Texas Tech University
Addendum in Response to the Offsite Review

Overview and Conceptual Framework

CF.2 Areas of concern related to the conceptual framework

Further, the literature review only covers the first six initiatives and it appears to be incomplete.

(Note, yellow highlighted text indicates concerns as expressed by the BOE team in the Offsite Report.)

The literature review (expanded exhibit) has now been more fully developed.

CF.3 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Review and clarify evidence and statements in the annual reports of the unit’s intellectual philosophy and standards, which serve as the principle of the unit’s drive to lead a revolution in educator preparation.

Following is an expansion of the Conceptual Framework (CF) described in the Institutional Report. This version maintains the original “process-orientation” but explains how such processes lead to outcomes. Together processes and outcomes form a conceptual framework that supports the unit’s intellectual philosophy and standards.

A Conceptual Framework for Educator Preparation

The overarching goal of reforms in the College of Education at Texas Tech University (TTU) is to “Lead a Revolution in American Education.” This goal is accomplished by adding value to P-12 schools, institutions of higher education, agencies, and communities we serve, and is directed through a conceptual framework (CF). A conceptual framework affords meaning to the unit’s operations and direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability (paraphrase of NCATE 2008 Professional Standards).

Texas Tech University’s Conceptual Framework for Educator Preparation has two major facets—one focused on process, the other on outcomes. First, the unit leads a reform of education through the process of transformation: 1) transforming educator preparation; 2)
transforming client/university partnerships; 3) transforming educational research; and 4) transforming reward systems. This framework may be visually represented as follows:

The second aspect of the conceptual framework focuses on the outcomes of transformation. The “Integrated Scholar” model below focuses on three major outcomes: 1) producing the measurably best educators in the U.S.; 2) collaborating to foster school/agency/community effectiveness, maximizing college and career readiness, health, and success; and 3) conducting intervention research that advances a measured impact on those we serve. This outcomes model may be represented as follows:
Numerous indicators signify to Texas Tech University the need for a “Revolution in American Education.”

The Center for Research, Evaluation and Advancement of Teacher Education (CREATE), a consortium of several university systems in Texas, provides an annual Performance Analysis for Colleges of Education (PACE) Report. One portion of the 2012 report (based on 2010-11 data), considered information about school districts within a 75 mile radius of Texas Tech, which is called the Proximal Zone of Professional Influence (PZPI).

The majority of teachers within the PZPI are graduates from Texas Tech, with a large number of individuals being hired annually. (In 2010-11, 39% of the new teachers hired were from Tech.) Therefore, TTU certified teachers have a major impact on the schools within the PZPI. The college’s concern is that P-12 student test scores on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (previous exhibit) exams in the PZPI were below state averages. Many factors are involved in these results, but Texas Tech University has decided to aggressively make a positive difference in our region.

Furthermore, the need for this revolution is consistent with the changes called for in NCATE’s Blue Ribbon Panel:

- increasing rigorous accountability;
- strengthening candidate selection and placement;
revamping curricula, incentives, and staffing;
supporting partnerships; and
expanding the knowledge base to identify what works and supports continuous improvement (NCATE, 2010).

The need for change is also supported by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) as noted in a 2/28/12 press release from its Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting.

“The Commission will ensure increased accountability through a focus on outcome data and key program characteristic data.” “CAEP will expect accredited preparation providers to take bold steps to recruit, prepare, and help develop effective teachers who can contribute their expertise to improving student performance in all schools.

For these and other reasons, Texas Tech University is preparing itself to lead a “Revolution in American Education;” the foundation of our conceptual framework.

Together, the process and outcomes components of the conceptual framework provide the bases for the unit’s intellectual philosophy and institutional standards, supporting a revolution in American education by producing trademark graduates with distinctive and measurable skills and outcome-producing capacities that address stated market needs. In so doing, TTU faculty and graduates become distinctive from faculty and graduates of other institutions.

The two aspects of the framework become integrated in that it is through the process of transformation that the outcomes of reform are realized. The outcome of producing the measurably best educators is achieved through transforming educator preparation; the outcome of conducting intervention research is achieved through transforming educational research, and the outcome of collaborating to foster school/agency/community effectiveness is achieved through transforming client/university partnerships. Transforming the reward system supports the achievement of all three outcomes.

Dean Scott Ridley presented the “Integrated Scholar” model to College faculty during his initial interview in 2010 and has subsequently communicated with various groups of faculty and administrators throughout the campus as well as partners in P-12 public schools, and the community. Since that time this model has gained approval from faculty members and other stakeholders providing direction for educator preparation work at TTU.

The heart of the Conceptual Framework is the “Integrated Scholar,” who through teaching, service, and research produces outcomes which support a Revolution in American Education. The three points of the triangle indicate the outcomes:

produce the measurably best educators in the U.S.;
collaborate to foster school/agency/community effectiveness, maximizing college and career readiness, health, and success; and
conduct intervention research that advances a measured impact on those we serve—that is producing the measurably best educators and collaborating to foster school/agency/community effectiveness.
These outcomes are achieved through 12 implementation strategies, known as the **Big 12 Initiatives** (previous exhibit). (It should be noted during the 2011-12 year of reform there were nine initiatives. During 2012-13 three more (10, 11, 12) were added. For the upcoming 2013-14 year, several more implementation initiatives will be included. Thus the Big 9 has evolved to the Big 12 to the Big XX. Reform in the College of Education is dynamic and rapidly moving forward.)

Specific assessments are associated with each of the three outcomes. For teacher candidates, assessment of “measurably best” comes from the [TAP rubric](#) (previous exhibit), the [Tripod instrument](#) (previous exhibit), and ISD benchmark measures of P-12 student achievement. Student achievement will be measured using the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness, [STAAR](#) (previous exhibit) and other ISD benchmark data. Some preliminary data (from previous exhibits) are available for TAP, Tripod, and STAAR.

For graduate programs, three phases of learning are assessed to ensure candidate success. Phase One (P1) emphasizes the foundational knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) focuses on the hypothetical application of knowledge and skills, such as through case studies and role playing. In phase Three (P3) candidates apply knowledge, reasoning, and skills to address client issues in real world settings. Assessments and appropriate rubrics are created for each phase by program faculty members.

Assessing the other two outcomes, collaboration and research, depends greatly on the nature of the collaboration and research guidelines. For example, the [ELPN assessments](#) (new exhibit) are extensive and specific as per the grant procedures. This is also true for the assessments associated with the i3 collaboration.

A literature review (expanded exhibit) supporting the CF is organized by the 12 initiatives supporting the three outcomes. Initiatives # 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, and 11 lead to producing measurably the best educators in the United States. Initiative # 6 supports collaboration to foster school/agency/community effectiveness, and initiative # 8 promotes research that advances excellence. Additional initiatives, # 4, 7, 9, and 12 are strategies that support all three outcomes.

The Educator Preparation Conceptual Framework also becomes the College of Education’s Strategic Goals, which align well with the university’s strategic priorities, the CAEP/NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations, and the Big Twelve Initiatives. An [alignment table](#) (new exhibit) is available for review.

(2) Review evidence of clear buy-in from educator preparation programs not housed in the College of Education. Such evidence could be program curriculum, candidate learning outcomes, assessment rubrics, and/or other appropriate institutional reports.

There are several indicators of buy-in from educator preparation programs outside the College of Education.
The TI has been discussed at meetings of the Teacher Education Council (TEC) for the past two years, and the Council voted its approval of the proposal sent to NCATE/CAEP. The TEC includes representatives of all colleges that participate in educator preparation.

The elementary education (new exhibit) blocks of coursework have been coordinated to accommodate students majoring in Early Childhood in the College of Human Sciences. They are completing one semester of their Tech Teach field placements in the Child Development Research Center of the College using TI video capture of lessons.

Course rotations and scheduling have emerged from meetings with the Department of Health, Exercise, and Sport Sciences.

Faculty members from the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources have attended training for elements of the TI (TAP training, Tech Teach training).

The secondary education course, EDSE 3100, Introduction to Teaching (new exhibit) is taken by candidates in the Agricultural Education program.

The secondary education course schedule was negotiated with the departments of English, History, Mathematics, Science, Health, Exercise, and Sport Sciences, and Classical and Modern Languages.

Doug Hamman, Director of Teacher Education, has had meetings with all impacted chairperson and the interim dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

There have been meetings with advisors of teacher preparation programs from around campus, including discussion of an implementation schedule. (new exhibit).

Arts and Sciences advisors have distributed Tech Teach recruiting materials during freshmen orientation.

Interview faculty, school partners, and candidates to ensure that the conceptual framework has been infused into program curriculum, field experiences, and assessment; and is widely supported by key stakeholders.

Arrangements are to be made with Dr. Rong for such onsite interviews.

**Summary of the Transformation Initiative**

**TI.2 Statement about the evidence**

The College of Education (COE) at Texas Tech University (TTU) is pursuing the Transformative Initiative (TI) Option of NCATE review because it fits well with the reforms occurring in the College. Tech Teach, the new Teacher Education Program, is the focus of the TI review, with considerable progress made toward its implementation. However, it must be emphasized that the TI is not a separate initiative to test out a particular aspect of educator preparation. It is rather, the transformation of our Educator Preparation Program as a whole. Although the focus of the TI review is on Tech Teach, the transformation initiative is part of a fundamental reform effort that involves all programs, including advanced certification programs and graduate degree programs. The TI is not an "extra" added to the Teacher Education Program. The Transformation Initiative and the other reforms are defining the work occurring, and the programs offered in the College, both at the teacher and advanced educator preparation levels. The Transformation Initiative is not the “icing on the cake,” rather it is becoming the “cake itself.”
The unit states that the project will have 1,000 participants. It is unclear whether Tech Teach is a special delivery model within the unit’s teacher preparation program or it reflects the fundamental change of all teacher preparation programs. It is unclear whether the above-mentioned number of 1,000 participants represents multiple year cohorts or a single cohort. It is also unclear what will happen to the project after it reaches 1,000 participants.

The 1000 participants will be over a four year period. By the end of the transition period, Tech Teach will be the only program available for teacher education candidates. The research study associated with the TI will unfold over the course of four years. Over the course of that time, the number of teacher candidates expected to complete the EPP will total at least 1,000. This is the number of participants whose data (i.e., attitudes, teaching competencies, achievement of their students) will be analyzed for the TI study and report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TI.3 Areas of concern related to the TI

The unit expects that through the use of a co-teaching model to gain experience, its candidates will develop the qualifications and skills equal or above that of a 2nd year teacher. Because the unit has not identified and defined qualifications and skills of a 2nd year teacher, it is unclear how the unit plans to benchmark its candidates against these qualifications and skills.

An effective second year teacher, based on the metrics used in Tech Teach would score “3s” and above on the TAP rubric, would have STAAR benchmark scores above the district average, and would have no negative sections on the Tripod survey.

TI.4 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Unit Program Assessment Plan. How does the unit plan to gauge its progress in achieving the three intended outcomes?

Progress toward achieving the 3 outcomes will be gauged in several ways:

- **Instructional competencies:** Teacher candidates’ (TC) progress toward instructional competency will be gauged by conducting 5 performance assessments (PA) of their teaching. The first will occur in the semester prior to the student-teaching semester. This “pre-PA” will be used to screen candidates for the student-teaching semester, and prepare them for the assessment expectations in the following year. The next PAs will occur in the two semester of the student-teaching practicum (2 each semester). The data reflecting teacher candidate instructional competency is reviewed with the teacher candidate. It is part of the teacher candidate’s learning with a pre-conference and post-observation conference discussion with a site coordinator during each PA cycle. The instructional competency progress data are also reviewed at the program
level, where trends in competency are examined, and implications for curriculum reform are derived.

- **Engagement of students**: The Tripod instrument (Harvard & Cambridge Education) will be used to assist the TC in assessing and improving P-12 student engagement. In the first semester of student teaching, TC will administer to their students the questionnaire. Results from the questionnaire will be compiled and presented back to the TCs in a “report” detailing the descriptive statistics for their students. TCs will then develop a plan of action to improve the engagement and achievement of the students in the lowest quartile of the class.

Progress toward this goal will be assessed by post-test administration of the Tripod at the end of the student-teaching practicum. At the program level, data from all TCs will be analyzed, trends in engagement will be examined, and implications for curriculum reform will be derived.

- **Positive impact on student achievement**: Each reporting period, P-12 student achievement data is gathered from partner districts. Analysis of this data will occur at the student teaching classroom level and the program level. Analysis will compare student achievement gains in classrooms where TCs are working against classrooms where TCs are not assigned. The exact methodology for this comparison is being developed.

(2) Assessment Implementation. Discuss the subsequent year assessment implementation plan with the program stakeholders.

Arrangements are to be made with Dr. Rong for such onsite discussions.

(3) Research methodologies. What are the methodologies for the four proposed research questions, including instrumentation, data collection, analysis modeling, and plans for dissemination?

A description of research methodologies (new exhibit), as described in the original Transformation Initiative Proposal, is available for review.

**Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

The College of Education (COE) at Texas Tech University (TTU) is pursuing the Transformative Initiative (TI) Option of NCATE review because it fits well with the reforms occurring in the College. Tech Teach, the new Teacher Education Program, is the focus of the TI review. However, the TI is not a separate initiative to test out a particular aspect of educator preparation. It is rather, the transformation of our Teacher Education Program as a whole. Although the focus of the TI review is on Tech Teach, the transformation initiative is part of a fundamental reform effort that involves all programs, including advanced certification programs and graduate degree programs. The TI is not an "extra" added to the Teacher
Education Program. The Transformation Initiative and the other reforms are defining the work occurring, and the programs offered in the College.

Perhaps the two most important aspects of the COE reforms is the focus on assessment and use of data for decision making. Assessment has been an area of concern, particularly the regular and genuine use of data for decision making. The college has not always been pleased with the past data presented for accreditation purposes. However, the unit is extremely pleased and encouraged with the current direction and progress of assessment-related activity. This progress is exemplified and directed by an initial data usage report, which is available for review.

The emergence of TAP, Tripod, STAAR, ISD benchmarks, Apply and Evaluate (A&E), Performance Assessments (PA) and Phase 1, 2, and 3 data will provide an authentic and valued basis for decision making. The use of Tableau, Toolbox, TracDat, and Digital Measures as platforms to organize data also allow for program reform with the subsequent fostering of outstanding candidates and faculty.

1.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Assessment Data. What are the assessment data results from spring 2013 Exhibit 1.4.f indicates that no data were available for candidates’ assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning.

In the initial teaching programs, candidates’ ability to focus on student learning is measured through their ability to assess P-12 student learning and to plan appropriate instruction based on those assessments. Following are State of Texas competencies addressing candidates’ ability to assess student learning, plan, and perform accordingly. The following table reports data based on evaluations of student teachers by university supervisors. The last four competencies (14-16b) were added later so that data before fall 2011 were not available. Also, fall 2012 data onward were not captured as the college moved to a new assessment system that has not yet provided results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Competencies</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a. Applies instructional strategies to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process and to promote critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. Remediate or enriches as a result of ongoing assessment and reflection</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Incorporate the effective use of technology to plan, organize, deliver, and evaluate instruction</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Monitors student performance and achievement with appropriate and varied assessments</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Collects, manages and analyzes data from multiple sources in order to interpret learning results for students</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Learning Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Collects and manages formative assessment data to guide instruction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Documents student learning to determine when an intervention is necessary and appropriate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b. uses technology to collect, manage and analyze student data</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 4-point scale

### 2. Advanced Program Data

There was limited data provided for advanced programs. Only data from interviews with the dean and employer survey data were included. No data from candidate assessments were provided.

### 3. Program Assessment Plans

Program assessment plans were only provided for secondary education at the initial level and the M.Ed. in Community Counseling, M.Ed. in School Counseling, Ph.D. in Counselor Education, M.Ed. in Educational Leadership and Principal Professional Certification Preparation Program at the advanced level. No data were reported in these plans. *(Concerns 2 and 3 are treated together.)*

Advanced candidate preparedness, including knowledge, skills, and dispositions, is currently assessed and reported in several ways.

- **Certification Exam Pass Rates**

  The definitive candidate assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in Texas is how well individuals perform on state licensure exams.

### Initial Pass Rate by Certification Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Field</th>
<th>2008 Completers Pass Rate (N)</th>
<th>2009 Completers Pass Rate (N)</th>
<th>2010 Completers Pass Rate (N)</th>
<th>2011 Completers Pass Rate (N)</th>
<th>2012 Completers Pass Rate (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Hard of Hearing (EC-12)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>100(16)</td>
<td>100(13)</td>
<td>100(13)</td>
<td>100(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educacional Diagnostican (EC-12)</td>
<td>100% (16)</td>
<td>93.3(15)</td>
<td>91.7(12)</td>
<td>85(20)</td>
<td>93.1(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Reading Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Technology Teacher</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100(1)</td>
<td>100(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
<td>95.45(22)</td>
<td>100(23)</td>
<td>94.4(18)</td>
<td>90(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>100% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100(3)</td>
<td>100(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>100% (4)</td>
<td>100(5)</td>
<td>100(6)</td>
<td>100(5)</td>
<td>100(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Field</td>
<td>2008 Completers Pass Rate (N)</td>
<td>2009 Completers Pass Rate (N)</td>
<td>2010 Completers Pass Rate (N)</td>
<td>2011 Completers Pass Rate (N)</td>
<td>2012 Completers Pass Rate (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>100(9)</td>
<td>100(10)</td>
<td>83.3(6)</td>
<td>100(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired – Braille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.1(17)</td>
<td>100(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.7(21)</td>
<td>100(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Transition Point Assessments:**
  Assessments also occur as candidates move through programs. A table indicating these transition point assessments (modified exhibit indicating both TEP and advanced programs) is available for review. It should be noted that as programs undergo reform, some of assessments will remain. However, there will be many changes as new data sources are incorporated. Data from TAP, Tripod, STAAR, ISD benchmarks, Phase 1, 2, 3, and Texas Education Agency principal and new teacher assessments will all impact candidate transition through TTU educator programs.

- **End of Program Assessments:**
  The end-of-program survey (previous exhibit) that is completed when candidates register for the Master’s Comprehensive Exam provides knowledge, skill, and disposition data (new exhibit) for advanced programs. Additionally, programs have Master’s Comprehensive Exam (new exhibit) data, which are often analyzed through rubric scoring. For example, the Educational Leadership Principal Program gains insight into knowledge, skills, and dispositions through an analysis “reflective thinking and decision making” (new exhibit).

- **Program Assessment Plans:**
  As programs are drastically reformed, all aspects of program assessment plans (PAP) have radically changed, including program purposes, trademark (student learning) outcomes, and associated assessments. The transformation timeline is just beginning to allow collection of data. Furthermore, it was deemed not useful to pursue collecting data for student learning outcomes that were no longer relevant. Therefore a gap in data has occurred in the PAPs. That being said, some older program assessment plans for advanced programs are available for review as follows (all new exhibits):
  - Principal Certification
  - Superintendent Certification
  - Counselor Education (Community Counseling)
  - Counselor Education (School Counseling)
  - Special Education (bachelor’s)
  - Special Education (doctorate)
  - Special Education (master’s)

- **Strategic Planning Annual Reports**
  Although candidate assessment is not directly reviewed in the Annual Strategic Planning Reports, they do offer an insight into assessment within the college (all new exhibits).
The College of Education  
The Center for the Integration of STEM Education and Research (CISER)  
The Center for Research on Leadership in Education  
The Burkhart Center for Autism Education and Research  
The Virginia Sowell Center for Research and Education in Sensory Disabilities

All advanced programs are shifting to new assessments aligned with the college’s reform initiatives. However, there are examples of program assessment work that precedes the reforms. The Educational Leadership Program (principal and superintendent certification) is a prime example of such assessments. The faculty initiated an in-depth review of all current and needed assessment practices. Numerous procedures were modified and instruments developed, some of which may be reviewed online.

Again, it should be emphasized that many of these assessment procedures are being replaced or modified based on current college reform activities. For example, many assessments in advanced programs focus on three phases of learning. Phase One (P1) emphasizes the foundational knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) focuses on the hypothetical application of knowledge and skills, such as through case studies and role playing. In Phase Three (P3) candidates apply knowledge, reasoning, and skills to address client issues in real world settings. Assessments and appropriate rubrics are created for each phase.

A tremendous amount of activity and progress have resulted with numerous assessments plans, rubrics, scope and sequence charts, and the like being developed. Following are some examples of this work (all new exhibits).

- Principal Assessment Plan  
- School Counseling Assessment Plan  
- Educational Diagnostian Assessment Plan  
- Superintendent Assessment Plan

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

2.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit provides scores over several years on the state licensure exam (TExES) that average just over 90 percent. However, in examining data from Performance Analysis for Colleges of Education (PACE) and the regional proximal zone for professional impact (PZPI) data, concerns are raised about unit graduates success and retention.

The unit is also concerned with data, such as from PACE and elsewhere, that indicate need for improvement in TTU educator preparation programs. The unit does have quality programs and faculty, which have produced quality educators. However, concerns about PACE-like data are a factor in the current rigorous and extensive reform movement within the college.

The emergence of data from TAP, Tripod, STAAR, Apply and Evaluate (A&E), Performance Assessments (PA) and Phase 1, 2, and 3 provide an authentic and valued basis for decision making. Additionally, the use of Tableau Server (new exhibit), Toolbox, TracDat, and Digital
Measures as platforms to organize data also allow for program reform and the subsequent development of outstanding candidates and faculty. The ability of Tableau to organize and analyze data is exceptional. Examples of such analysis are not currently available for public distribution, but will be demonstrated for the BOE team during the onsite visit.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) There is limited evidence of assessment data collection for advanced programs. Not all advanced programs have data.

This concern was addressed under Standard 1, 1.6 (2) and (3). A hyperlink to that explanation is available for review (new exhibit), including an expanded table of transition point assessments.

(2) The unit does not regularly collect program entry level data at the initial level.

The unit does regularly collect entry-level data for initial teaching programs, as indicated in a transition point assessment table (modified from earlier exhibit). Also, GPA data (new exhibit) are available for review. However, one difficulty with collecting such data has been identifying all individuals interested in becoming teachers. Candidates in the College of Education are easily identified and tracked. But the majority of teacher candidates come from six other colleges in the university. The problem is heightened because many individuals do not decide for teacher certification until late into their college career. Also, the university has traditionally focused on degree data, leaving certification concerns to the College of Education. Now there is increased university attention on early identification of such candidates, and new software, Toolbox, (previous exhibit) has the potential for improved collection and organization of all certification-related data. Entry-level data for initial teaching and advanced programs are both included.

2.5 Areas of concern related to TI

(1) While the unit has presented some very good infrastructure for the transformation, there has not been enough time to collect data to determine effectiveness. This must be an ongoing process.

A status report of Tech Teach and a plan for data usage in Tech Teach are available for review.

(2) The program implementation plans need to be defined with specific timelines and activities.

An implementation timeline (new exhibit) for fall 2012 to spring 2015 reveals how transition will occur from traditional to reformed program. Each semester, one "block" of reformed courses will be phased into the program. The entire transformation of the program to Tech Teach will be accomplished by fall 2014. In this manner, the integrity of the traditional program is maintained, while the vision and reforms of the new program is gradually phased in. The graphic of the fall 2013 schedule (new exhibit) shows how this balance between "traditional" and
"Tech Teach" is accomplished, as well as how the TEP is collaborating with departments in other colleges around campus. The schedule, as represented in this artifact, was negotiated with department chairs and advisors from each of the indicated disciplines.

The unit presents assessment plan data on the special education initial program but on other programs, only short paragraphs of goals are presented. Assessment data from all programs are needed.

As programs have been drastically reformed, all aspects of program assessment plans (PAP) have radically changed, including program purposes, trademark (student learning) outcomes, and associated assessments. The reform timeline is just beginning to allow collection of data. Also, it was deemed not useful to pursue collecting data for learning outcomes that were no longer relevant. Therefore the unit has a gap of data in the PAPs. That being said, some older program assessment plans are available for review as follows (all new exhibits):

- Elementary Education
- Secondary Education
- Middle Level Education
- Principal Certification
- Superintendent Certification
- Counselor Education (Community Counseling)
- Counselor Education (School Counseling)
- Special Education (bachelor’s)
- Special Education (doctorate)
- Special Education (master’s)
- Bilingual Education
- English as a Second Language

Additionally, several annual Strategic Planning Assessment Reports (SPAR) provide insight into assessment for the college and for centers in the college (all new exhibits).

- The College of Education
- The Center for the Integration of STEM Education and Research
- The Center for Research on Leadership in Education
- The Burkhart Center for Autism Education and Research
- The Virginia Sowell Center for Research and Education in Sensory Disabilities

It is unclear how all advanced programs are included in the unit assessment system.

This concern was addressed under Standard 1, 1.6 (2) and (3). A hyperlink to that explanation is available for review.

The assessment system chart in Exhibit 2.3.X contains initial programs only. There is no corresponding chart for advanced programs.

The reference to Exhibit 2.3.X is not clear. Does this refer to the following section with the hyperlink to the TAKS exam? If so, this table is meant to focus only on the impact of teachers on P-12 student scores on the TAKS exam. There is no similar data for advanced programs.
The majority of teachers within the PZPI are graduates from Texas Tech, with a large number of individuals being hired annually. (In 2010-11, 39% of the new teachers hired were from Tech.) Therefore, TTU certified teachers have a major impact on the schools within the PZPI. The college’s concern is that P-12 student test scores on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (previous exhibit) exams in the PZPI are historically below state averages. If this reference to Exhibit 2.3.X is to the transition point assessment table, it has now been modified and expanded.

2.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Technology Committee. Where is evidence that the technology committee is meeting?

As noted in the Institutional report, several major products from the Technology Committee provide evidence that the group was meeting and working to accomplish its goals. The following is from the IR with previously reviewed exhibits.

Several activities focused on identifying signature technology for each program: a calendar for technology activities was established, a technology committee report was presented, and Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy was suggested as a possible tool to accomplish this goal.

Additional evidence of Committee activity includes the following (all of which are new exhibits):

- A 2012-13 Strategic Plan, with a stated mission to “promote the use of signature technologies among COE faculty and staff to increase the efficiency of college operations and to facilitate effective teaching strategies that result in students acquiring trademark learning outcomes.”
- An Instructional Technology Taxonomy to foster the classification of signature technology competencies and to enhance program skills and outcomes.
- The Trademark Outcomes Assessment Management System (TOMS). This system, utilizing Blackboard (new exhibit) technology, provides a platform to assess student learning outcomes, particularly the 3 phases of graduate programs. A YouTube video at http://youtu.be/dKebE4ID4qg describes how TOMS has been applied to the Educational Diagnostician Program. The associated diagnostician assessment plan provides another example of Technology Committee efforts.
- Additionally, the following meeting agendas and minutes (all new exhibits) provide support of Technology Committee activity.

  Meeting agenda 090111, Retreat agenda 090611, Meeting minutes 091611, Meeting minutes 101411, Meeting agenda 101112, Meeting agenda 102512, Meeting agenda 110812, Meeting agenda with Dean Ridley 032913, and Meeting agenda 042413
It should be noted that the Technology Committee will not meet in the 2013-2014 year. The Instructional Technology (EDIT) faculty will serve as “consultants” to other programs as courses are moved on-line, and as programs use technology for instruction and evaluation.

(2) Return on Investment Data. What is the “return on investment” data?

The nature of the Return on Investment (ROI) data is described following. However, the data themselves have sensitive aspects, which are not appropriate for this public Offsite Review Addendum. If review of the data is useful, they will be available during the onsite visit.

Big Twelve Initiative #4: Review the cost/returns for faculty/staff members, programs, services, centers, and GAs/RAs. Use this data to make budget allocation decisions to ensure resource availability for the most productive college programs.

The university has explored Responsibility Centered Management as a way of analyzing revenue sources and expenses on a university level. The College has conducted analyses to determine how programs contribute to university revenue. In 2012, Andrea Knapp, Assistant Dean for Finance and Peggy Johnson, Vice Dean, met with each program area and shared with faculty the revenue the program brought to the university and the cost of the faculty teaching the courses.

Revenue includes tuition, formula funding from the state, and college fees. All revenue used in this analysis was derived from semester credit hours. Salaries were based on the semester salaries of faculty.

This is an incomplete picture of the revenue and expenses of programs since faculty have duties other than teaching and revenue is generated by grants and contracts as well as SCH. However, the analysis did provide an indication of the ways that programs contribute to the funding of the university. Another analysis is planned for the fall semester of 2013.

(3) Global Exemplar School Team. What is the status of the Global Exemplar School team?

A Global Exemplar School (GES) Study Team was established to focus on partnerships fostering success for P-20 students and schools. The Team included representatives from P-12 schools, community leaders, and personnel from across Texas Tech University. A goal was to develop pilot programs that would lead to collaborations aimed at advancing P-12 student and school. One focus was to attain grant-related funding for this work, which resulted in the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood (ELPN) Grant. This allowed placing GES principles into an area of Lubbock with a majority of individuals from underrepresented populations.

Promise Neighborhoods, first launched in 2010, is a community-focused program that funds local-led efforts to improve educational opportunities and provide comprehensive health, safety, and support services in high-poverty neighborhoods. The $24.5 million East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood grant, written in collaboration with district personnel, community agency partners, businesses, and local governmental agencies, creates opportunities for educator
preparation faculty and candidates inside and outside the College to work on a large scale effort to improve schools and a community.

The original GES Study Team has now evolved into an **ELPN governance structure**, which directs the work of the grant. An extensive university, P-12 school, and community-based **Advisory Board** and a **Management Service Domain Team** are part of the structure. Community Advisory Board and Management Domain Team meeting **agendas** and **minutes** provide an understanding of ELPN work and activities. The associated programs are being assessed through rigorous **federal guidelines** for such grants. (All documents hyperlinked in this paragraph are new exhibits.)

(4) Graduate Student Survey. What are the results of the May 2013 Graduate Student Survey?

The May 2013 **survey of graduate students** (new exhibit) concerning program satisfaction is available for review. The number of respondents per question ranged from 247 to 295. Graduate candidates from all program areas were included. The quality of the faculty, the curriculum, and the overall quality of graduate programs were rated most highly as follows:

- 4.61 The intellectual quality of the faculty.
- 4.26 The overall quality of the graduate program.
- 4.25 The helpfulness of staff members in the College.
- 4.24 The respect paid to graduate students by faculty members.
- 4.21 The quality of the graduate curriculum.
- 4.21 The level of academic rigor in the program.
- 4.21 The integration of recent developments in the field into coursework.
- 4.20 Relationships between graduate students and faculty members.
- 4.17 The quality of instruction by faculty.

Areas of concern were also noted:

- 3.65 The research opportunities in the program.
- 3.91 The availability of courses needed to complete the program.
- 3.99 The opportunity to interact intellectually across disciplines in the field of education.
- 3.99 The quality of faculty mentorship.
- 4.02 The quality of distance courses.
- 4.08 The quality of advising by faculty.

Analysis of the survey results has resulted in several actions:

- Dean Ridley has met with several focus groups;
- professional development for faculty advising is being developed;
- research methodologists have met to propose research requirements (guidelines for faculty advising graduate students); and
- Educational Technology faculty members will be assisting other faculty with online courses.
Principal Survey. What are the specific data from the principals’ survey?

There is currently only one year of data available from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Principal Survey (new exhibit). The State of Texas’ Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) requires principals who supervise first year teachers to complete a survey (previous exhibit), focusing on: (a) classroom environment and instruction, (b) working with diverse learners, (c) technology integration, and (d) overall effectiveness.

As indicated in the Institutional Report, the unit found the results from the initial Principal Survey to be concerning, with such data become a primary force for the reforms now occurring in educator preparation programs at Texas Tech University.

Employer Focus Groups. When have employer focus groups occurred and is there evidence?

Past attempts to attain employer feedback about graduates usually resulted in a low rate of survey returns. To counter the problem, current program reforms required employer input as an initial element of the process, and which was included in the review by the Dean’s Executive Council (DEC). The DEC presentations occurred during the spring semester 2012, with employer focus groups mostly convened fall 2011.

A sense of employer input may be gained from selected slides from the DEC PowerPoint presentations. For example, the secondary education faculty solicited through employer forums and teacher meetings the nature of desired secondary teachers. Counselor education incorporates input from several outside sources. Special Education, Elementary Education, and Language Literacy Education all note input from stakeholders. Also notice that these slides indicate the incorporation of state and national standards. The combination of employer input with professional standards provide a strong foundation for programs that develop skills, products, and assessments. (All of the following hyperlinks are new exhibits.)

- Middle-level Education
- Secondary Education
- Counselor Education
- Special Education
- Elementary Education
- Language and Literacy Education
- Educational Leadership (Principal)

Elementary, middle-level, and secondary personnel have also met with Lubbock ISD “Green Teachers.” These are individuals with student achievement scores above the district average. An agenda for the May 14, 2013 meeting is attached, as well as notes from the elementary and middle/secondary meetings. Elementary also had an earlier stakeholder’s meeting (all are new exhibits).
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.5 Areas of concern related to TI

(1) The unit has not discussed how the TI will be sustained and enhanced in the area of field/clinical experiences.

The college decided to pursue the Transformative Initiative Option because it fit well with the reforms already occurring within educator preparation programs. Tech Teach, the new Teacher Education Program, is the focus of the TI; however, it is not a separate initiative to test out a particular aspect of educator preparation. Tech Teach is rather the transformation of the teacher education program as a whole. This is true of all aspects of the program, including field/clinical experiences.

Although Tech Teach is the focus of the TI, the TI in turn is part of a fundamental reform effort that involves all programs, including advanced certification and graduate degree ones. Therefore, as with the transition to any new program, the human and financial resources will move with this transition. As faculty, staff, and finances are no longer needed in the old program, they will be shifted to the new ones. An implementation schedule (new exhibit) is available for review.

Additionally, the recent hiring of 23 individuals as site coordinators, eight tenure-track faculty, and 2 clinical faculty members, was all done with permanent money. The use of Teachscape has been incorporated into fees. All these costs are incorporated into the “fabric” of the college and already in the fixed cost of the unit.

3.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Candidates not in Tech Teach. How do candidates not involved in Tech Teach meet this standard?

Candidates not in the pilot program are still completing field experiences and student teaching. All such candidates prior to student teaching are spending one full day in a classroom setting. They are completing assignments from their courses (Apply and Evaluate assignments) in the field. Additionally, candidates not in Tech Teach are completing a full semester (five days a week) of student teaching.

(2) Candidate experience with diverse students. How do initial and advanced candidates work with students with exceptionalities and limited English language proficiencies?

This concern is very similar to the one in 4.6 (3): “What data does the unit have that all candidates’ field and clinical experiences include work with students with exceptionalities and ELL students?” The response for this 3.6 (2) concern is therefore given as an exhibit of the 4.6 (3) response (new exhibit).
Partnerships at advanced level. How are partnerships for advanced candidates being developed?

The major outcomes from COE transformation, as noted on the conceptual framework, focus on the importance of partnerships in 1) producing the measurably best educators in the U.S.; 2) collaborating to foster school/agency/community effectiveness; and 3) conducting intervention research that advances a measured impact on those we serve.

At the advanced level, collaboration focuses on P3 partnerships – all graduate programs have P3 internships based on client needs. Graduate students meet contract-specific outcomes as part of TTU academic program requirements designed to facilitate higher-order (skills, outcome-producing capacities) trademark outcomes.

A major way in which partnerships are fostered is through the program reform process requiring input from employers. The Counselor Education program has relied on input from outside sources for several years including: site supervisor twice yearly meetings, survey from employers of graduates, the Counselor Education Advisory Board and its Ad Hoc Committees, and alumni.

For the principal and superintendent programs, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) requires that the acting administrator of P-12 schools work with program faculty and candidates, who are to meet a minimum of three times during the year-long principal internship. The superintendent internship is for one semester and joint meetings are also required. The purpose such meetings is to review student progress and identify areas of strengths and areas of needed support.

Graduate programs are developing partnerships with institutions including schools, agencies, and institutions of higher education so that graduate candidates may complete their Phase 3 work. P3 work requires authentic performance in a context using the P3 rubric developed for each program. For example, Counselor Education’s School Counseling Program has a rubric for communications skills and for essential therapeutic skills. Programs are currently making arrangements for such partnerships. More traditional collaborations also occur. The Educational Leadership faculty members have been active for the past four years with Lubbock ISD personnel developing a Summer Leadership Institute. (An agenda for breakout sessions is available for review.) (The four preceding hyperlinks are previous exhibits.)

Dispositions. How are dispositions assessed regarding the belief that all students can learn?

In the Tech Teach program, dispositions are assessed through performance assessments and through Tripod and benchmark scores. The Haberman Star pre-screening survey (new exhibit) is being developed to assess the dispositions of teacher candidates upon entry into the College of Education. This survey is intended to evaluate candidates' dispositions related to Persistence, Organization and Planning, Values for Student Learning, Fallibility, and four other dispositions associated with teacher retention and success in working in higher-poverty settings.

Dispositions are also assessed using the TAP rubric in categories such as Activities and Materials (are relevant to student lives, provide students with choices) and Academic Feedback, and
Instructional Plans (evidence that plan provides regular opportunities to accommodate individual student needs). Additionally scores on benchmark tests and scores on the Tripod are disaggregated to assure that candidates are having positive effects on diverse groups of students.

Previous to Tech Teach, dispositions were addressed via competencies in the e-Portfolios as follows:

### e-Portfolio Dispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition Competency</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010*</th>
<th>Spring 2011*</th>
<th>Fall 2011*</th>
<th>Spring 2012*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for All Students</td>
<td>N=118</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional planning considers student diversity (2)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate fostering learning, equity and excellence (5)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors performance and provides quality feedback for all students (10)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Demeanor</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacts with professional community and participates in professional activities (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to legal and ethical requirements (13)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Critically and Reflectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-point scale. Although the domains and competencies remain the same, the assignments and rubrics for the ePortfolio changed as of Fall 2010.


Clinical placements for advanced programs are the responsibility of faculty in those programs as follows:

- **Counselor Education:**
  The Counselor Education Field Experiences Handbooks (new exhibits) for practicum and internship experiences are extremely specific about placement for field experiences. Sections of the handbook including Guidelines for Obtaining a Field Site.

  The Clinical Director and the Counselor Education faculty will assist prospective counseling interns in obtaining potential practicum and internship sites by providing information about approved sites and discussing questions about potential sites.

  The faculty’s policy regarding interns obtaining a field site is that this process is a joint responsibility of the faculty and the student. The Clinical Director, Dr. Hendricks, will provide initial site information via the on-line Field Site Database. It is the student’s responsibility to use this information to select their sites and to schedule interviews for potential practicum or internship site placement. It is the student’s responsibility to contact the Counselor Education faculty or Clinical
Director for assistance as needed. Students may request that the Clinical Director make a follow-up contact (if necessary) in obtaining a new site for an internship. If the student has been unable to obtain a field site after several interviews, he or she should contact the Clinical Director for further assistance.

- Educational Leadership Programs for Principals and Superintendents:
  Within the master’s (principal) program and the superintendent certification program, candidates practice their internships at a school or schools within the district in which they are employed as teachers or as administrators. Candidates make placement requests and are dependent on the good will of area administrators to participate in this voluntary activity, but to date no one has refused to work with an intern.

- Educational Diagnostician:
  The educational diagnostician program requires an internship of 160 hours documenting assessment and evaluation of students with special needs in a field based placement with a mentor. Mentors are arranged locally by the candidate. The candidate provides the EDSP 5094 course instructor with the contact information and credentials of their local mentor. The local mentors are required to be trained and certified in administering standardized assessments (i.e. Intelligence tests and Achievement tests) and to have a minimum of two years of experience as a Diagnostician, an LSSP, or other professional credentials (e.g. clinical psychologist).

  Students also receive supervision from the EDSP 5094 course instructor in accordance with TEA regulations for professional certification programs. Students provide video evidence of assigned skills related to the skills expected of practicing diagnosticians via three 45 minute videos during the semester. Each video is viewed by the EDSP 5094 instructor and is followed up by a 15 minute personalized contact (generally by phone). These supervisory videos and follow up feedback sessions are in addition to the distinctive outcome of the Master’s program, which requires students to develop and implement an assessment plan using a collaborative consultation model and to submit a video and written self-evaluation of the placement.

**Standard 4: Diversity**

4.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Faculty knowledge and experience. What are specific examples of faculty knowledge and experience related to preparing all candidates to work with diverse learners?

One means to judge faculty knowledge and experience is to consider individuals who are themselves from underrepresented populations. Beginning in 2003, the college established a major initiative to diversify faculty. From fall 2003 through fall 2012 there have been 80 new faculty hires (previous exhibit). Of those 68% (54) were female and 34% (27) were from underrepresented ethnic populations.
Additionally, the Educational Leadership (EDLD) program five of six of current faculty have conducted leadership research in working with diverse learners and have publications focused on leadership required to move student achievement higher among diverse learners. A large number of those publications focus on transformational and ethical leadership. In addition, EDLD faculty have supervised doctoral student research (in the last 10 years, EDLD faculty have hooded a total of 62 doctoral students) and most of that research has focused on transformational leadership and what it takes to practice transformational leadership. Research indicates that practicing transformational leadership is helpful when addressing the needs of diverse learners.

From individual professors:

- Melanie Hart professor in Health, Exercise, and Sport Sciences: My personal knowledge and experience relating to adequate preparation for teaching Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) candidates how to deal with exceptionalities is extensive. I taught PE, coached a variety of sports, and taught in the academic classroom for 31 years in the public school prior to teaching at Tech. My final 15 years of public school teaching was at a very diverse, low socio-economic High School. I had to adapt teaching styles to accommodate students with physical handicaps (no arms), blind, deaf and ELL students. Through personal experience, I am able to transfer my success strategies to my PETE students.

- Penny Pollart: I have worked with reluctant and struggling readers and writers from elementary through college age. I taught Developmental Reading at another University for 7 years.

- Rach King: Before I retired last year I had been the District Bilingual/ESL Coordinator for the Marble Falls Independent School District. Before that I was a bilingual teacher for 22 years. I also provide training for teachers who would like to add ESL to their certification and I’ve been providing that training for the last 7 years. As a bilingual teacher and as the District Bilingual and ESL Coordinator, I worked fulltime with bilingual/ESL teachers and students for 29 years so I feel that my experience helps me prepare teacher candidate to work with diverse learners.

- Nora Griffin-Shirley Professor in Special Education: All of our courses deal with diverse learners.

- The vita of Barbara Allison (new exhibit) professor in Family and Consumer Sciences Education, has numerous publications and presentations focused on diverse and English language learners.

(2) Evidence that all candidates’ diverse field and clinical experiences. How does the unit track and ensure that each candidate has diverse placement experiences?

(3) Exceptionalities and ELL. What data does the unit have that all candidates’ field and clinical experiences include work with students with exceptionalities and ELL students? 

(The responses for concerns 2 and 3 are similar, so are considered together.)

The current structure for clinical placement of teacher candidates is a “POD” system. A “POD” is a group of campuses where candidates will be placed from the beginning of their field experience to the end of student teaching. Campuses for a “POD” were selected based on several diverse measures i.e., Title I status of the campus, diversity of students, location of campuses, exceptionality of students, and number of English Language Learners. During the
first semester in the Teacher Education Program, students are placed with one campus from the group of campuses in the POD. Students will then rotate to a different campus for each semester thus ensuring the diversity of experiences. Current, “traditional,” students are placed using the same POD system, again promoting a diversity of experiences. An overview of the PODS arrangement (new exhibit) is available, and the student demographics within the PODS available for review.

Prior to Tech Teach students were placed by a faculty member on a campus that best fit the needs of their course or program for field experience. A database with placements was maintained in the Field Experiences office. When students applied for student teaching, the database was consulted and all factors affecting diversity were considered before making a student teaching/internship assignment. For example, if during field experience a student was placed in a High SES campus, the student teaching placement would be at a low SES campus. If a student was always at a campus with students with no exceptionalities, a placement would be made at a campus to ensure experience with exceptionalities.

Also, all candidates in teacher education programs complete a special education and English as a Second Language course. Furthermore, Apply and Evaluate (A&E) activities are now in courses and set in field settings with P-12 students with special needs and ELL.

Candidates having experiences with diverse populations are also important at the advanced program level. For several years, the Educational Leadership program has included action research projects in the master’s internships (the field and clinical experience part of the program). One of those experiences is to analyze after school supplemental program, its effectiveness, and what can be done to better meet student needs. Those programs are usually geared to students with exceptionalities, including ELL students. The superintendent certification internship also includes experiences with students with exceptionalities and ELL students.

In advanced special education programs, internship courses deal with diverse learners in school or rehabilitation settings for people with sensory impairments. Many of these individual have additional disabilities including a sensory disability. This is noted in the course purpose of EDSP 5093.

The purpose of this course is to provide practical experiences working with students with visual impairments in the classroom and community as indicated by the Student Learning Outcomes in EDSP 5093 (new exhibit) Internship in Special Education: Teachers of Students with Visual Impairments.

In Family and Consumer Sciences Education (FCSE), Professor Barbara Allison notes that a lesson plan template used in the FCSE program includes a section on accommodations, “Describe how you would accommodate ELL students or students who are not proficient in the English language in this lesson.” Additionally from the ECSE 4302 syllabus: “Upon completion of this course, students will be able to develop effective teaching plans that address the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains of learning and meet the needs of all students including students with exceptionalities and ELL students.”
Diverse Candidates. What data does the unit have that initial and advanced candidates interact with peers of diverse backgrounds on committees and education projects?

It is clear that the university and the educator preparation programs do not have enough diversity of candidates. However, there has been an increase in diverse populations in the past four years. The university tracks ethnicity of candidates each semester. In the fall of 2009, minority undergraduate candidates in the COE made up 23% of the total. In the fall of 2012, minority candidates made up 27% of the total. This increased diversity should promote increased interaction of peers.

Changes, if available, outlined in the Educator Preparation Diversity Plan. How do candidates, faculty, and staff develop curriculum and devise culturally responsive experiences?

Faculty members are aware of and utilize state and national standards and competencies as they develop curriculum and devise culturally responsive experiences. Diversity-related proficiencies, such as the following, are mandated in the state’s Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Competencies; and are used as the bases of assessment throughout initial educator preparation programs.

- The teacher understands student diversity and knows how to plan learning experiences and design assessments that are responsive to differences among students and that promote all students’ learning.
- The teacher knows how to establish a classroom climate that fosters learning, equity, and excellence, and uses this knowledge to create a physical and emotional environment that is safe and productive.

Similar competencies for advanced programs are also specified for Educational Diagnosticians, School Counselors, Principals, and Superintendents (new exhibits).

Many initial certification courses focus on diversity-related concepts and issues, as noted in the following course syllabi (new exhibits).

- EDEL 2300 Schools, Society, and Diversity
- EDSE 2300 Schools, Society, and Diversity
- EDSE 4322 Diversity and the Classroom Learning Environment
- EDEL 4360 Teaching Social Studies
- EDCI 3361 Teaching Social Studies at the Middle Level
- EDSP 3300 Exceptional Children and Youth
- EDSP 3205 Learning and Special Populations.

Coursework at the advanced level also emphasizes diversity-related concepts and issues (new exhibits).

- EDBL 5337 Teaching Strategies for ESL and Content-Area Teachers of Limited English Proficient students
- EDLD 6341 Legal Issues with Special Populations
- EDSE 5305 Issues and Reform in American Secondary Schooling
Diversity-related proficiencies are specified throughout programs for pre-student-teaching field experiences, student teaching/internships, culminating portfolios and certification examinations. Those proficiencies have been adopted and modified for TTU usage from state specified competencies. Such proficiencies are integrated throughout all initial certification programs. Those focused on meeting the needs of all learners are as follows:

1. Selects learner-centered and developmentally appropriate instructional content
2. (a) Uses diversity in the classroom and the community to enrich all students’ learning experiences
   (b) Plans and adapts lessons to address students’ varied backgrounds, skills, interests, and learning needs, including the needs of English language learners and students with disabilities
3. Establishes a classroom environment of courtesy and respect that is safe, nurturing, inclusive, and productive
4. (a) Organizes activities, applies procedures, and manages time in ways that promote student learning, appropriate behavior, and ethical work habits in the classroom
   (b) Establishes and maintains positive rapport with students
5. Demonstrates clear and accurate oral and written communication in the teaching and learning processes and uses language that is appropriate to students’ ages, interests, and backgrounds
   (b) Exhibits effective communication and interpersonal skills to enhance student understanding
6. (a) Applies instructional strategies to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process and to promote critical thinking and problem solving
   (b) Remediates or enriches as a result of ongoing assessment and reflection
7. Monitors student performance and achievement with appropriate and varied assessments
8. Develops positive, productive relationships with students, parents, staff, and other professionals

Individual professors note how issues of diversity are considered.

- **JoAnn Klinker Professor in Educational Leadership:** We constructed our revised master’s and doctoral program from the advice from our advisory board and the input from administrators/teachers. As 99% of our students are teachers and/or administrators, our classroom conversations center around their problems of practice which are inclusive of culturally responsive experiences and curriculum that is address culturally diverse needs.
- **Nora Griffin Shirley, Professor in Special Education:** The Personnel Preparation Advisory Group (PPAG) provides feedback on areas we need to improve. In our May 2013 meeting of the PPAG, we asked about devising culturally responsive experiences. Feedback from the group lead to course revisions in EDSP 5386, 5387, and 5093.
- **Jerry Dwyer, Professor in Mathematics:** “I also use multiple instructional strategies to address the needs of diverse learners. In general it is our aim to have extensive group work in all the special math courses for middle level.”
- **Melanie Hart Professor in Health, Exercise, and Sport Sciences:** “ESS 4445 students are required to keep journals and lesson plans during the entirety of the course. These must include adaptations for exceptional children.”
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit:

(1) Faculty knowledge of standards. Evidence that faculty connect their courses to state and national standards.

All programs made a presentation to the Dean’s Executive Council focused on program reforms, which included references to using state and national standards. The following excerpts from those presentations are examples (all are new exhibits):

- **Secondary Education**: “TEA Requirements,” “College & Career Readiness Standards,” and “Affiliation with National Learned Societies.”
- **Counselor Education**: “Input from CACREP Standards.”
- **Special Education**: “All courses are currently aligned with Texas and National Professional Standards (TEA & Council of Exceptional Children).”
- **Language Literacy Education**: “Sources for Conditions/Context/Skills and Products: NCTE and IRA.”

Individual professors also indicate incorporation of standards into coursework (all exhibits in this section are new).

- In FCSE 4302, my students create a "Unit Plan" containing 5 lesson plans. In every lesson plan, they are required to identify the state standards that reflect their lesson content. (Barbara Allison, professor in Family and Consumer Sciences Education)
- As noted in the Syllabus for ESS 4445, at least one entire lecture is devoted to NASPE, the National Standards for Physical Education, and the National Standards and Guidelines for Physical Education Teacher Education. Each lesson plan prepared by students in this class must contain the National Standard covered in that lesson. Students must also include the TEKS for that lesson. (Melanie Hart, Professor in Exercise and Sport Sciences)
- The student learning outcomes for **EDLD 5392** (highlighted in yellow), Principal Internship in Education, are based greatly on the Texas State Board for Educator Certification Standards for the Principalship.
- In a 4/18/13 meeting, the Middle Level program faculty “voted to add TExES (Texas Examinations of Educator Standards), AMLE (Association for Middle Level Education), and relevant national content standards as an appendix to each syllabus.” The incorporation of both state and national standards is evidenced in syllabi for **EDLL 3354**, Reading Processes and Practices at the Middle Level; and **EDML 3370**, Teaching Mathematics at the Middle Level.
- The first two of six Student Learning Outcomes for **EDML 4325**, Classroom Management for Middle Level Teachers, focus on state and national standards.
- In social studies methods, **EDEL 4360**, assignments are based off the state and national standards. Candidates are required to develop lesson plans, eBooks, and drama play that are supported with appropriate grade level TEKS. The students take a final exam that is multiple choice and is based on knowledge of socials studies content. (Penny Pollart)
Faculty terminal degree. A revised faculty table that includes information about earned doctorate status for all faculty member.

Faculty. Information about the total number of faculty in the educator preparation program. (Concerns 2 and 9 are similar and are combined for the following response.)

NCATE’s Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) indicates a total of 192 educator preparation faculty members at Texas Tech University. Unfortunately it is extremely difficult to capture data of all individuals, particularly teaching assistants (TAs) and graduate part-time instructors (GPTIs), in the seven colleges outside the College of Education. This difficulty was acknowledged at the beginning of the Institutional Report.

Texas Tech University acknowledges that the preparation of quality educators is the responsibility of the entire university. This is evidenced by certification candidates being enrolled in majors throughout the university, general education courses being delivered across the campus, and educator preparation programs being housed in eight of the nine traditional colleges and the Graduate School. The professional education unit therefore represents all educator preparation programs no matter where they are housed. However, for the purposes of the NCATE review, the unit will be defined as the College of Education (COE). This designation is a practical one, conforming to administrative realities, including university organization of college-specific records and data.

Even so, the following may be stated about educator preparation faculty at TTU.

- Institutional Research’s Data Warehouse (new exhibit) indicates for fall 2012, the College of Education had 93 full-time and 49 part-time faculty members (excluding TAs and GPTIs).
- Every tenured and tenure-track faculty in the COE (83) have doctoral degrees. This is a basic requisite for employment.
- Outside the COE, 35 of the 36 tenured and tenure-track faculty have doctoral degrees. The one without a doctoral degree is considered to have a masters-level terminal degree for that program.
- Additionally, all individuals involved with educator preparation but not on a tenured track must possess a master’s degree relevant to the course and 18 credit hours relevant to the teaching discipline. This is a condition of employment in the university.

Clinical faculty’s licensure status. Additional information about the credentials and experience of clinical faculty who serve as classroom mentors for interns or student teachers, including information about those professional’s licensure in the fields in which they teach.

To qualify as a student teaching mentor teacher, an individual must have a minimum of three (3) years of classroom teaching experience, possess certification in the content area being taught, and be identified and recommended as a quality role-model by the building principal and/or district office. Mentor teachers should demonstrate prior success with students according to state standards.
Instructional practices. Examples of innovative instructional strategies used by faculty.

All faculty members are engaged in innovative instructional strategies as a result of the major reforms in the College of Education as follows:

- Teacher education programs incorporate Apply and Evaluate (A&E) (new exhibit) activities throughout coursework, in which candidates learn knowledge and skills in courses, apply them to field settings, and then evaluate the success of those applications. A&E Schedules (previous exhibit) are developed.
- Instructional competency during student teaching/internship is measured by Performance Assessments (new exhibit) using the TAP Rubric (previous exhibit). An overview of TAP is available for review (previous exhibit).
- At the beginning and conclusion of student teaching, P-12 students are administered a Tripod Survey. Tripod (previous exhibit) provides information about student attitudes towards their student teacher and that student teacher’s instruction.
- Video capture of lessons is an important feature of Tech Teach. Candidates use video equipment to record lessons and then upload the videos to the TeachScape (previous exhibit) website. TeachScape enables students, TTU faculty, and site coordinators to review and assess lessons taught.
- Tech Teach faculty all engaged in reviewing the videos of student teachers in their respective programs, and double scoring the videos using the TAP rubric in the spring of 2013. The resulting program evaluations yielded goals for fall 2013. Reports from all three programs are available for review: Elementary, Middle Level, and Secondary (new exhibits).
- All graduate degree and advanced certification programs have been, or are being revised to enable candidates to have a positive impact on the clients (e.g., schools, agencies, and community) they serve. For graduate programs, three phases of learning are assessed to ensure candidate success. Phase One (P1) emphasizes the foundational knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) focuses on the hypothetical application of knowledge and skills, such as through case studies and role playing. In phase Three (P3) candidates apply knowledge, reasoning, and skills to address client issues in real world settings. Assessments and appropriate rubrics are created for each phase by program faculty members. Results will be entered into a database enabling faculty to monitor candidate progress and to evaluate program quality.

Faculty Scholarship. Follow-up with faculty vitae to examine depth of scholarship. For example, the EPP only provides one year of sample publications for faculty. Are additional publications listed on faculty vitae?

Education faculty members, both within and outside the College of Education, have an outstanding record of scholarly productivity. Such information is stored in the commercial software Digital Measures, which when queried provides a three-year overview of faculty publications, presentations, and grant activities. (All three of these documents are new exhibits.)

Terminology. Description of “statistically indistinguishable” in state surveys.
"Statistically indistinguishable" indicates that the analysis of state-level data revealed teacher education programs at Texas Tech University were not statistically different from other TEPs in the comparison group.

(7) Faculty involvement in Tech Teach. Examples through interviews to be conducted on site regarding faculty involvement in curriculum redesign in the Tech Teach program. Individuals to be interviewed are to be determined by consulting with Dr. Rong.

(8) Endowed chair. Follow-up on the status of hiring an endowed chair.

Dr. Jian Wang has now been hired for the endowed chair position. His vita and a recent proposal to AERA (new exhibits) have been attached for review.

(9) Faculty. Information about the total number of faculty in the educator preparation program.

(Concern #9 was addressed with concern # 2.)

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.5 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Course Load. Data on course load by faculty member along with an interpretation of the columns in the table that describe the course load.

Following is an excerpt from the individual workload table (previous exhibit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coll</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>Crs</th>
<th>Sect</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>Agnello, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>Aquirro, Zonaida</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>5340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>Aquirro, Zonaida</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDBL</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>Aquirro, Zonaida</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>5340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>Aquirro, Zonaida</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>5340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend and explanation of the Individual Workload table above:
- Coll: ED College of Education (COE)
- Dept: EDUC These data place all COE faculty into a single “education” department
- Name: Name of faculty member and then below are the extra workload
equivalencies (#7a to #7r), which are identified in university policy (previous exhibits).

- **FTE:** Full Time Equivalent (This indicates that this individual’s assignment is equivalent to One Full Time assignment. This could be .5 or .25 for some individuals.)
- **Subj:** This indicates the course prefix/program. (e.g., EDEL indicates the course in the Elementary Education program.)
- **Crs:** The number of the course.
- **Sect:** The section of that particular course. (The first digit indicates the level of the course—1 through 4 indicates freshman through senior-level courses. 5-8 indicates graduate courses. The second digit indicates the number of semester hours credit. The last two digits indicate a course designation.)
- **Load:** How much workload credit is assigned to that particular activity. (e.g. 4.5 indicates 4.5 workload credit for teaching this particular graduate course.)
- **Count:** The number of students in this particular section of this course.
- **Method:** The type of course, lecture, independent, and discussion.

The workload of COE faculty is consistent with the following college policy (new exhibit), which in turn is consistent with university policies.

Each faculty member is assigned a minimum of a 12-credit-hour equivalent teaching workload. Non-graduate faculty, teaching undergraduate courses are assigned the equivalent of four 3-credit-hour courses per semester. Graduate faculty teaching either undergraduate, graduate, or a combination of graduate and undergraduate courses are assigned one semester of three 3-credit-hour courses, one semester of two 3-credit hour-courses, and the equivalent of 3-6 credit hours released time for scholarship for one semester and a reduction to two 3 credit-hour courses and 6 research hours for the other semester. Faculty who teach undergraduate, graduate, or a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses and who are directing at least three doctoral dissertations may be assigned the equivalent of two 3-credit-hour courses and 3 credit hours for dissertation research during the semester in which students complete their dissertations.

Workloads of individual faculty members may vary based on qualifications and the needs of the departments. Department chairs assign individual faculty workloads. Faculty workloads will be monitored in relation to student demand while simultaneously maintaining a high level of faculty productivity. Faculty workloads may be adjusted for specified periods of time, based on department and individual faculty needs, for carrying out their teaching and research responsibilities.

Additionally, the University Workload Comparisons (previous exhibit) for fall 2012 indicate the average workload of COE faculty at 17.35, above the university average of 12.22 and above all other colleges at TTU except Agriculture.
(2) Faculty engagement. Evidence of faculty engagement in program design, implementation, and evaluation of programs and the unit.

A dropbox system was used to capture the dozens of documents generated by faculty members as they worked to transform/reform programs. The system allowed easy interaction between faculty within and between programs. The attached screen shots of the various levels of the drop box for only two programs, an initial one (Elementary Education—new exhibit) and an advanced one (Educational Leadership—new exhibit) provides a sense of the magnitude of faculty engagement with the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

(3) Tech Teach sustainability. Plans for sustained monetary support for the Tech Teach initiative. Documentation of the educator preparation program’s plans for the sustainability of the TI.

The response to this concern is substantially the same as the one for 3.5 (1): “The unit has not discussed how the TI will be sustained and enhanced in the area of field/clinical experiences.” Therefore, this response becomes an exhibit of the response from 3.5 (1) (new exhibit).

(4) Tech Teach and Arts and Science faculty. Evidence of how Arts & Sciences partners been involved in the Tech Teach initiative

There are several examples of Arts and Science Partnerships:

- The secondary education course schedule was negotiated with the A&S departments of English, History, Mathematics, Science, Health, Exercise, and Sport Sciences, and Classical and Modern Languages.
- Doug Hamman, Director of Teacher Education, has met with all impacted A&S chairpersons and the interim dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- There have been meetings with advisors of teacher preparation programs from around campus, including discussion of an implementation schedule (new exhibit).
- Arts and Sciences advisors have distributed Tech Teach recruiting materials during freshmen orientation.
- COE personnel met with Arts and Science advisors (new exhibit).

(5) Tech Teacher and P-12 partners. Evidence of the involvement in the development and implementation of the Tech Teach initiative by P-12 partners.

Evidence of the involvement in the development and implementation of the Tech Teach initiative by P-12 partners is captured with examples of shared governance between the university and ISD partners. Shared governance within TTU and between university and ISD personnel is an essential part of the TI.

- The Teacher Education Council, a Provost Council, oversees teacher education at Texas Tech. This year the TEC, with representatives from all the colleges connected with teacher education, has been active in disseminating information about the transformation initiative. TEC meetings have provided opportunities for faculty from the College of Education and faculty from around campus to exchange ideas. The TEC also has
representatives from three area school districts and the regional Education Service Center. The public school representatives regularly report on issues affecting public education. The TEC for the past two years has become a forum for input on the TI. (2/20/13 Meeting Minutes, 3/20/13 Meeting Minutes.) (Previous exhibits)

- TTU and ISD personnel were involved with the rigorous four-day TAP training workshops (previous exhibit), with interaction between the two groups organized and promoted.

- A major change in shared governance with school districts is indicated by an excerpt from a memo of understanding (MOU). “The superintendent and dean of the college, or mutually-accepted leader designees, and other key district and TTU leaders will attend monthly shared-governance meetings.” An example of a MOU (previous exhibit) is available for review.

- Much shared governance is enacted through meetings between site coordinators (SC) and building principals. The purposes of the meeting are to: (a) share information gathered by the SC about the implementation of Tech Teach, such as the amount of co-teaching, results from Tripod, and progress on the TAP indicators; (b) discuss implementation and calendar issues; (c) identify candidates to be considered for teaching positions in the coming year; and (d) discuss any other problems that may exist.

- Doug Hamman, COE Director of Teacher Education Programs, meets monthly with Lubbock ISD leadership personnel, including: Kathy Rollo, Executive Director, Leadership and Professional Development; Kelly Trlica, Chief Academic Officer; Lisa Leach, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; and Denise Mattson, Executive Director School Support Services. Meeting agendas (previous exhibit) are available for review.

- A Tech Teach Leadership Team meets weekly, including Scott Ridley, Dean; Peggy Johnson, Vice Dean; Doug Hamman, Director of Teacher Education Programs; Peggie Price, Chairperson of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction; Kathy Rollo, LISD Executive Director, Leadership and Professional Development; Lisa Leach, LISD Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Dora Salazar, Professional Development Facilitator (PDF); Katie Button, PDF; Donna Brasher, University Certification Officer, Larry Hovey, Coordinator of Assessment, and several student representatives.

- The TEP Director, Site Coordinators, and PDFs maintain continuous communication with school district personnel.

- TEP faculty met with school district (ISD) personnel to determine which performance outcomes were important to ISDs. A sense of employer input may be gained from selected slides from the DEC PowerPoint presentations. (All of the following hyperlinks are new exhibits.)
  - Middle-level Education
  - Secondary Education
  - Special Education
  - Elementary Education

- Elementary, middle-level, and secondary personnel have also met with Lubbock ISD “Green Teachers.” These are individuals with student achievement scores above the district average. An agenda for the May 14, 2013 meeting is attached, as well as notes.
from the elementary and middle/secondary meetings. Elementary also had an earlier stakeholder’s meeting. (All of these hyperlinks are new exhibits.)

2.6 Evidence for the Site Visit Team to validate during the onsite visit

(2) Return on Investment Data. What is the “return on investment” data?

Dr. Rong suggested the following response should be in both Standard 2 and 6.

The nature of the Return on Investment (ROI) data is described following. However, the data themselves have sensitive aspects, which are not appropriate for this public Offsite Review Addendum. If review of the data is useful, they will be available during the onsite visit.

Big Twelve Initiative #4: Review the cost/returns for faculty/staff members, programs, services, centers, and GAs/RAs. Use this data to make budget allocation decisions to ensure resource availability for the most productive college programs.

The university has explored Responsibility Centered Management as a way of analyzing revenue sources and expenses on a university level. The College has conducted analyses to determine how programs contribute to university revenue. In 2012, Andrea Knapp, Assistant Dean for Finance and Peggy Johnson, Vice Dean, met with each program area and shared with faculty the revenue the program brought to the university and the cost of the faculty teaching the courses.

Revenue includes tuition, formula funding from the state, and college fees. All revenue used in this analysis was derived from semester credit hours. Salaries were based on the semester salaries of faculty.

This is an incomplete picture of the revenue and expenses of programs since faculty have duties other than teaching and revenue is generated by grants and contracts as well as SCH. However, the analysis did provide an indication of the ways that programs contribute to the funding of the university. Another analysis is planned for the fall semester of 2013.