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I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

According to the Institutional Report, originally named Texas Technological College, the institution opened in 1925 with six buildings and an enrollment of 910. By action of the Texas state legislature, Texas Technological College formally became Texas Tech University on September 1, 1969. As a result, the School of Education, along with the Schools of Agricultural Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Engineering, and Home Economics became known as "colleges." Currently, the university is the largest (30,000 plus students) comprehensive public higher education institution in the western two-thirds of Texas. It is classified as a Research University Extensive by the Carnegie Foundation. The university states that its mission as a public research university is to advance "knowledge through innovative and creative teaching, research, and scholarship." The university "is dedicated to student success by preparing learners to be ethical leaders for a diverse and globally competitive workforce. The university is committed to enhancing the cultural and economic development of the state, nation, and world."

The university has clearly acknowledged that the preparation of quality educators is the responsibility of the entire university. The university reports that its educator certification candidates are 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. For the purposes of the current accreditation review, the College of Education is defined as the unit as well as the coordinating body for partnering educator preparation programs in other colleges (e.g., Arts & Sciences, Human Sciences). The university argues that this designation is a practical one, conforming to administrative realities, including university organization of college-specific records and data. However, a major institutional-wide initiative, Toolbox, now provides more extensive certification-level, not just degree-level data.

The university has been regionally accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
(SACS) since 1928. The educator preparation unit has been continuously accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1963.

The unit has submitted a full listing of all educator preparation programs, including administrative home colleges and enrollments. The unit states that it has received a waiver from Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review for the fall 2013 accreditation cycle; however, SPA standards are incorporated into programs. Some programs have been reviewed by other accrediting bodies. In addition to the College of Education, educator preparation programs are also administered by the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (Agriculture Education), Arts and Sciences (content preparation), Business Administration (content preparation), Engineering (content preparation), Human Sciences (Early Childhood Education), Mass Communications, and Visual and Performing Arts (Art and Music Education).

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This is an NCATE/CAEP-only legacy visit. The state was informed of the visit by the unit; however, a state evaluation team did not participate in either the offsite or onsite visit. On behalf of NCATE/CAEP, Nate Thomas participated in the offsite and onsite visits as an observer.

I.3 Programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning. Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

The unit is in the planning process of implementing online teacher preparation programs at sites in Dallas/Fort Worth, Grand Prairie, Houston, Lamesa, New Caney, and San Antonio. These programs will be in place in the fall 2014. As such, these future programs are not part of the current review.

I.4 Unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit. (Character Limit: 3,000)

Not applicable.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

II.1 Overview of the unit’s conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit reports that a fundamental shift in developing and articulating its conceptual framework has occurred since the last NCATE review in fall 2006. It is designed to realize a revolutionary transformation in educator preparation. The unit states that the conceptual framework has two facets—one focused on process, and the other on outcomes. The process component includes four thrusts: (1) transforming educator preparation; (2) transforming client/university partnerships; (3) transforming educational research; and (4) transforming reward systems. The second aspect of the conceptual
framework focuses on the outcome of transformation. The "Integrated Scholar" model carries three major outcomes: (1) producing 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 the community the unit serves. In essence, the unit's conceptual framework focuses on the application of academic theories in real world settings. The unit desires that its approach will add value by collaborating with community stakeholders to develop the human capital potential of all students and especially the historically underserved children living in distressed communities.

The unit has developed 12 initiatives for changing its educator preparation. The current conceptual framework attempts to capture the essence of these 12 initiatives as well as the demands for change. The four thrusts and 12 initiatives have become the strategies for the unit to reach its goal of leading a "revolution." The 12 initiatives, in summary, are:

- Curriculum revision;
- Construction of comprehensive data warehouses;
- Technology development;
- Outcome-based resource allocations;
- Teacher preparation program's immersion with partner districts;
- Formulation of a Global Exemplar School Study Team;
- Development of a communications campaign;
- Creation of an Office of Program Evaluation and Research Support;
- Revision of academic standards to reflect the unit's reform agenda;
- Reforming graduate studies;
- Strengthening candidate recruitment; and
- Assessment of effectiveness of various centers.

The unit further states that a major governance change has occurred in the implementation of the conceptual framework, by establishing a process of "focused accountability." A major driving force in this process is the dean's Executive Council, which consists of 18 standing members of faculty, staff, and administrators, with other individuals and groups represented as warranted. Specific "homework" was assigned each week with identified lead individuals and due dates. Progress was monitored at each subsequent Executive Council meeting. This focused accountability became a major factor in the implementation of the conceptual framework. Further, the review of faculty contracts reveals that, through the fiscal support from the university provost, the unit's accountability measures allows the dean to allocate performance based compensation for program coordinators.

The unit has established specific assessments associated with each of the outcomes. The unit has indicated that the conceptual framework has become the College of Education's strategic goals, aligned with the university's strategic priorities. The exhibit of the alignment table and interviews with the stakeholders have demonstrated there is buy-in from internal and external constituents of the unit. A number of examples mentioned by the unit strongly suggest the unit faculty's approval and the integration of the conceptual framework in their instructions.

Onsite interviews with faculty, candidates, and school and community partners clearly indicate that there is a passionate buy-in and strong commitment to the revised conceptual framework at both initial and advanced program levels. To them, the "revolution represents a renewed consideration of partners by gaining valuable inputs from the community." It is aimed at "energizing the unit's responsibilities and re-conceptualizing educator preparation." The unit constituents state that the new model is focused on struggling schools, and holds the unit accountable for making a difference on the ground level through conversations about assessments and cultural and capacity building. The conceptual framework clearly reflects the university's mission in "preparing learners to be ethical leaders for a diverse and globally
competitive workforce;" and the university "is committed to enhancing the cultural and economic development of the state, nation, and world."

### III. The Transformation Initiative

#### III.1 Summary of the Transformation Initiative

The unit states that its transformation initiative is aligned with the strategic goals reflected in the conceptual framework. According to the unit, 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 considered information about school districts within a 75 miles radius of Texas Tech, which is called the Proximal Zone of Professional Influence (PZPI). The majority of the teachers within the PZPI are graduates of the unit. Data of student learning in the districts served by graduates of the unit's programs suggested P-12 students in these districts were performing below the state average. Although there are many factors involved in the student achievement scores, the resultant P-12 student data has prompted more rigorous and clinically-based teacher preparation. Interviews with the unit's school partners reveal that school administrators were reluctant in hiring graduates of the unit before the implementation of the redesigned teacher preparation program--Tech Teach. They stated many of the unit's graduates were not ready to assume teaching and other professional educator positions in struggling schools. This lack of readiness resulted in these graduates leaving their work in such schools for more affluent districts within one of two years of beginning their teaching induction.

Beginning May 2011, initiatives were proposed to transform the unit in achieving its potential as an institution attuned to 21st century educational needs. The unit reports that these reforms have been undertaken with numerous educational partners; have been intended to impact candidate/client success and school/agency improvements; and have become a means to implement the college's strategic priorities and to meet national standards.

The transformation initiative, Tech Teach, is a clinically intensive, competency-based teacher preparation program aimed at improving P-12 student achievement, increasing teacher candidates' qualifications upon entry into their careers, and fostering within candidates the dispositions important to remain and thrive in the teaching profession. This model will completely replace the unit's teacher preparation programs by the fall of 2014. By then, 1,000 candidates will have participated in the pilot phase of the program.

According to the unit, candidates, and its partners, Tech Teach marks a radical departure from its traditional programs by engaging candidates in activities aimed at developing superior instructional competency and professionalism. The unit reports that the transformed program now focuses on helping candidates learn and apply the skills necessary for fostering P-12 student achievement. The Apply and Evaluate (A & E) Assessment approach has been designed and implemented throughout the program. Clinical experiences, including extended placements throughout the program and a full year of student teaching, focus on supporting candidate growth and transition into careers. Through the use of video-capture technology, candidates receive feedback about instructional competency. 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 second year teacher.

The unit has articulated the TI project's three intended outcomes. First, pre-student teaching field-based candidates and student teachers will contribute measurably to P-12 student learning gains. Second, after two years of teaching, Tech Teach graduates will perform above school districts' average for P-12 student gains. Third, teacher candidates and student teachers will be a desired asset to school administrators and mentor teachers, enhancing the academic success of P-12 students in those schools.
Tech Teach has posed the following original research questions:

- What is the relation between teacher candidates' teaching competency and their perceived readiness to teach?
- What is the relation between teacher candidates' teaching competency and P-12 students' perception of classroom climate?
- What is the relation between teacher candidates' teaching competency and P-12 student learning gains?
- In what ways do teacher candidates' teaching competencies change over time?

The unit is ahead of schedule in implementing the transformation initiative. Originally, it was planned to be in place for all elementary, middle, and secondary participants by fall 2013. However, the project began its implementation in spring 2013. The other significant milestones include that in fall 2011, the unit conducted relevant professional development in co-teaching and began to utilize the System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP) rubric; revised program curriculum to reflect "competency" emphasis; and piloted middle-level implementation. In spring 2012, the unit piloted elementary implementation; continued middle-level pilot implementation; and began to phase in secondary implementation. In the fall 2012, the unit began full implementation of the elementary and middle-level programs and continued to phase in the secondary area subjects. In spring 2013, the unit began full implementation in all level pilots. By the fall of 2014, the approach will replace all traditional delivery of teacher preparation offered by the College of Education, and Human Sciences. The Agriculture Education offered by the College of Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources, and the art and music education programs offered by the College of Visual and Performing Arts have made modifications to incorporate the video components of student teaching in their programs. However, these programs will not adhere to the extensive clinically-based approach.

### III.2 Status of TI Implementation

It is evident that the unit has invested resources to significantly transform its traditional teacher preparation program. Such efforts are evidenced by the revised course syllabi, construction of a year-long student teaching infrastructure with the support of its school partners, extended clinical placements throughout the program, and the support documents and assessment system, the Toolbox. The unit is to be commended for the groundwork that it has done so far for the project.

According to the unit, all components of the TI projects are now in place to be fully implemented. Within the curriculum component, course revisions will be completed in spring 2014. All courses will include A & E assignments. The unit is in the process of standardizing the lesson plan template and has held meetings to review and discuss student performances. In the area of clinical placement, the unit has solidified the early clinical placement of one day per week, and student-teaching blocks of four-days per week for the entire school semester calendar. This transition will be completed in spring 2014 for the current pilot in elementary and middle levels, and secondary component has been fully implemented at the time of visit. The unit has appointed Professional Development Facilitators (PDF) to support the site coordinators.

The unit has established memorandum of agreements with districts of Lubbock, Lubbock-Cooper, Roosevelt, Friendship, Dallas, Fort Worth, and North East to offer co-teaching professional development for mentor teachers and teacher candidates prior to student-teaching semester, conduct monthly mentor-teacher meetings on site, use Teachscape for video capture and some content knowledge assessment. The unit has ensured that all teacher education program faculty are TAP certified. It has contracted Cambridge Education and Scantron for production of Tripod, and Haberman Foundation for Star Teacher Survey. The unit has conducted some pre-tests and Star Teacher Survey. The unit has launched the Apply and Evaluate database and the TAP database.
The unit has reported some changes in the transformation initiative implementation. While most are normal adjustments between project proposed ideas and the implementation realities, the BOE team has found that the unit's acknowledgement of the difficulty in analyzing data related to the proposed research questions, as well as the examination of data gathered for other purposes, is worth noting. Analysis originally planned with in-house developed programs did not prove feasible. The unit is now contracting for commercial software, Tableau, which will allow the sophisticated level of data analysis required for the transformation initiative.

Interviews with the unit's partner school principals revealed a need for programs offered outside of the College of Education to review their graduate's successes and to begin to adopt the unit's clinically- and competency-based teacher preparation model. Principals' experiences with graduates from these programs suggested these same graduates lacked understanding and skills working in struggling schools resulting in a need for schools to spending a great deal of time remediating deficits in teaching.

**Progress of TI Implementation**

*This rubric is intended to provide feedback to an EPP on (1) its capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the TI; (b) the level of broad-based involvement of EPP constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the TI; and (c) review of the goals and assessment plans that result in a successful TI.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>Well-defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capability to initiate the plan</strong></td>
<td>No attention given to personnel, budget and other support need to implement and complete the TI.</td>
<td>While some basic information on budgetary, personnel and other needs are presented, <em>some or all of that support is &quot;soft&quot; and not committed to by the unit.</em> Often vague details are provided about personnel, organization control, and budget needs.</td>
<td>Yearly overall budget with basic descriptions of personnel needs including organizational structure needed to carry out the TI.</td>
<td><em>Very detailed budget information, unit commitment of funds clearly indicated.</em> If individuals not yet identified, detailed job descriptions provided that indicate the specific skills and abilities needed for key personnel. Organizational structure shows clear reporting responsibilities and oversight structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capability to implement and complete the plan</strong></td>
<td>No timetable provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment/research processes.</td>
<td>Generalized timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment/research processes.</td>
<td>Detailed timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment/research processes.</td>
<td>Very detailed timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment/research processes. Timetable clearly indicates that the TI can be realistically implemented and completed in five years. Process used ensured input from all relevant constituencies in developing the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-based unit and stakeholder involvement in development of the plan</td>
<td>TI developed by one individual or a small group of individuals not representative of key stakeholders.</td>
<td>TI developed by one individual or a small group; some attention given to obtaining input from others on and off campus but <em>no real</em></td>
<td>Process used to develop plan <em>involved key stakeholders.</em></td>
<td>Process used ensured input from all relevant constituencies in developing the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.3 Statement about TI Findings

This is a unique Transformation Initiative project. This project is aimed at completely redesigning the unit's teacher preparation programs by emphasizing a strong school-based clinical experience. According to the unit, it is not a separate initiative to test out a particular aspect of educator preparation. Rather, it is the transformation of the unit's teacher preparation as a whole. Through the process, the unit will embark on the journey to transform its other educator preparation programs, including those at the advanced level. The redesigned Tech Teach program emphasizes cooperative learning in classrooms, and is focused on cultivating a generation of well-prepared teachers ready to work as teacher leaders in high-need schools. The Apply and Evaluate Assessment approach encourages candidates' learning and growth through questioning, thinking, and problem solving. Tech Teach has capitalized on the unit's other grant funded projects in the Lubbock community (such as the East Lubbock Promise
Neighborhood, and the i3 Grant) by garnering strong community support.

Interviews with the unit's faculty and administration have indicated a strong desire to make a difference in the equity of educational opportunities for children in the unit's service area. Interviews with community leaders, including local school principals, business owners, and a former city councilman revealed that they welcome such active engagement from the unit and are supporting the unit's involvement. To them, such involvement is "long overdue." They have expressed optimism that the struggling neighborhood has a brighter future because of such collaboration.

In schools, principals who have worked with Tech Teach candidates have indicated that these candidates are of much higher caliber than those from the unit's traditional preparation programs. They possess a deeper understanding of content and content pedagogical knowledge. The extended time spent in schools have allowed them to have a more realistic comprehension of schooling and teaching. Several principals have commented that they have observed a measurable difference of the Tech Teach candidates, and they will now offer employment opportunities to these candidates before they consider candidates from other colleges and universities. Some principals have stated that the teachers who graduated from the first cohort of Tech Teach have already raised their students' achievement level. In a few isolated cases, such gains were greater than those taught by veteran teachers in their schools.

Further, the school principals have reported that the TAP assessment rubric has allowed a much more involved mentor teacher and candidate professional relationship. Not only are the mentor teachers using the instruments to assess the performance of candidates, but also they are using the same instrument for self-improvement and reflection. As a result, some schools have begun to use the TAP assessment rubric and video capture, as part of their teacher evaluation component.

Interviews with the stakeholders have confirmed that the unit is taking active steps to respond to the broad national criticisms of traditional schools of education. The unit has taken a serious self-examination and reflection on its own practices of teaching and learning. Through its redesigned Tech Teach program and its active involvement in the community, it appears to be making a positive statement on the relevance of College of Education in the greater Lubbock community.

Once again, interviews with school principals and local community leaders reveal a strong desire that the unit's other educator preparation programs offered outside of the College of Education transform and adopt a stronger clinically-based approach.

### III.4 Recommendations on Further Implementation of the TI

Because all components of Tech Teach are in place, the unit is poised to modify the rest of its teacher preparation programs at the College of Education. The Transformation Initiative has prompted a number of changes to the curriculum and field experiences of candidates. One recommendation to consider would be to continue to document the influence of the transformational initiative on educator preparation programs that are housed in other colleges in the unit. Given the expressed interest in documenting the impact of the Tech Teach initiative, it will be important for the unit to measure and engage in collaborative dialogue with partners in the Colleges of Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources, Visual and Performing Arts, and Human Sciences to judge the impact of the changes on those specific educator preparation programs (e.g., delivering content courses into a more compact timeline, meeting the needs of all candidates in terms of requisite experiences in specific programs, e.g., music education students having to make choices about ensemble performance or field experience). As these arts and sciences partners are also preparing candidates in their specific field (e.g., degree in biology with education added), it is important for the unit to continue to examine the specific needs of those programs and candidates as they collect and interpret research data on the initiative and document research findings.
In addition to fine tuning these operational components, during the further implementation phase of the Transformation Initiative, the unit should focus its efforts to gauge the candidates' instructional competencies; their ability to engage P-12 students through the Tripod instrument, and the candidates and graduate's positive impact on student achievement. As a result of the BOE team's discussion with the unit's Tech Teach leadership and research team, the unit has proposed the following four revised research questions to be addressed in the next four years:

I. What did candidates learn about teaching in Tech Teach?
   a. What is the relation between beliefs, knowledge and practice?
   b. How do PST beliefs, knowledge and practice change in Tech Teach?
   c. What patterns of teaching practices do candidates develop in the course of a competency-based program?)

II. How do the components of the Tech Teach program influence candidates' teaching?
   a. What effect does the accountability measure (TAP rubric) have on candidates' performance in the field?
   b. In what ways does a competency-based coursework influence beliefs, knowledge and practice?
   c. In what ways does intensive field experience (more time, clinical analysis, competency-based) influence beliefs, knowledge and practice?

III. What is the influence of candidates' teaching on K-12 student learning?
   a. In what ways does candidates' teaching practices influence K-12 student perception of climate?
   b. In what ways does candidates' teaching practice influence K-12 student achievement?

IV. How can information from Tech Teach be used to select candidates and sites?
   a. What is the influence of student background on candidates' teaching practice?
   b. What is the influence of school context on candidates' teaching practice?

However, onsite interviews further indicate that, because the unit has recently hired an endowed chair to provide research leadership in the Transformation Initiative, the unit should continue to revisit its designated research questions to address the contributions and proposed modifications to the data collected. Specifically, the previous four questions capture a fraction of the rich data and analyses suggested to be conducted in our interviews with research staff. The BOE team believes that the above revised research questions will give the unit a reasonable understanding of the progress of the Tech Teach program and the performance of its candidates, but the unit should be careful and deliberate in debating the validity and feasibility of these questions. The unit has great potential to provide a rich source of evidence-based outcomes for the field and should be encouraged to reexamine their questions to better address this important contribution. Although there is great interest in quickly moving the reform to scale and to conduct analyses to judge the efficacy of the intervention, a methodical and fully mapped implementation, data collection, and analysis plan would likely serve the unit well in plotting the use of resources, the time to carry out the work, and the expected outcomes from the Transformation Initiative. A more in-depth examination of pilot data is warranted to judge the efficacy of the measurement tools utilized in the pilot phases (e.g., Tripod assessment and its developmental appropriateness for young children; use of the TAP measures and the operationalization of the items within it in analyses). Finally, given the changes to the proposed activities (e.g., elimination of randomized control trials, addition of a qualitative component), a matrix which documents the proposed activities and analyses over the next seven years would also be of great benefit to the unit.
Finally, since the unit's advanced programs have also embarked on this transformation initiative journey, the unit should systematically identify detailed and specific research questions to gauge their operational successes and candidate performances.

### III.5 Next Steps for Reporting to NCATE

In its annual report to the NCATE, the unit should include narratives on its progress in Tech Teach's operational success. In addition, it should report the progress and findings to address the above-stated research questions. The unit should report its progress on designing the research questions for its advanced programs, and methodologies to answer them. The unit should report on how the transformation initiative at the College of Education is impacting on the other educator preparation programs offered by other colleges at the University, such as Agriculture Education, Art and Music Education.

In the fall 2014, the unit plans to launch its online version of Tech Teach to communities of Dallas/Fort Worth, Grand Prairie, Houston, Lamesa, New Caney, and San Antonio. The unit should include data and information on the progresses of these sites.

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

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

#### 1.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Before the unit embarked on Tech Teach as its Transformation Initiative, it collected data on its candidate knowledge, skills, dispositions. A review of such data during the onsite visit indicates that over 90 percent of the unit candidates had demonstrated the required content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions to help student learn. However, interviews with unit faculty, staff, administrators, and partners indicate that the assessments were designed to measure curricular requirements of traditional educator preparation programs. A careful review of the student achievement data in the unit's service area has raised questions of how well the unit was preparing candidates for 21st century classrooms and for struggling schools. The unit's Transformation Initiative is aimed at completely redesigning all of its initial and advanced programs.

The unit's teacher education program includes 13 initial teacher preparation programs. They are bachelor's degree programs in early childhood education, elementary, middle, secondary (6-12) programs in art, biology, chemistry, English, history and government, mathematics; and P-12 endorsements in art, music and physical education/health, and agriculture. Advanced programs include the master's degree for licensed teachers as well as programs for other school professionals and the doctoral degrees.

The IR Addendum provided clarification that the Transformative Initiative (TI) is focusing on Tech Teach but also includes all advanced certification programs and graduate degree programs. During the onsite visit, the unit clearly indicated the implementation of the TI was in response to data from the
PACE report showing that student achievement in the Proximal Zone of Professional Influence (PZPI) was lower than state averages. This data was used as a basis for program change for the college.

The resulting program changes and data collection on new assessments began implementation in fall 2013. Transition point assessments with some corresponding data for all programs (including advanced) were provided in the IR Addendum via a modified exhibit titled Transition point assessments. In addition, a data usage report included with the addendum outlined the assessments being implemented for the undergraduate programs. Programs not offered by the College of Education (Art, Music and Agriculture) also collect data to ensure candidates in these programs exhibit qualifications that match those of Tech Teach candidates. Interviews with principals confirm that Agriculture education candidates are sometimes placed in public schools and when they are, they perform well.

A concern noted in the Offsite Report was a lack of assessment data from fall 2012 onward for advanced programs. According to the IR Addendum, fall 2012 data onward were not captured because the college was moving to a new assessment system that had not yet provided results. Data for advanced programs assessing candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions were measured using state licensure exams, transition point assessments, and end of program assessments. Data from state licensure exams for years 2008-2012 indicate well over 90 percent of candidates pass the exams in all areas with the exception of the Visually Impaired licensure exam taken by 21 program completers in 2011 resulting in an 85.7 percent pass rate. State licensure data for 2013 with similar pass rates were provided during the onsite visit.

As mentioned in the Offsite Report, advanced program assessments 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. Exhibits discussed by faculty during the onsite visit confirm End of Phase assessments are collected for each advanced program near the end of each of the three phases. Examples of Phase Three assessments include intervention research projects implemented in field settings. These Phase Three assessments address the concern reported in the Offsite report that candidates in advanced programs were concerned with limited opportunities to engage in research.

In the IR Addendum, it was reported that the unit determined it was not useful to collect data on student learning outcomes that were no longer relevant. Therefore, there is a gap in the data collected via Program Assessment Plans. Transition point data for advanced programs outlined on the Transition Point Assessments chart were provided. An examination of the Transition Point Assessment chart revealed gaps in data even for assessments that remain the same from prior to implementation of the TI to the present. However, interviews with faculty confirmed the use of data from these assessments including the Candidate End of Program survey, submitted to the Dean's Executive Council (DEC) in annual program reports. During interviews with faculty from advanced programs, examples were provided of using data for program improvement. Specifically, faculty reported using annual report data that showed candidates scoring lower on measures of managing student behavior. These data prompted a request for faculty in the Special Education program to revise coursework to include content on applied behavior management.

End of program assessments include the master's Comprehensive exams and Graduate Student End of Program Survey. The comprehensive exam pass rates from fall 2006 through spring 2013 for the Master of Education degree programs show a very high pass rate with only 5 out of over 300 candidates between fall 2011 to spring 2013 not passing. Data from the Graduate Student End of Program survey provided for years 2009 through spring 2012 indicate mean scores on a five-point scale range from a low of 3.38 to a high of 4.89. In addition, newly available data from the May 2013 Survey of Graduate Students summarized in the IR Addendum, show mean scores ranging from a low of 3.65 to a high of
4.61 on a five-point scale indicating general satisfaction of program graduates.

The IR Addendum also indicates that new assessments and relevant rubrics created for each phase will begin to be implemented in fall 2013. Clarification was provided indicating data relative to the new assessments were not yet available as they are being implemented during fall 2013. As data are collected, they are uploaded into the Trademark Outcome Management System (TOMS).

As indicated in the Offsite Review, evidence to validate during the onsite visit included Program Assessment Plans for advanced programs. The IR Addendum and interviews with program faculty confirmed that program assessment plans (PAP) have been revised for all advanced programs. Because these plans included many new assessments, no data were included or summarized in these plans but again, as demonstrated in the onsite visit, those assessments have been developed and are being incorporated into the TOMS during fall 2013 semester.

1.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Teacher Education programs including advanced programs have revised their Program Assessment Plans which show a clear alignment between student learning outcomes and assessments. There is also a clearly stated plan for reviewing these data on an annual basis.

Candidate content knowledge is assessed at two points, admission to the program and again prior to student teaching. Candidates take a practice subject area test state licensure exam prior to being admitted to the program. Those who fail to make a score of 70 percent are instructed to complete a remediation plan. Prior to student teaching, candidates are required to pass the state subject area licensure exam. Candidate scores on the TExES state licensure exams indicate a 95 percent pass rate for 2011-12 compared to a 92 percent pass rate in 2010-11.

Assessment of candidates for initial licensure programs are collected during pre-student teaching consisting of Apply and Evaluate activities and during student teaching using the Teacher and Student Advancement Program (TAP) rubric to evaluate candidate teaching performance through observations of lessons taught gathered by the Site Coordinator (SC) four times during student teaching. These performance assessments are evaluated using the TAP rubric that measures six areas of competency on a five point scale. Expectations are that candidates will receive a rating of at least a 3 on the 5 point scale by the time they finish student teaching. As indicated on the TAP results from fall 2012 data, preliminary data show candidates performed close to the 2.5 range on all six competencies of the second performance assessment, just under the stated expected scores of 3 on all competencies.

In addition, mentor teachers conduct weekly surveys of their teacher candidates. Data from spring 2013 indicate a range of mean scores from 1.6 to 2.9 on a three point scale on the survey items. The response rate of mentors completing the surveys was 47 percent.

P-12 student perceptions of student teachers are collected at the beginning and conclusion of student teaching using the TRIPOD assessment. As indicated in exhibit 1.4.e (3) Tripod Data preliminary, overall mean scores for candidates on the TRIPOD for fall 2012 was a score of 72 percent. Finally, P-12 student achievement is measured using benchmark data from the ISDs. These benchmark data are end of course exams for middle and secondary programs and STAAR performance measures for elementary programs. Data from 2013 STAAR 8th grade results show an increase in every indicator of student performance when comparing 2012 to 2013 data.

Data from candidate exit surveys collected in 2012 show over 90 percent of candidates are satisfied with all elements of their preparation program.

All program data are reviewed each semester by program faculty to monitor student progress and inform
Programs for candidates in graduate degree programs and advanced licensure are organized into three distinct phases with specific focus at each phase. Assessments and rubrics are used at each phase to document candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Data (N=30) from informal interviews with the dean were summarized. Among the six reported findings were concerns over limited opportunities to participate in research and variations in advising. Data from employers of the Counselor Education program graduates survey showed results from 2011 similar to findings from 2008, with an overall mean scores of 9.4 and 9.2 respectively on overall program attributes.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit does not systematically collect, analyze, and report data on the skills and dispositions of candidates across all advanced programs (ADV).</td>
<td>A review of the assessment data indicates data are being collected and candidates from advanced programs are meeting standards. Assessment data are provided for advanced programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Recommendation related to the TI

None

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

The unit has had an assessment system that collects data on candidate qualifications, performances, and
unit operations. On the basis of the data, the unit is making fundamental changes in the way it delivers its programs.

The unit assessment plan consists of multiple measures across a number of domains. At the heart of the plan are 12 initiatives that are part of the "Leading a Revolution in American Education" transformation. These initiatives are designed to move from the status quo to development of innovative practices and leaders. Each of the 12 initiatives are aligned with specific aspects of the unit programs.

Initial programs have begun to develop new assessment plans. During interviews with unit administrators, it was stated that programs have developed timelines and should all have assessment plans by the end of the year. Advanced programs are also in the process of collecting candidate performance data and there is a system in place to accomplish this task. The unit has an assessment calendar that gives a timeline for various assessments. Program assessments are available to faculty and administrators through dropbox. The trademark outcome for the unit is to engage with stakeholders to improve educational outcomes. The unit involves the community through the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood (ELPN) which is a US Department of Education grant for $24.5 million over five years. This is the first year of the grant. ELPN has developed projects which go beyond the concept level to skill development. Skills for the ELPN include homemaking, nutrition, and exercise. ELPN utilizes a Community Advisory Board made up of non-governmental members that approve all activities of the ELPN. The unit's candidates will be involved in the education aspects of this grant. The unit's assessment system and research plan will capture outcome data impacting candidate preparation from these activities.

A major question for the unit is to find out what employers desire in a teacher candidate. The idea is to be relevant and to meet employers' 21st century expectations. The unit reports that all 35 elementary candidates this past year were employed immediately following graduation. This success is attributed to the full school year professional internship experience which gives principals an opportunity to see a candidate working in the school for an entire school year. Principals who were interviewed state that they give feedback to the unit through direct contact with site coordinators and principal surveys. They also reported that they like to hire Tech Teach candidates because of their readiness to teach. Principals noted that these candidates are more like second year teachers and often know more than many veteran teachers.

Assessment of candidates is accomplished through a number of transition points in each program. It starts with program admission where assessments consists of 2.7 GPA and ACT scores. The second transition is program entry into clinical placements and the candidate must maintain at least a 2.7 GPA. The third transition point is exit from program which indicates that the candidate had a successful student teaching experience. The fourth transition is program completion marked by completion of a capstone course, a professional portfolio, and successful scores on the TExEs licensure exams. Before candidates can student teach, they must pass the content portion of the TExEES exam.

Interviews of candidates in the program revealed that the practice test is given before program entry and is often prior to advanced content coursework. Some candidates have concerns with the validity and fairness of this practice because the TExEES exam tests for content. Interviews with program faculty and administration indicate that most applicants should have had the content being tested at the score level of 70. For candidates who tested below the 70 threshold, they also develop a remedial plan is developed. The unit has a goal of requiring all candidates to pass the real TExEES exam before they can participate in student teaching.

The last transition point is after program completion and consists of employer focus group feedback and surveys. A concern in the Offsite Report was the apparent lack of data at the advanced level. The unit presented three phases for assessment at the advanced level that are set to be implemented by 2014.
Phase One addresses knowledge and reasoning, Phase Two is about problem solving, and Phase Three is a mastery phase including a performance-based demonstration. The focus of the phases is on the application of academics. There are two assessment points for advanced programs: Apply and Evaluate (A&E) activities and end of phase assessment. Further, advanced program data are housed in the Trademark Outcomes Portal System (TOPS) and the Trademark Outcome Management System (TOMS). TOMS is a multi-user system that is student and faculty friendly. TOPS contains TOMS information on individual candidates.

A demonstration of the Trademark Outcome Management System (TOMS) and Trademark Outcomes Portal System (TOPS) during the onsite visit confirmed that advanced programs are implementing assessments for phases one, two, and three of the programs according to an implementation cycle beginning with the Educational Diagnostician program. All advanced programs are scheduled to be included into TOMS during the fall 2013 semester.

Candidates and teachers in clinical experiences are assessed in multiple ways. The unit has adopted a Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP) assessment that contains 19 original rubrics and the unit employs six of them, including instructional plans, standards and objectives, presenting instruction content, activities and materials, academic feedback, and managing student behavior. These six rubrics have been communicated directly with candidates in courses, which is part of the Tech Teach initiative. The rubrics are scored on three levels, exemplary, proficient, and unsatisfactory. Data are collected through video capturing of lessons in the Apply & Evaluate (A&E) assessment process. Lessons are taped and graded by the site coordinator who confers with the mentor teacher and loads the results on a data set. TeachScape is an online repository where lessons can be viewed. Other assessments used in clinical experiences include the Tripod survey assessment which uses multiple measures for both candidates and teachers and STARR which is the State Assessment of Academic Readiness. A TAP performance assessment is conducted twice a semester on clinical candidates by the site coordinator in conference with the mentor teacher. Mentor teachers complete a weekly survey using a one to three scale to assess clinical candidates. Data presented indicate that candidates score between two and three on this scale.

The unit provided scores over several years on the state licensure exams (TEXeES) which average just over 90 percent. However, in examining data from PACE and the regional proximal zone for professional impact (PZPI) data, concerns are raised about unit graduates' success and retention. These data will serve to aide in developing future unit assessments to determine improvement. Struggling candidates are assisted by the unit through the development of professional improvement plans that help the candidate progress in approved steps.

### 2.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit is undergoing a significant paradigm shift in its focus and goals. The notion is to move from a summative assessment model to a formative one that will allow for faster response to professional issues. Tech Teach is the vehicle for this transformation. School based professionals who were interviewed stated that Tech Teach candidates are much better prepared for teaching than non-Tech Teach candidates. The unit reports that non-Tech Teach delivery in the College of Education is being phased out and only Tech Teach candidates will remain. Advanced programs use the Phase One, Two, and Three model and data can be found in the TOPS and TOMS systems.

Interviews with faculty and candidates confirm the collection of assessment data referred to in the offsite report including but not limited to the TAP rubric, Tripod assessments, and Apply and Evaluate assessments. Candidates use video capture technology to record their Apply and Evaluate assessments in each course. Site Coordinators then meet regularly to review this video captured evidence for the purpose of providing feedback to candidates. Interviews with program faculty confirm candidates
achieve ratings of three on the TAP rubric. Principals interviewed onsite report Tech Teach candidates are much better prepared than candidates in the traditional program and are in high demand. Site Coordinators shared specific experiences of using assessment data to identify areas for program improvement. One example was discussed in an interview with program faculty where they described reviewing aggregated data from the TAP rubrics and determined a need for more instruction on providing academic feedback to teacher candidates. Faculty gave additional examples of using data from video captured evidence to provide one-on-one assistance to a struggling teacher candidate.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Recommendation for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Recommendation related to the TI

None

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Evidence from the unit's institutional report, exhibits, addendum and onsite interviews with unit faculty, P-12 personnel, and candidates support the fact that the unit and its school partners "...design, implement and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice." This design is focused around the demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to foster learning for all students.

Evidence to be validated onsite included how candidates not involved in Tech Teach meet Standard 3; how initial and advanced candidates work with students with exceptionalities and English language learners; partnerships for advanced candidates; assessment of candidates regarding the belief that all
students can learn; and placement of advanced candidates. All areas were validated as evidenced by initial/advanced candidate interviews, faculty interviews, and interviews with P-12 faculty.

As noted in the IR Addendum, candidates not involved in Tech Teach continue through teaching blocks, gradually move from classroom observation to student teaching. These candidates spend one full day in a classroom setting prior to student teaching, complete Apply and Evaluate assignments, and complete a full semester of student teaching. Additional assessments include weekly journals, daily conferences/goal setting with P-12 mentors, and completion of a case study. For example, initial candidates in elementary education complete daily plans/goals with regard to one focus student in the area of reading and writing.

Work with students with exceptionalities and English language learners occurs in multiple ways as evidenced via exhibits and the IR addendum. Initial candidates are placed in PODS for field experiences as well as student teaching. These PODS provide for diverse experiences as they are selected based on factors such as: Title I status, student diversity, geographic location, students with exceptionalities, and the number of English language learners. Students rotate to different field settings. This is true of Tech Teach candidates as well as those in the traditional system. In addition to these experiences, initial level candidates complete Apply and Evaluate assessments. These assessments are integrated in coursework and include candidate work with P-12 students with exceptionalities and ELL students. Exhibits as well as onsite interviews provide evidence of how candidates at the initial level rotate each semester and are monitored in order to ensure this diverse experience. Initial candidates are currently monitored through the Tech Teach program database. Before Tech Teach, a database with placements was maintained in the Field Experiences office. Placements to include diverse experiences were then monitored by the head of the placement center.

As evidenced by the Field Experience Handbook, advanced candidate program placement is arranged via the candidate and the unit faculty for that particular program. At the advanced level, candidates' experience diversity in various ways, depending on the program. For example, the Educational Leadership program includes action research projects such as an analysis of school supplemental programs, including those for students with exceptionalities and English Language Learners.

As noted in the Offsite Report, Tech Teach is one example of how the unit and its P-12 partners work together to ensure all students learn. This work includes changes such as the revision of initial and advanced programs to include longer periods of clinical practice and application of student learning in coursework. Three P-12 sites, Lubbock Independent School District, Roosevelt, and Lubbock Copper are currently engaged in this initiative. Partnership agreements are also in place for five additional sites. Mentors and candidates indicated that the Tech Teach program prepares them to meet the needs all students upon graduation. In interviews, both candidates and mentors noted the focus on a full-year student teaching experience, video self assessments, reflection, feedback, and the focus on application of coursework are key parts of this success.

Another area to be validated was that of advanced level partnerships. As noted in the IR Addendum, advanced programs collaborate in various ways. The Counselor Education program uses data from outside sources such as employer surveys and the Counselor Education Advisory Board. Partnerships also occur between the Educational Leadership faculty and the Lubbock SID personnel via a summer leadership institute.

As validated in interviews with candidates and mentors, disposition assessment regarding the belief that all students can learn occurs in multiple ways via an e-Portfolio as well as daily informal feedback. Specific competencies include advocacy for all students, professional demeanor, and thinking critically and reflectively. The Haberman Star pre-screening survey is being utilized to assess the dispositions of initial candidates at the beginning of their program, and includes indicators for valuing for student
Expertise is shared in multiple ways between unit faculty and P-12 partners. For example, at Lubbock Cooper West Elementary, one mentor noted that she is teaching a Children's Literature class at her P-12 site in which candidates move through different classrooms (K,1,2, etc.) throughout the course to understand the setting as well as the application of the use of literature in the elementary classroom. Other examples include the Global Exemplar School (GES) Study Team which includes representatives from P-12 schools, unit faculty, and community leaders. Grants such as the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood (ELPN) Grant and Investing in Innovation have resulted in a focus on P-12 student achievement in health, wellness, college readiness, and mathematics. Interviews with P-12 personnel at Dunbar College Prep Academy validated the focus of these partnership grants on P-12 student success. Dunbar is an ELPN school and is currently partnering not only with unit faculty and candidates but also with a partner school in California. Expertise is shared via school visits, presentations, and weekly meetings. Project Based Learning, Health and Wellness facilities for families, and the A,B,C model are specific changes that have been implemented as a result of this partnership. Data comparing this year to last year indicate the following increases in the number of honor roll students (GPA of 3.5 and above out of four): 6th grade - 20 percent; 7th grade-30 percent; 8th grade-36 percent.

As the Offsite Report stated, unit faculty members also share expertise via publications. Examples include publications on mentor and content area literacy in the 21st century. Interviews with advanced candidates noted that unit faculty encourage publication in partnership with the advanced candidates and offer lunch workshops as well as one-on-one consultation to foster such research.

Candidates must pass the appropriate subject-area state certification exam before entering the year-long student teaching or internship. At the initial level, candidates participate in a full year of student teaching and are monitored by the site coordinator and evaluated using the System for Teacher and Student Advancement Program (TAP) rubric. Areas for refinement or improvement are identified and goals are set. Examples of this process are found in multiple exhibits and include items such as the TAP Rubric and via candidate and mentor interviews. In addition, formal and informal feedback is given weekly, as well as each semester. As noted in the exhibits and validated in interviews, video capture is one method used by candidates to analyze and provide timely feedback. The weekly meeting agendas between the mentor and candidate focus on areas of improvement/refinement.

At the initial level, the student teaching experience includes a three-step process of pre-lesson planning (academic content and characteristics of learners), lesson delivery (teacher candidate teaches the lesson while being observed and videotaped by a peer and then posted on TeachScape), and post lesson reflection and self-evaluation using the TAP rubric and formative assessment data from the lesson conference between unit faculty and candidates.

Programs at both the initial and advanced levels have identified areas in which to incorporate technology. The calendar for technology activities as well as the Technology Committee Report outline areas of focus. Faculty have received professional development in the use of Tech Teach/Smartboard and Tech Teach candidates engage in the use of technology in P-12 student learning as evidenced in site visits to elementary schools. For example, one candidate was using a Smartboard to instruct first graders in handwriting.

Criteria for site coordinators and mentor teachers are clearly spelled out in handbooks for site coordinators, mentors, and candidates, as noted in multiple exhibits. As verified in interviews with P-12 personnel and unit faculty, training for these partners occurs via four days of TAP training prior to clinical placement as well as in weekly meetings for site coordinators to discuss topics such as performance assessment and co-teaching. In addition, mentor teachers receive initial training from site coordinators at the beginning of each semester as well as a mentor handbook. Mentor teachers also meet
monthly with site coordinators for professional development on topics such as those noted above. While mentors currently formally evaluate candidates and meet at least weekly with unit site coordinators to give informal candidate and program feedback, they stated in interviews that a more formal method of giving program feedback to the unit would be appreciated. They indicated that they have an open door policy with the unit, feel supported by unit faculty and would be able to readily share this need with their site coordinators. In addition to the mentor, site coordinator, candidate meetings; site coordinators hold governance meetings with principals on a monthly basis, the unit director of Teacher Education Programs meets monthly with Lubbock leadership personnel, and the Tech Teach Leadership Team meets weekly.

In interviews, candidates at both the initial and advanced levels noted the importance of invaluable experiences with unit faculty, which continue after graduation. Candidates report that they still call on faculty to provide expertise with regard to teaching needs in their current roles in first grade, kindergarten and physical education. An open door policy from faculty is evident to ensure that candidates not only complete coursework and have diverse field and clinical experiences, but also to provide assistance in obtaining employment and in meeting the needs of all P-12 students both before and after candidate graduation. As candidates stated, they are "...better prepared than anyone in their building" and the unit has only "...gotten better and better over time". Mentors, candidates, and P-12 administrators cited the Tech Teach program as an exemplary example of this consistent improvement and commitment by the unit to P-12 student learning.

### 3.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit has made multiple changes in field and clinical experiences regarding the TI. The development of the Tech Teach program was based on data from multiple partners. As noted in exhibits and verified in interviews, changes have occurred in the following areas: recruiting of students, faculty, and supervisory personnel; clarification of roles and responsibilities; training to use the TAP rubric, TeachScape, and a variety of other technology and processes and finding funding resources. To sustain and enhance the program, 23 individuals have been added as site coordinators, tenure-track faculty, and faculty members. In interviews P-12 personnel noted the importance of these additions. For example, site coordinators meet weekly with mentor teachers to obtain feedback on candidate progress and to provide data with regard to the overall program success.

In field and clinical experiences, this transformation has resulted in coursework focused on helping candidates learn and apply the skills necessary for fostering P-12 student achievement. At the initial level, changes have included clinical experiences embedded in courses as well as a full year of student teaching. Video capture technology, weekly meetings with mentors, and monthly feedback from site coordinators ensure that candidates receive feedback about instructional competency. In addition, the development of a co-teaching model focuses on the qualifications and skills equal to or above that of a 2nd-year teacher as evidenced by exhibits, candidate and faculty interviews. In interviews, candidates noted that they feel "far ahead of peers" with regard to their ability to meet the diverse needs of P-12 students. Mentors stated that they see a vast difference in the readiness of these candidates and that they perceive that the year-long student teaching experience is invaluable in candidate’s ability to understand the skills and knowledge necessary to teach. Administrators noted that they are eager to hire TechTeach candidates because of their advanced knowledge and skill with regard to meeting the needs of all students.

Partnerships such as the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood Grant also focus on candidate success with P-12 students as candidates, P-12 personnel and unit faculty in various departments work together to offer services such as after school tutoring and health/wellness clinics for P-12 students and for families. This implementation and growth is evaluated weekly through meetings with the dean, unit faculty and P-12 faculty.
3.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Recommendation for Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Recommendation related to the TI

None

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Evidence support the fact that the unit and its school partners have focused on working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 faculty, as well as students in P–12 schools. Areas of concern regarding this standard included faculty knowledge and experience related to preparing all candidates to work with diverse learners, all candidates' having diverse field and clinical experience placements, and work with students with exceptionalities and English language learners. In addition, the interaction of initial and advanced candidates with peers of diverse backgrounds as well as how unit curriculum reflects culturally responsive experiences needed to be validated. All concerns and evidence have been validated with the exception of the interaction with diverse peers.

As evidenced by faculty demographics data, and noted in the Offsite Report, conventional and distance learning programs at both the initial and advanced levels consist of both male and female faculty from at
least two ethnic/racial groups. As noted in the IR Addendum and validated in interviews with faculty and
with candidates, faculty knowledge and experience regarding diversity is evident in varied ways. Since
fall 2003, there have been 80 new faculty hires, of which 68 percent are female and 34 percent represent
ethnic populations. Faculty expertise with regard to diverse learners is evident at both the initial and
advanced levels. For example, Educational Leadership faculty have conducted research and publications
focused on the achievement of diverse learners. Another example is that of a professor in Health,
Exercise, and Sport Sciences who has over 15 years of experience working in diverse settings at the high
school level adapting teaching for students with physical handicaps and ELL students. As noted in
interviews with current and alumni candidates, all candidates interact with diverse faculty via
coursework and/or in field and clinical experiences. Good faith efforts for recruiting diverse faculty
include announcing faculty positions at predominantly African American and Hispanic universities,
posting positions in The National Directory of Diverse & Strategic Faculty, and sending recruitment
information to individuals selected from the Women and Minorities Doctoral Directory.

Interaction of all initial and advanced candidates with peers from diverse backgrounds via coursework,
committees and/or education projects does not currently occur consistently, as noted in interviews and in
the IR Addendum. The IR addendum notes: " The university and the educator preparation programs do
not have enough diversity of candidates." Good faith efforts to increase diverse candidate enrollment
during the past four years include tracking the ethnicity of candidates each semester. From fall 2009 to
fall 2012, candidate diversity has increased by four percent. In addition, the Office of Instructional
Technology Support Services facilitates distance learning to increase the recruitment of diverse
populations. As noted in the Offsite Report, the Dallas area program is being revised to fit the needs of
candidates seeking bilingual and ESL certification. In the unit's Diversity Plan, a full time position for
recruitment has been added at the advanced level. The Graduate Student Services Coordinators are
responsible for providing support to diverse candidates at both initial and advanced levels. Additional
elements of diverse candidate recruitment at both the initial and advanced levels include participating in
the South Plains Closing the Gaps Coalition, sponsoring an annual transfer conference for counselors,
and partnering with South Plains College (SPC), a Hispanic serving institution, with an Associate of Arts
in teaching (AAT) program.

Cultural diversity within the curriculum is addressed in multiple ways through EDEL 2300, Schools,
Society, and Diversity (initial level) and EDBL 5337, Teaching Strategies for ESL and Content-Area
Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students (advanced level). Diversity related proficiencies such as
"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"
are integrated in initial candidate program assessments. These competencies are also specified for
advanced programs including School Counselor, Principal, Superintendent and Educational
Diagnostician, as evidenced via multiple exhibits and noted in the unit addendum.

The unit's Diversity Plan outlines areas for change regarding the design, implementation, and evaluation
of curriculum and experiences with regard to diversity. One such change is reflected in the addition and
revision of the following courses: at the advanced and initial levels, respectively, EDSE 4323: Teaching
Diverse Students in Secondary Classrooms, EDSE 4312: Classroom Management and Working with
Learners Who have Disabilities in Secondary Classrooms.

Proficiencies for teaching diverse learners in the classroom are clearly articulated for initial candidates in
the Student Teaching Observation Rubric. Impact on individual student learning is also assessed and
analyzed via the TAP assessment and the Tripod Perception Surveys. Courses such as EDSE 3100 and
EDBL 3335 embed the application and evaluation of working with diverse learners.

Candidates' diverse field and clinical experience placement and work with students with exceptionalities
and ELL was evidenced in the IR addendum and validated through onsite interviews and exhibits. The
data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice indicates that partnership schools include male/female students from differing socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. As noted in the offsite report, peer feedback regarding meeting the needs of diverse learners occurs in multiple ways throughout coursework as well as in field and clinical experiences. For example, candidate lessons are uploaded to Teachscape and evaluated by peers using the TAP rubric. Toolbox also provides support for data compilation, analysis, and goal setting in the area of meeting diverse P-12 student needs.

4.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable
With regard to the TI, the unit has made multiple changes to ensure diverse experiences for candidates, faculty and with P-12 students. Some examples of these changes are the establishment of the Office of Instructional Technology Support Service, the revision of the Dallas area program, and the establishment of an Office of Outreach and the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood Grant.

The unit plans to sustain and enhance the TI work with regard to diversity to include service to P-12 populations in programs such as Project Future, Step 2, Generation Texas, and the Dallas Area bilingual/ESL program.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Initial and advanced candidates do not have experiences interacting with diverse peers.

The unit does not have a systematic mechanism to ensure that all initial and advanced candidates have experiences working with diverse peers.

4.4 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation
Met

Advanced Preparation
Met

4.5 Recommendation related to the TI

None

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Information from the offsite report on the requisite qualifications and contemporary professional experiences for full-time unit faculty, faculty members from partnering colleges, site coordinators, and instructors was confirmed in onsite interviews. The unit provided a revised table indicating the terminal degree earned by all faculty as well as the number of unit faculty who support teacher preparation and other professional educator preparation programs. For example, the unit noted that there are 93 full-time and 49 part-time faculty members. All faculty members who are not in tenure-track positions must possess a master's degree relevant to the area taught and 18 hours of credit relevant to the teaching position as a condition of hire.

In response to the Offsite Report, the unit provided additional evidence of scholarship. These data include the presentation of three years of information to support the assertion faculty members have expertise in the areas in which they teach and conduct research.

Interviews with mentor teachers and site coordinators at the onsite visit along with information provided in the IR Addendum provided information on the qualifications for mentor teachers who support candidates in field placements. While the process is not identical at each site, requirements for mentor teachers were described and included a minimum of three years of teaching experience, evidence of teacher leadership skills, and a recommendation by a school administrator. Differences in selection of mentor teachers included being directly recruited by a building administrator and referred to the unit, completing a paper application, and completing a web-based application. Despite these slight differences, all mentor teachers meet the minimum qualifications for selection.

Faculty diversity was also confirmed onsite. Candidate, site supervisor, and mentor teacher interviews triangulated the teaching capability of the faculty. Numerous examples are provided on the unit's connection of course and field experiences to the professional standards of specific disciplines. A presentation during the onsite interview indicated that the faculty in special education developed their three-phase assessment for their educational diagnostician program based on the Council for Exceptional Children standards. Documentation on college and career readiness standards, standards from specialty professional associations (e.g., CACREP, NCTE, IRA, NASPE) and Texas Educational Standards were provided. Numerous examples of the integration of state and national standards are found in the syllabi for face-to-face courses and field experiences and confirmed by candidate interviews.

A hallmark of the unit's assessment system is the incorporation of technology in video capturing of candidate performance. Additionally, innovative instructional approaches were described in interviews and included a co-teaching model. Further, examples were provided on how the unit faculty adjust their instruction to enhance candidate learning. For example, faculty noted the use of clips from candidate videos to consult with candidates about academic feedback with P-12 students. Innovation in instructional practice is also found in Apply and Evaluate activities which are embedded in courses and field settings. Specific examples of these Apply and Evaluate activities include the use of questioning strategies and incorporating elements of diversity and differentiation for ability into lesson planning. Innovative practices are also found for advanced programs such as the use of case study, role playing, and application to real-world settings. Interviews onsite indicate faculty are engaged in the design and delivery of instructional programs. All advanced programs have been charged with developing a three-
phase approach to connecting their theoretical learning to their classroom practice. One example cited was conducting action research to develop a plan for addressing a student concern, collecting data, and analyzing the effectiveness of the intervention designed to ameliorate the concern. A second example is connected with advanced programs where faculty have comprised a "Super Committee" to address concerns expressed by advanced candidates about their ability to conduct research. Candidate interviews also confirmed faculty assistance in connecting the theoretical knowledge gained in classes to real-world solutions in P-12 settings.

Numerous examples of faculty engagement in service to the field and community were provided. Activities included work with a Promise Neighborhood grant, an I3 grant, and teacher professional development. Finally, unit faculty confirmed the information presented in the institutional report on faculty evaluation. A specific example of other forms of faculty evaluation is found in agreements for graduate program coordinators and program coordinators where faculty are required to submit a written report of accomplishment at the end of the year as well as participate in a meeting with the faculty member's chair and Dean.

5.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit documents that efforts of its faculty, through its Transformation Initiative, have modified their practice to enhance candidate outcomes. Using data from a state survey, the unit has also tracked its candidate's impact on P-12 student learning. These modifications have included faculty professional development as well as modifications to programs for candidates. In addition, concerted efforts through the transformation initiative have strengthened connections between unit faculty and program partners. Evidence for this connection is found in Memoranda of Agreement and in meeting minutes where P-12 partners have helped redesign elements of programs. The hire of an endowed chair to lead the Transformation Initiative is complete. Further, a number of faculty have engaged in research projects around the Transformation Initiative.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5.4 Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Recommendation related to the TI
As the unit continues to develop its full-time clinical faculty, it may begin to consider a long term promotional scheme to ensure that its clinical faculty members, who have their distinctive roles and responsibilities, have guidelines for their career development and progression.

**Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

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

**6.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report**

The onsite visit confirmed a successfully implemented revision to the governance structure and overall program design of the unit. Each of the redesigned elements of the unit reflect the unit's commitment to the Transformation Initiative and included strengthening offices such as the Office of Program Evaluation and Research Support. Governance and support is further noted in successful hires of an endowed chair to assist with the Transformation Initiative and a Director of Teacher Education. Onsite interviews with the Teacher Education Council indicated faculty from other colleges on campus who assist in educator preparation have input into decision making of policies in the unit. One example provided by a Teacher Education Council member centered on the development of the conceptual framework and an iterative process of engagement in the Transformation Initiative that included meetings, aligning assessments, and contributing to the implementation of the Transformation Initiative.

Faculty in the unit collaborate with P-12 partners in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit's programs. Numerous citations of this performance included redesign of courses, student learning outcomes, collaboration on outreach initiatives supported by external funding, and development of a co-teaching model in the Tech Teach initiative. Data indicate that faculty and P-12 partners participated in assessment plan design, scope and sequence development, and determination of data points and assessment rubrics. Data were available for both initial and advanced programs to document this involvement.

Evidence of the unit's leadership was provided by members of the university planning and assessment division who noted that other colleges on the Texas Tech campus are looking to the unit for its thoughtful and well-designed approach to assessment.

Additional evidence provided in the IR Addendum revealed additional resources directed to the unit to sustain its efforts and particularly its work on the Transformation Initiative. Program coordinator agreements which support Transformation Initiative work are provided a $7,000 stipend to faculty who engage in that work. Interviews also indicated that the unit has made substantial investments in its program through the hiring of site coordinators who assist with the Tech Teach efforts. A timeline noting an implementation schedule also alludes to the sustainability of the Transformation Initiative.

Faculty workload data were clarified by IR Addendum and through interviews with faculty. In regard to the Area for Improvement cited during the last accreditation visit, the unit has engaged in substantial efforts to engage part-time faculty in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. Interview data revealed that these efforts varied by program; however, all efforts indicate good faith approaches to include these important partners in design, implementation, and evaluation activities of the unit. For example, in Educational Leadership, part-time faculty (i.e., the unit's adjuncts) met weekly with the program faculty to engage in reform of the program and develop assessments. In
the Visual/Blind preparation program, part-time faculty examined revised standards from their national specialty organization and worked with unit faculty to redesign courses, determine where courses fit in a scope of sequence of the program's curriculum, and connected work to externally funded projects of the faculty in that specific program.

6.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit has made specific gains in its Transformation Initiative and this standard. The most impressive change is in its cooperation and shared governance with its P-12 partners in piloting the Tech Teach program. Site coordinators have been hired to replace a cadre of student teaching supervisors to maintain continuity in the unit's programs. The unit has hired an Endowed Chair in Teacher Education and a Director of Teacher Education to further the efforts associated with the Transformation Initiative.

6.3 Areas for Improvement

6.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all advanced programs engage part-time faculty in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.</td>
<td>Substantial evidence from documentation and onsite interviews indicates that part-time faculty in advanced programs participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.4 Recommendation for Standard 6

| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

6.5 Recommendation related to the TI

None

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

See the attached list.
See the attached list.

**Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibits in the Original IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits in the IR Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in the Onsite Interview Sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See [Attachment](#) panel below.

(Optimal) State Addendum: