licensure programs?

Table 1 Admission GPA (based on 4.00 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA (based on last 90 undergraduate credits)</th>
<th>% over 3.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #1
- Compare mean GPA to 3.0 GPA
- Comment on % candidates with GPA who did not have a 3.0 GPA

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
2. What are the candidates’ general knowledge and skills in reading, writing, and math upon entering the initial licensure programs?

Table 2 CBEST Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBEST (total passing score 123; 41 on subtests)</th>
<th>% Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #2
- Compare mean total scores on CBEST or PPST to “passing score” (CBEST: a total of 123 is required for passing; passing score for each section is 41, must have a 37 on one or two sections); see PPST passing scores in table.
- How much do the average scores exceed the passing test score?
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of subscores: reading, writing, and math and relate to implications to success in program or changes to program.
- Address the subtest with lowest score. How does this data impact your program? Do you have program entry requirements (e.g. 9 credits composition, writing sample, math courses, etc.) or program modifications to address these scores?
- Comment on % candidates passing CBEST or PPST.

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
3. What is the overall *content knowledge* of candidates entering clinical practice as measured by tests used for state licensure?

Table 3 ORELA Multiple Subjects Exam (MSE) and ORELA ESOL Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORELA MSE (passing score 240) n = 28</th>
<th>ORELA ESOL (passing score 240) n = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtest I</td>
<td>Subtest II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #3
- Compare subtest scores on ORELA MSE subtests I & II and ESOL subtests I & II (if applicable) to “passing score” (passing score is 240 for each subtest)
- Comment on % candidates passing ORELA MSE & ESOL (if applicable)

or
- Compare mean scores on Praxis II exams to “passing score” (passing scores vary)
- Comment on % candidates passing Praxis upon entry to clinical practice

- How does the candidates’ GPA, CBEST/PPST test scores, and ORELA MSE & ESOL (or Praxis test scores) reflect their ability to teach content in your program?

**SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW**
1a. Program Summary Questions

- How does your program address low or non-passing test scores? What is your program policy for not passing? Number of retakes? How do you accommodate candidates who do not pass, such as English Language Learners?
- How do these overall scores inform your program about the teacher candidates content knowledge that they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts based on standards?
- Discuss content knowledge course requirements in relation to general knowledge and skills (reading, writing, and math) and in the content area.
- If you have additional data that measures student content knowledge or insight add it and discuss it in your narrative.

REFLECT ON YOUR RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 1-3, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY QUESTIONS BELOW

End of NCATE Element 1a.
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Question 4

- Teacher candidates understand the relationship of content and specific pedagogy delineated in professional, state, and national standards.
- Candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and national standards.
- Candidates facilitate student learning of the content through presentation of content in clear and meaningful ways and through integration of technology.

4. What do work sample data suggest about candidates pedagogical content knowledge?

Table 4 Work Samples I and II: IV. Conceptual Framework: Rationale/Unit Goals/ Standards (a-c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 items (a-c): maximum score = 9*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-4)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on scale 0 to 3

**Percentage is a calculation of the average scores of the subsection divided by the maximum number of points (score) that can be awarded to the specific section (e.g. 7.3/9 & 6.5/9)

***Ranking is based on the highest % to the lowest % (1 to 4) in the four subsections in the Work Sample Analysis Questions:

- Reflect on evaluation question #4
- Compare percentages and rankings for subsection IV in work samples I & II.
- Compare ranking to other subsections in Work Samples I & II (ranking: 1 = highest %, 4 = lowest %)
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of each item (a-c) (see complete program data)

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
1b. Program Summary Questions

- How does your program address Work Sample or Three-way Evaluation subsections with low percentages/ranking?
- Reflect on your program’s overall effectiveness in preparing candidates to understand the relationship of content and specific pedagogy and provide them with a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills. What do you conclude based on the data provided?
- What data might be used or do you use to measure if a candidate integrates technology in their teaching? Discuss how candidates integrate technology in their teaching.
- What additional data could be collected or that you already collect that measures student pedagogical content knowledge? Discuss it in your narrative.

**REFLECT ON YOUR RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY QUESTIONS BELOW**

End of Element 1b.
1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Questions 5 - 8

- Teacher candidates can apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning.
- Candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and their prior experience of candidates to develop meaningful learning experiences.
- Candidates reflect on their practice.
- Candidates know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning.
- Candidates are able to analyze educational research findings and incorporate new information into their practice as appropriate.

5. What do work sample and three-way evaluation data suggest about candidates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills?

Table 5 Work Samples I and II: V. Instructional Plans (a-d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 items (a-d): maximum score = 12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work sample II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on scale 0 to 3

Table 6 Three-way Evaluations I and II: 1. Planning for Instruction (a-g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 items (a-g): max. score = 21*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-way Eval I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-5)*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way Eval II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on scale 0 to 3

*Percentage is a calculation of the average scores of the subsection divided by the maximum number of points (score) that can be awarded to the specific section (e.g. 13.8/21 & 18.5/21)
**Ranking is based on the highest % to the lowest % (1 to 5) in the five subsections in the Three-way Evaluation**
Table 7 Three-way Evaluations I and II: 3. Engaging Candidates in Planned Learning Activities (a-f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Three-way Eval I</th>
<th>Three-way Eval II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 items (a-f): max. score = 18*  *based on scale 0 to 3

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #5
- Compare percentages and ranking for subsection V in work samples I & II
- Compare ranking to other subsections in Work Sample (ranking 1 = highest %, 4 = lowest %) and Three-way Evaluations (ranking 1 = highest %; 5 = lowest %)
- Compare percentages and ranking for subsection 1 in three-way evaluations I & II
- Compare percentages and rankings between Work Sample (V. Instructional Plans) to Three-way Evaluation (1. Planning for Instruction).
- Compare percentages and ranking for subsections 1 and 3 in three-way evaluations I & II
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items in V. a-d in WS; and 1. a-g & 3 a-f in 3-way (see complete program data)

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
6. What do work sample data suggest about candidates understanding of learner, school, and community context?

Table 8 Work Samples I and II: III. Contextual Aspects of Work Sample (a-d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 items (a-d): maximum score = 12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on scale 0 to 3

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #6
- Compare mean scores in subsection III work sample I & II
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items in III. a-d (see complete program data)
- Compare ranking to other work sample subsections (1 high, 4 low)
- How does these scores relate to candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills?

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
7. What do candidates say about their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills according to the Candidate Exit Survey?

Candidate Exit Survey Scale: 0 to 4

0 NA  1 poorly prepared  2 partially prepared  3 well prepared  4 exceptionally prepared

Candidate Exit Survey: n = 53

SECTION 1. PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION - OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.1 (78%)

Figure 1 Candidate Exit Survey: 1. Planning for Instruction (a-h)

SECTION 3. ENGAGING CANDIDATES IN PLANNED LEARNING ACTIVITIES – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.2 (80%)

Figure 2 Candidate Exit Survey: 3. Engaging Candidates in Planned Learning Activities (a-f)
Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #7
- Compare mean scores for subsections 1 & 3 in the Candidate Exit Survey
- Discuss strengths and weakness in items 1. a-h and 3. a-f (see program candidate exit survey results)
- Compare mean scores in exit survey subsections 1 & 3 to three-way evaluation subsections 1 & 3.
- Refer to your program Candidate Exit Survey results to review each TSPC proficiency requirement for initial teacher license. Identify strong and weak areas of instruction.
- How do the candidates’ responses in the Candidate Exit Survey compare to the PTCE evaluations?

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
8. How do employers rate OSU graduates in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills according to the Employer Follow-up Survey?

Employer Follow-up Survey Scale: 0 to 4
0 NA 1 poorly prepared 2 partially prepared 3 well prepared 4 exceptionally prepared

Employer Follow-up Survey: n = 12

SECTION 1. PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION - OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.0 (75%)

Figure 3 Employer Follow-up Survey: 1. Planning for Instruction (a-h)

SECTION 3. ENGAGING CANDIDATES IN PLANNED LEARNING ACTIVITIES – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.1 (78%)

Figure 4 Employer Follow-up Survey: 3. Engaging Candidates in Planned Learning Activities (a-f)
Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #8
- Compare mean scores for subsections 1 & 3 from Employer Follow-up Survey
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses in items 1. a-h and 3. a-f (see program employer survey results)
- Compare subsections 1 & 3 from Employer Follow-up Survey to Candidate Exit Survey. Describe the correlation (between employee and candidate responses).
- How does the PTCE evaluations (Work Sample and Three-way Evaluation) compare to the employee and candidate responses in these subsections?

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
1c. Program Summary Questions
1. Reflect on your program’s ability to develop teacher candidates that can apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.
2. Based on the data results, how well does your program ensure that candidates consider school, family, and community contexts in which they work and their prior experience of candidates to develop meaningful learning experiences?
3. Based on the data results, are candidates in your program able to analyze educational research findings and incorporate new information into their practice as appropriate?
4. If you have additional data that measures student Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills or insight, discuss it in your narrative.

REFLECT ON YOUR RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 5-8, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY QUESTIONS BELOW

End of Element 1c.
1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Questions 9-11

1. Candidates focus on student learning.
2. Candidates assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.
3. Candidates are able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for candidates based on their developmental levels and prior experience.

9. What do work sample and three-way evaluation data indicate about the candidates’ ability to assess student learning, using assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences for all candidates?

Table 9 Work Samples I and II: VI. Assessment Strategies & Analysis of Learning (a-g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work sample I</th>
<th>Work sample II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 items (a-g): maximum score = 21*

*based on scale 0 to 3

Table 10 Three-way Evaluations I and II: 4. Evaluating Student Progress (a-e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Three-way Eval I</th>
<th>Three-way Eval II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 items (a-e): maximum score = 15*

*based on scale 0 to 3

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #9
- Compare mean scores and ranking for subsection VI in work samples I & II
- Compare mean scores and ranking for subsection 4 in three-way evaluations I & II
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items in VI. a-g in WS; and 4. a-e in 3-way (see complete program data)
• What is the correlation between work sample and three-way evaluations scores and ranking in this section?

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
10. What do candidates say about their ability to assess student learning, use assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences that help all candidates learn according to the Candidate Exit Survey?

Candidate Exit Survey: n = 15

SECTION 4. EVALUATING STUDENT PROGRESS – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.0 (75%)

Figure 5 Candidate Exit Survey: 4. Evaluating Student Progress (a-e)

Analysis Questions:
• Reflect on evaluation question #10
• Compare mean scores for each subsection in the exit survey
• Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items in 4. a-e (see program candidate exit survey results)
• Compare these results (subsection 4) to the work sample and three-way evaluation results. Is there any correlation between candidates’ feedback and faculty/supervisor observations?

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
11. How do employers rate OSU graduates ability to assess student learning, use assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences that help all candidates learn according to the Employer Follow-up Survey?

Employer Follow-up Survey: n = 12

SECTION 4. EVALUATING STUDENT PROGRESS - OVERALL AVERAGE = 2.9 (73%)

Figure 6 Employer Follow-up Survey: 4. Evaluating Student Progress (a-e)

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #11
- Compare Candidate Exit Survey mean scores to the Employer Survey scores in each section
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items in 4. a-e (see program employer survey results)
- Compare mean scores in exit survey subsections 3 & 4 to three-way evaluation subsections 3 & 4

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
1d. Program Summary Questions

- Based on the data results, reflect on your program’s ability to develop teacher candidates that can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.
- According to your program data in this section, are candidates able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for candidates based on their developmental levels and prior experience?
- Overall, how well are the candidates prepared to focus on student learning?

REFLECT ON YOUR RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 9-11, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY QUESTIONS BELOW

End of Element 1d.
### 1g. Professional Dispositions for Teacher Candidates – Questions 12-15

- Candidates are familiar with the professional dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.
- Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all candidates.
- Candidates recognize when their own professional dispositions may need to be adjusted and are able to develop plans to do so.

12. **What are the candidates’ knowledge and demonstration of important dispositions upon entering an initial licensure program?**

   a. What ratings do candidates receive on their written personal statement evaluations?
   b. What ratings do candidates receive on their references?
   c. What ratings do candidates receive on their interview or simulation?

**Analysis Questions:**
- Reflect on evaluation question #12
- Compare rating to total points and “passing/acceptance score”
- Which items specifically relating to candidate disposition?

**SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW**
13. What do three-way evaluation data indicate about candidates’ knowledge and demonstration of important dispositions?

Table 11 Three-way Evaluations I and II: 2. Establishing a Classroom Climate Conducive to Learning (a-k)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 items (a-k): maximum score = 33*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-way Eval I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on 0-3 scale

Table 12 Three-way Evaluations I and II: 5. Exhibiting Professional Behaviors, Ethics, and Values (a-j)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 items (a-j): maximum score = 30*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-way Eval I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking (1-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on 0-3 scale

Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #13
- Compare mean scores for subsection 2 in three-way evaluation I & II
- Compare mean scores for subsection 5 in three-way evaluation I & II
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items 2. 1-k and 5 a-j (see program data)

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
14. What do candidates say about their professional dispositions according to the Candidate Exit Survey?

Candidate Exit Survey: n = 15

SECTION 2. ESTABLISHING A CLASSROOM CLIMATE CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.1 (78%)

Figure 7 Candidate Exit Survey: 2. Establishing a Classroom Climate Conducive to Learning (a-k)

SECTION 5. EXHIBITING PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIORS, ETHICS, AND VALUES – OVERALL AVERAGE = 4.0 (100%)

Figure 8 Candidate Exit Survey: 5. Exhibiting Professional Behaviors, Ethics, and Values (a-h)
Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #14
- Compare mean scores for subsection 5 in the exit survey
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items 2. a-k and 5 a-h (see program candidate exit survey results)
- Compare mean scores in exit survey subsection 5 to three-way evaluation subsection 5

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
15. What do employers say about their professional dispositions?

Employee Follow-up Survey: n = 12

SECTION 2. ESTABLISHING A CLASSROOM CLIMATE CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.0 (75%)

Figure 9 Employer Follow-up Survey: 2. Establishing a Classroom Climate Conducive to Learning (a-k)

SECTION 5. EXHIBITING PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIORS, ETHICS, AND VALUES – OVERALL AVERAGE = 3.2 (80%)
Figure 10 Employer Follow-up Survey: 5. Exhibiting Behaviors, Ethics, and Values (a-h)
Analysis Questions:
- Reflect on evaluation question #15
- Compare mean scores for subsection 5 in the Follow-up survey
- Discuss strengths and weaknesses of items 2. a-k and 5 a-h (see program employer survey results)
- Compare results to candidate responses from exit survey
- Compare mean scores in Follow-up survey subsection 5 to three-way evaluation subsection 5

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW
1g. Program Summary Questions

- Reflect on your program’s ability to familiarize candidates with the professional dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.
- How well does your program prepare candidates to demonstrate classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all candidates?
- How well does your program have candidates recognize their own professional dispositions may need to be adjusted and are able to develop plans to do so?
- Suggest other measures of dispositions that the PTCE might look at that are more rigorous and at every transition point: admission, entry and exit to clinical.

REFLECT ON YOUR RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 12-15, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY QUESTIONS BELOW

---

End of Element 1g.
16. What do work sample and three-way evaluation data suggest about candidates overall preparation for teaching?

Table 13 Work Samples I and II: *Total Scores of All Subsections III, IV, V & IV*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work sample I n =</th>
<th>% passing</th>
<th>Work sample II n =</th>
<th>% passing</th>
<th>Difference Between Work Sample I and II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 items: maximum score = 54*

*based on 0-3 scale

Table 14 Three-way Evaluations: *Total Scores of All Subsections 1-5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three-way Eval I n =</th>
<th>% passing</th>
<th>Three-way Eval II n =</th>
<th>% passing</th>
<th>Difference Between Three-way Evaluation I and II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 items: maximum score = 117*

*based on 0-3 scale

**Analysis Questions:**
- Reflect on evaluation question #16
- Compare mean of total scores on work samples I & II to “passing score” (passing score is between 36-54)
- Comment on % candidates passing work samples I & II
- Provide an explanation for the difference in total scores between work sample I & II
- Compare mean of total scores on three-way evaluations I & II to “passing score” (passing score is between 78-117)
- Comment on % candidates passing three-way evaluations I and II
- Provide an explanation for the difference in total scores between three-way evaluation I & II

**SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW**
Table 15 Comparison of Candidate and Employer Average Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Candidate Exit Survey Average Scores</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Employee Follow-up Survey Average Scores</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluating Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dispositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions:
- How does your program candidate exit survey results compare to the overall employer follow-up scores for each section?

Overall & Final Program Questions for Standard 1:
1. What does your program do particularly well related to Standard 1?
2. What are areas for improvement related to Standard 1?
3. What program changes might you consider based on the analysis of this data?
4. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted within your program?
5. What is the candidate completion rate (%) in your program, i.e. how many were admitted vs. how many obtained an Initial Teaching License?
6. What percentage of candidates complete all program attributes, i.e., earn their Initial Teaching License, and obtain all authorizations and endorsements?
7. What data is missing, is insufficient, or can be modified to better understand how the PTCE unit is preparing candidates?

Table 16 Initial I Teacher License Completion Rate (at end of year) (n = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No License</th>
<th>One Authorization</th>
<th>Two Authorizations</th>
<th>ESOL Endorsement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program completion rate = 100%

SUMMARIZE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS, INSERT YOUR RESPONSES BELOW