

# **Institutional Report**

**for**

## **Focused Review of Texas Tech University**

Submitted to the  
National Council for Accreditation of  
Teacher Education  
(NCATE)

Electronic Review  
April 26-28, 2009



College of Education  
P.O. Box 41071  
Lubbock, TX 79409-1071  
<http://www.educ.ttu.edu/>

Contacts:  
Larry Hovey (overall assistance)  
[larry.hovey@ttu.edu](mailto:larry.hovey@ttu.edu)  
Shane Hammontree (technical asst.)  
[shane.hammontree@ttu.edu](mailto:shane.hammontree@ttu.edu)

## OVERVIEW

### A. The Institution

#### 1. *What is the institution's historical context?*

Texas Tech University (TTU) was created by legislative action in 1923 and is now the largest (28,000 plus students) comprehensive higher education institution in the western two-thirds of the state. Originally named Texas Technological College, it opened in 1925 with six buildings and an enrollment of 910. Graduate instruction began in 1927 within the School of Liberal Arts. A "Division of Graduate Studies" was established in 1935 and eventually became known as the Graduate School in 1954. By action of the Texas State Legislature, Texas Technological College formally became Texas Tech University on September 1, 1969. At that time, the schools of Agricultural Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, and Home Economics became known as "colleges." Texas Tech was first accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1928 and has been accredited continuously since that time. The educator preparation unit has been continuously accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1963. The university is classified as a Research University Extensive by the Carnegie Foundation, making it one of the top 125 universities in the nation.

#### 2. *What is the institution's mission?*

The focus of Texas Tech University is captured in its mission statement. "Committed to teaching and the advancement of knowledge, Texas Tech University, a comprehensive public research university, provides the highest standards of excellence in higher education, fosters intellectual and personal development, and stimulates meaningful research and service to humankind."

#### 3. *What are the institution's characteristics?*

TTU is a public comprehensive university. It is the only institution in Texas that includes a major university, a law school, and a medical school on the same campus. The university includes a Graduate School and nine traditional colleges plus an Honors College and a College of Outreach and Distance Education. The university is located in Lubbock, with a population of more than 200,000, situated in the heart of the vast Southern Plains of West Texas and Eastern New Mexico. A graphic overview of the university is found in the [TTU Fact Sheet](#) for fall 2007. Also, in-depth university and college data may be viewed via the home page of the [Office of Institutional Research and Information Management](#). Additionally, some sense of the university may be found by reviewing a TTU [monthly e-newsletter](#).

### B. The Unit

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.

The work of the College of Education is expressed in its mission statement. “The College of Education at Texas Tech University prepares professional educators and specialists for a diverse society. Our comprehensive programs integrate scholarship, research, and practice in collaboration with individuals, communities, educational institutions, and agencies.” Additional details about the COE vision and core values statements may be [reviewed online](#). Also, a general overview of the college may be found by visiting the [college’s homepage](#).

1. *How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools?*

As of spring 2009, there are 1104 candidates in EC-12 initial teaching programs and 202 in advanced programs.

2. *What is the size of the professional education faculty, including graduate assistants? How many of them are full-time, and part-time? How many graduate assistants teach education courses? What do the data in Table 1 tell the unit about its faculty?*

The College of Education has 88 full-time and 41 part-time professional education faculty members, for a total of 129. Forty-five instructors and graduate assistants teach classes or supervise clinical practice. The college has a fairly reasonable distribution of faculty in ranks from instructor to full professor.

**Professional Education Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants <sup>1</sup>**  
**Fall 2008 (NCATE Table 1)**

Academic Rank	# of faculty who are full-time in the unit	# of faculty who are full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit	# of faculty in the unit who are part-time at the institution	# of graduate teaching assistants teaching or supervising clinical practice
Professors	10	0	0	--
Associate Professors	31	1	0	--
Assistant Professors	27	1	3	--
Instructors	16	0	10	13
Clinical Supervisors	4	0	28	32
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>45</b>

<sup>1</sup> Data from COE Dean’s and Departmental Offices

3. *What programs are offered for the preparation of teachers for the first license to teach? What do the data in Table 2 tell the unit about its initial teacher preparation programs?*

Texas Tech University offers a wide range of educator preparation programs, all of which are approved by the State of Texas. The programs are housed in 8 of the 9 traditional colleges on campus plus the Graduate School. Almost all programs have undergraduate and post-

baccalaureate options, some with substantial enrollments others with minimal ones. Enrollment and other related data are currently the source of ongoing focus and discussions. Some programs are not recognized by national specialized professional associations. However, the current assessment system is better prepared than in the past to provide data needed for such recognition.

**Initial Programs and their Review Status  
(NCATE Table 2)**

<b>Program Name and Level</b>	<b>Award Level (Bachelor's or PostBac)</b>	<b>No. of Candidates Enrolled (or) Admitted Fall 2008 Total (B, PB)</b>	<b>Agency Reviewing Programs <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Program Report Submitted for Review</b>	<b>State Approval Status</b>	<b>National Recognition Status by NCATE</b>	<b>Administrative Home College <sup>2</sup></b>
Agriculture	(B, PB)	30 (27, 3)	--	No	Approved	--	AS&NR
Art (All level)	(B, PB)	21 (19, 2)	NASAD	No	Approved	Recognized by NAS	V&PA
Bilingual Generalist EC-4 (Spanish)	(B, PB)	12 (12, 0)	NA in 2006	No	Approved	NA in 2006	COE
Bilingual Supplemental (Spanish)	(B, PB)	3 (2, 1)	NA in 2006	No	Approved	NA in 2006	COE
Computer Science (Secondary)	(B, PB)	1 (0, 1)	No Sts.	No	Approved	--	ENGR
Dance (Secondary)	(B, PB)	4 (3, 1)	NASD	No	Approved	Recognized by NASC	VPA
Deaf and Hard of Hearing EC-12	(PB only)	23 (0, 23)	CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
English (Secondary)	(B, PB)	63 (35, 28)	NCTE	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
English as a Second Language	(B, PB)	119 (97, 22)		no	Approved	NA in 2006	COE
English Language Arts and Reading (Middle)	(B, PB)	4 (3, 1)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
English Language Arts /Reading/Social Studies (Middle)	(B, PB)	57 (54, 3)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Family and Consumer Science - Composite	(B, PB)	20 (14, 6)	AAFCS	No	Approved	Recognized	HS
Family and Consumer Science – Hospitality/Nutrition/Food Science	(B, PB)	6 (6, 0)	AAFCS	No	Approved	Recognized	HS
French (Secondary)	(B, PB)	1 ( 0, 1)	ACTFL	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Generalist EC-4	(B, PB)	520 (406, 114)	NAEYC (B only)	Yes (B only)	Approved	Recognized	HS & COE
German (Secondary)	(B, PB)	0	ACTFL	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Health Education (All Level)	(B, PB)	2 (2, 0)	AAHE	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
History (Secondary)	(B, PB)	46 ( 35, 11)	NCSS	No	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Journalism (Secondary)	(B, PB)	2 (1, 1)	NA in 2006	No	Approved	NA in 2006	A&S
Life Sciences (Secondary)	(B, PB)	8 (0, 8)	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Mathematics (Middle)	(B, PB)	23 (19, 4)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Mathematics (Secondary)	(B, PB)	30 (21, 9)	NCTM	Yes	Approved	Conditions	A&S

Program Name and Level	Award Level (Bachelor's or PostBac)	No. of Candidates Enrolled (or) Admitted Fall 2008 Total (B, PB)	Agency Reviewing Programs <sup>1</sup>	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE	Administrative Home College <sup>2</sup>
Mathematics/Physics (Secondary)	(B, PB)	1 (1, 0)	NO STS.	No	Approved	--	A&S
Mathematics/Science (Middle)	(B, PB)	43 (43, 0)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Music (All level)	(B, PB)	78 (71, 7)	NASM	Yes	Approved	Recognized by NASM	V&PA
Physical Education (All Level)	(B, PB)	64 ( 57, 7)	NASPE	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Physical Science (Secondary)	(B, PB)	1 (0, 1)	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Science (Middle)	(B, PB)	8 (6, 2)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Science Composite (Secondary)	(B, PB)	20 (17, 3)	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S, COE
Social Studies (Middle)	(B, PB)	15 (14, 1)	NMSA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Social Studies Composite (Secondary)	(B, PB)	13 (10, 3)	NCSS	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Spanish (Secondary)	(B, PB)	14 (9, 5)	ACTFL	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	A&S
Special Education EC-12	(B, PB)	67 (61, 6)	CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Speech Communications (Secondary)	(B, PB)	5 (4, 1)	NA in 2006	No	Approved	NA in 2006	MC
Technology Applications EC-12	(PB only)	5 (0, 5)	ISTE	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Theatre Arts EC-12	(B, PB)	8 (6, 2)	NAST	No	Approved	Recognized by NAST	V&PA

<sup>1</sup> The associations reviewing programs are mostly the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). However, some programs have been reviewed by other accrediting bodies as follows:

AER	Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired
AAFCS	American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences
CACREP	Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs
NASAD	National Association of Schools of Art and Design
NASD	National Association of Schools of Dance
NASM	National Association of Schools of Music
NAST	National Association of Schools of Theatre
AAAE	American Assoc for Agricultural Education

In addition, some programs are not covered by either a SPA or another accrediting body. In those cases "NA" for "Not Applicable" is indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Administrative Home Colleges

AS&N	Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources	ENGR	Engineering	V&PA	Visual & Performing Arts
A&S	Arts and Sciences	HS	Human Sciences		
COE	College of Education	MS	Mass Communications		

4. *What programs are offered for the advanced preparation of licensed teachers and other school professionals? What do the data in Table 3 tell the unit about its advanced programs?*

Texas Tech University offers a wide range of advance educator preparation programs, all of which are approved by the State of Texas. The programs are all housed in the College of Education and the Graduate School. Some programs have substantial enrollments, others minimal ones. Enrollment and other related data are currently the source of ongoing focus and discussions. Some programs are not recognized by national specialized professional associations. However, the current assessment system is now better prepared to provide the data needed for such recognition than in the past.

**Advanced Programs and their Review Status  
(NCATE Table 3)**

<b>Program Name and Level</b>	<b>Award Level</b>	<b>No. of Candidates Enrolled (or) Admitted Fall 2008</b>	<b>Agency Reviewing Programs <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Program Report Submitted for Review</b>	<b>State Approval Status</b>	<b>National Recognition Status by NCATE</b>	<b>Administrative Home College <sup>2</sup></b>
Ed. Leadership Principal	Master's	43	ELCC	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Ed. Leadership Superintendent	Master's	7	ELCC	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Master Reading Teacher	PostBac	3	IRA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Master Technology Teacher	Master's	4	ISTE	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
Professional Reading Specialist	Master's	3	IRA	Yes	Approved	Not Recognized	COE
School Counselor	Master's	23	CACREP	Yes	Approved	Recognized by CACREP	COE
Educational Diagnostician	Master's	38	CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Orientation and Mobility	Master's	6	CEC and AER	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Orientation and Mobility	PostBac	20	CEC and AER	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments	Master's	18	CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE
Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments	PostBac Certification	70	SBEC & CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized	COE

<sup>1</sup> The associations reviewing programs are mostly the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA's). However, some programs have been reviewed by other accrediting bodies as follows:

AER Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired

CACREP Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

<sup>2</sup> Administrative Home College COE: College of Education

5. *What programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?*

There are no alternative educator preparation programs offered at TTU. However, there are several distance delivered ones. The master's degree in special education, including courses for educational diagnostician, deaf and hard of hearing, teacher of students with visual impairments, deafblind, and orientation and mobility, and generic special education certification, are offered at a distance. The master's and doctoral programs in educational leadership are also offered at a distance. The master's degree in instructional technology is offered entirely online. There is also a pilot distance education program currently offered at specific sites in the Texas Hill Country for undergraduate candidates seeking initial teaching certificates in Elementary ESL or Elementary Bilingual Education and Special Education.



## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework. The overview should include a brief description of the framework and its development.

### Professional Educators Opening Doors to the Future (Approved by TTU Stakeholders, 7/18/05)

Professional education programs at Texas Tech University, with associated assessments, are derived from a conceptual framework having two major data sources. First are the knowledge bases of research findings; sound professional practice; Texas educator proficiencies and content knowledge; and Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills. Second is a societal context, which includes the needs of society, schools, and students; accreditation standards; certification requirements; government initiatives, and guidelines from Specialized Professional Associations.

Data from the knowledge bases and societal context are used to inform the development and continual revision of mission and vision statements. Such data are also measured against, and made consistent with, beliefs, ethics, and values related to schools, learners, teaching, and scholarly inquiry.

Reflections and actions in respect to missions, visions, beliefs, ethics, and values result in the formation of goals and objectives, which in turn undergird programs that are focused on educator proficiencies, content knowledge, clinical experiences, issues of equity and diversity, and development and infusion of technology. Program goals guide the preparation of graduates—individuals who become professional educators capable of demonstrating appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions; integrating theory and practice; respecting and valuing all individuals; advocating academic excellence for all students; serving as change agents; and remaining life-long learners. The framework is supported by an assessment system allowing informed decision-making through inquiry, assessment, feedback and follow-up.

The essence of the conceptual framework is captured with the overall theme, “Professional Educators Opening Doors to the Future.” The term *professional educators*, refers both to the professional education faculty and staff of Texas Tech University and to our graduates who become professional educators in their own right. Our graduates are professional educators who demonstrate appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions; integrate theory and practice; respect and value all individuals; and remain life-long learners.

It is essential to use opening doors to the future in a concrete manner to guide educator preparation at TTU. One way to do so is to consider the *knowledge*, *skills*, and *dispositions* that enable the doors to be opened. We as *Professional Educators* at Texas Tech share knowledge, develop skills and model dispositions with our students, enabling them to open doors to their futures. In turn, our graduates, as professional educators, share knowledge, develop skills, and model dispositions with their students allowing those individuals to open doors to their futures.

In addition, our work is guided by our theme, Professional Educators Opening Doors to the Future, as doors are metaphorically opened to a future where equity and diversity are commonplace and all individuals are respected and valued. Both TTU educators and our graduates open doors by advocating academic excellence for all students, respecting and valuing all individuals, serving as change agents, and generally providing opportunities for all students to be successful.

Online is a [visual representation](#) of the conceptual framework with hyperlinks for definition, clarification and elaboration. Similar hyperlinks are used to more directly focus on the following NCATE questions.

1. Briefly summarize the following elements of the unit's conceptual framework:

a. the [vision and mission](#) of the unit

The College of Education Mission Statement: The College of Education at Texas Tech University (TTU) prepares professional educators and specialists for a diverse society. Our comprehensive programs integrate scholarship, research, and practice in collaboration with individuals, communities, educational institutions, and agencies. (Approved by COE Faculty and Staff 5/4/04.)

College of Education Vision Statement: The vision of the College of Education is to strengthen the foundations of democracy and realize its benefits through excellence in research, teaching, and service. Our professional faculty and staff prepare lifelong learners to become competent, effective, and caring professionals who are able to address the educational challenges of a diverse society in a dynamically changing world. (Approved by COE Faculty and Staff, 7/18/05.)

b. philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit

The college's philosophy and purposes are greatly captured by a [Core Values Statement](#), a [Statement of Philosophy Regarding Diversity](#), and a statement concerning the [needs of society, schools, and students](#).

c. [knowledge bases](#), including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit may be reviewed online.

d. candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards.

An [alignment of COE goals](#) with professional and state standards is a part of the Educator Preparation Assessment System. Therefore data that are regularly collected not only pertain to college goals but also to state and professional standards. Also, candidate proficiencies are measured through Program Assessment Plans (PAP), in which each program specifies program goals, student learning outcomes, and assessments of those outcomes. Examples of early PAPs for the [Elementary Initial Teaching Program](#) and the [Principal Advanced Program](#) may be reviewed online. Program (or unit) Assessment Plans are now being transferred to a new university software program, TracDat. Examples in this format are also available for review: [elementary](#), [secondary](#), [principal](#), [superintendent](#), and [counselor](#).

- e. summarized description of the unit's assessment system

The Educator Preparation Assessment System (EPAS) serves as the foundation for all of TTU's educator preparation programs by supporting the conceptual framework (CF) and its overall theme, Professional Educators Opening Doors to the Future. Candidates open doors to their future as educators by acquiring appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. On-going assessment of candidates and programs ensures the quality of the educational experiences candidates receive. The regular analysis of Program Assessment Plans, focusing on student learning outcomes, promotes continuous program improvement.

EPAS generates, organizes, and archives data to be used by faculty and staff to advance the college's mission. The Educator Preparation Assessment System focuses on the assessment of College of Education's strategic goals, which are derived from Texas Tech University goals and integrated with NCATE standards and state-specified competencies. Embedded within the assessment of strategic goals are metrics that relate directly to accreditation standards. The assessment system has been developed over several years, and has gone through several approval and reaffirmation processes: approved (12/06) and reaffirmed (9/07 & 2/09) by stakeholders, and approved (9/19/07) and reaffirmed (2/18/09) by the Teacher Education Council.

## STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

The Educator Preparation Assessment System (EPAS) serves as the foundation for all educator preparation programs by generating, organizing, and archiving data used to advance the college's mission. EPAS supports the conceptual framework (CF) and its overall theme, Professional Educators Opening Doors to the Future. The assessment system contributes to the knowledge bases and is drawn from the societal contexts on which the CF is founded. The system focuses on the assessment of the college's strategic goals, which are [aligned with Texas Tech University goals](#), NCATE standards, and state competencies. Embedded within the assessment of strategic goals are metrics that relate directly to NCATE and SACS accreditation standards. In addition, consideration of transition point assessments ensures that institutional standards are met.

As a result of the fall 2006 NCATE review, the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) found Standards 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 to be met. However, Standard 2 was not met, with the following areas of improvement cited:

- The unit assessment system is not fully developed and implemented.
- There are no plans to evaluate the assessment system to determine if it is fair, free from bias, and reliable.
- Data are not regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Since the report was issued, educator preparation faculty and staff have worked diligently to address the UAB concerns. First, the assessment system is now fully developed and implemented. The best indication of this is found in the expanded description of the [assessment system](#), which includes a description of the relationship with the college's conceptual framework; strategic goals with associated benchmarks; a research base for the system; a directory of repositories where data and documents are organized, archived, and accessed; and a calendar of assessment activities, including schedules of when assessments occur, data utilized, and reports due. Likewise, the extent of the assessment system's implementation is evidenced by the college's major annual reports, including the [2007-2008 Certification Report](#), the 2007 Annual [Strategic Planning Assessment Report](#), and the [2008 Assessment Report](#) (COE homepage, follow the Assessment Accreditation link to Assessment Plan and 2008 Assessment Report).,

Second, the assessment system does now undergo evaluation to determine if it is fair, free from bias, and reliable. This is evidenced later in this report in Section 2a, 4.

Third, data are now regularly compiled; summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. Again, the best evidence of this resides in such major annual reports as the 2008 Assessment Report, the 2007-2008 Certification Report, and the Strategic Planning Assessment Report. A review of unit [improvements based on data](#) provides insight into how the college has addressed this UAB concern. Assessments of unit operations are found throughout the college's strategic goals and benchmarks but most specifically in Goal 2, Human Resources, Infrastructure and Accountability. A summation of [Goal 2 assessments](#) may be reviewed online. Each program has developed a Program

Assessment Plan specifying program purpose, student learning outcomes, and assessments of learning outcomes. Examples of such assessment plans may be reviewed online for the Educational Leadership, [Principal Program](#) and the [Elementary Education Program](#).

The process of addressing UAB concerns has been greatly aided by university support, including an enlarged university [Office of Planning and Assessment](#), and an increased budget for assessment/technical solutions, such as [TracDat](#), [Digital Measures](#), and [SharePoint](#).

It should also be noted that the assessment system has been reviewed by all stakeholders at numerous junctures. All educator preparation faculty and staff reaffirmed the assessment system as of February 13, 2009. The Teacher Education Council also reaffirmed the system on February 18, 2009.

In addition to the preceding overview, UAB concerns are addressed in the following responses to specific NCATE questions related to Standard 2.

## **2a. Assessment System**

### *1. How is the unit assessment system evaluated and continuously improved? Who is involved and how?*

The evaluation, maintenance, and improvement of the Educator Preparation Assessment System (EPAS) are the primary responsibility of the College of Education (COE) Assessment Team, who in turn reports to and seeks input from all stakeholders, including the Leadership Council, the Teacher Education Council and all faculty and staff. The [Assessment Team](#) has a diverse membership of faculty, administrators, and staff.

An indication of the Assessment Team's management of the assessment system may be seen by reviewing a summation of recent meeting minutes, with hyperlinks to the full documents.

- [07/21/08](#): electronic input of final student teaching evaluations, diversity awareness survey, post-baccalaureate field work verification form, expansion of employer's survey, key assessments for programs.
- [07/28/08](#): graduate-level assessments, preparation for the 8/18/08 COE Assessment Convocation.
- [08/14/08](#): status of technology survey, focus groups of recent graduates, NCATE reports integrated into the Annual Certification Report, better access to assessment from the COE's homepage.
- [08/25/08](#): updating the graduate and undergraduate end-of-program surveys, developing a regular process to communicate assessment activities to stakeholders (Assessment Alert).
- [09/08/08](#): discussion of fairness, accuracy, and avoidance of bias
- [09/29/08](#): review of October Assessment Alert, review of modifications to strategic goals and benchmarks, discussion of fairness, consistency, accuracy and avoidance of bias.
- [10/06/08](#): organizing student teaching data, transitioning to use of the TracDat software, incorporating surveys into TaskStream; updating the TExES Domain Index.
- [10/20/08](#): facilitating program usage of a Wiki to promote communication, improving data repositories, preparing for the university's Assessment Symposium.
- [10/27/08](#): status of 2008 Assessment Report, use of Share Point software, recommendation to discontinue use of e-Agenda software; discussion of the Legislative Budget Board and Title II Reports.

- [11/10/08](#): discussion of possible revisions to the state's Assessment System for Educator Preparation (ASEP), discussion about the research base of the COE Assessment Plan, develop a lessons learned about assessment statement, doctoral-level assessments.

Assessment Team management of the assessment system is also seen in the "[Lessons Learned](#)" handout developed by the Assessment Team and used at a university-wide assessment symposium. The COE was the only college invited to present at the all-day meeting.

Although the Assessment team has primary responsibility for the evaluation, maintenance, and improvement of the assessment system, all faculty and staff members are actively involved as evidenced by the agendas from recent faculty/staff assessment convocations and program coordinators meetings.

- [January 9, 2006](#): status of assessment activities, conceptual framework, program assessment plans, and NCATE review;
- [May 4, 2006](#): status of assessment activities, conceptual framework, strategic goals, and program assessment plans;
- [August 21, 2006](#): NCATE review process, and program assessment plans;
- [August 20, 2007](#): status of assessment activities, redesigning program web pages, program assessment plans, documenting data usage, using data to inform decision making;
- [October 19, 2007](#): redesign of program web pages, program assessment plans, and strategic goals;
- [January 7, 2008](#): using assessment to improve all facets of college activities and using enrollment data to inform decision making;
- [January 11, 2008](#) (Program Coordinator's meeting) focused on program level assessments.
- [February 8, 2008](#): grading policies and practices as a function of assessment and advancing the recruitment of African American candidates;
- [February 8, 2008 follow-up](#): moving forward with grading policies and practices;
- [May 13, 2008](#) (Program Coordinator's meeting) focused on documentation for NCATE areas of improvement.
- [August 18, 2008](#): NCATE review process, assessment overview, assessment foundation documents, and gathering data for program assessment plans;

2. *What key assessments are used to monitor candidate performance at the transition points in Table 6?*

Key assessments used to monitor candidate performance at program transition points are summarized in the following table.

**Transition Point Assessments <sup>1</sup>**  
**(NCATE Table 6)**

	Admission to Program	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion
<b>Initial Teacher Preparation Programs: Bachelors Degree and Post-baccalaureate</b>					
Bilingual Education EC-6 Elementary Education EC-6 English as a Second Language EC-6 Math/Science EC-6 Special Education EC-12	GPA Overall (2.7) & in content fields (2.7) Evidence of basic skills (Texas Higher Education Assessment, Accuplacer, SAT, or ACT scores) Completion of general education core curriculum	GPA overall (2.7), content fields (2.7), and in education courses (2.7) Successful completion of specified education coursework (including field experiences)	Successful completion of student teaching assessed against competencies by: informal daily observations, use of clinical observation, midterm, and final assessment forms	Successful completion of Capstone Course Successful creation of a professional portfolio Successful completion of required coursework, including the achievement of student learning outcomes Passing the appropriate TExES (licensure) exams	Candidate end-of-program survey, Follow-up surveys of graduates and employers, Focus groups with local employers & graduates
English/Lang. Arts/Soc. Studies 4-8 Math/Science 4-8 Multidisciplinary Science Secondary Education 8-12	GPA Overall (2.5) & in content fields (2.5) Evidence of basic skills (Texas Higher Education Assessment, Accuplacer, SAT, or ACT scores) Completion of general education core curriculum	GPA overall (2.5), content fields(2.5), and in education courses (2.5) Successful completion of specified education coursework (including field experiences)	Successful completion of student teaching assessed against competencies by: informal daily observations, use of clinical observation, midterm and final assessment forms	Successful completion of Capstone Course, Successful creation of a professional portfolio, Successful completion of required coursework, including the achievement of student learning outcomes, Passing the appropriate TExES (licensure) exams	Candidate end-of-program survey Follow-up surveys of Graduates & employers Focus groups with local employers & graduates
<b>Advanced Teaching Programs: Master's Degree</b>					
Master Reading Teacher	Hold a valid Texas Teaching Certificate 2 years of teaching experience in TEA accredited schools	Teaching experience	Two years of teaching experience	Successful completion of the required program of study, Passing the appropriate TExES (licensure) exam	Candidate end-of-program survey, Follow-up surveys of graduates and employers
Master Technology Teacher	Accepted into the EDIT master's program and have teaching experience	Teaching experience	Two years of teaching experience	Success completion of the required program of study, Passing the appropriate TExES (licensure) exam	Candidate end-of-program survey, Follow-up surveys of grads. & employers

	Admission to Program	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion
Reading Specialist	Hold a master's degree Hold a valid Texas Teaching Certificate 2 years of teaching experience in TEA accredited schools	Teaching experience	Two years of teaching experience	Success completion of the required program of study, Passing the appropriate TExES (licensure) exam	Candidate end-of-program survey, Follow-up surveys of graduates & employers
<b>Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals</b>					
Counselor Certification	Graduate School application documents: application form, fee, official transcripts, and residence questionnaire COE documents (specific to program): usually application cover sheet, recommendation form or reference letters, resume', letter of application; writing samples, GRE scores, teaching experience	Successfully completed all coursework	Satisfactory completion of a professional portfolio, Satisfactory recommendations from the university and site-based supervisors based on assessment form	Pass both the TExES and master's comprehensive exams Minimum of two years teaching experience for certification	Candidate end of program survey, Alumni and employer survey/focus groups
Educational Diagnostician	Graduate School application documents: application form, fee, official transcripts, and residence questionnaire COE documents (specific to program): usually application cover sheet, recommendation form, letter of application; writing samples, GRE scores	Initial Practicum: Taking or have taken EDSP 5301 Final Internship: Completed all coursework except EDSP 5094	Exit exam based on CEC competencies	Pass the TExES exam, Two years teaching experience, Analysis of student learning outcomes (see separate student learning outcomes matrix)	Exit survey at end of program, focus groups with alumni and employers



	Admission to Program	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion
Principal Certification	Graduate School application documents: application form, fee, official transcripts, and residence questionnaire, COE documents: application cover sheet, recommendation form or reference letters, resume, letter of application; writing samples, GRE scores	Successfully completed all coursework	Successfully completed a professional portfolio Satisfactory recommendations from the university and site-based supervisors based on assessment form	Pass the principal TExES examination Master's Comprehensive Examination, Analysis of student learning outcomes (see separate student learning outcomes matrix), Minimum of two years teaching experience for certification	Candidate end of program survey, Alumni survey/focus groups
Special Education Certification Deaf and Hard of Hearing Deafblindness Orientation Mobility Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments	Graduate School application documents: application form, official transcripts, and residence questionnaire, COE documents: application cover sheet, recommendation form or reference letters, resume', letter of application; writing samples, GRE scores	Successfully completed all coursework	Successfully completed a professional portfolio, Satisfactory recommendations from the university and site-based supervisors based on assessment form	Master's Comprehensive Exam Analysis of student learning outcomes (see separate student learning outcomes matrix)	Candidate end of program survey, Alumni survey/focus group
Superintendent Certification	Graduate School application documents: application form, fee, official transcripts, and residence questionnaire COE documents: application cover sheet, reference letters, resume', letter of application; writing samples, Texas principal certification (with associated teaching experience)	Successfully completed all coursework Self assessment of leadership dispositions	Assessment of leadership dispositions Satisfactory recommendations from the university and site supervisors	Pass the superintendent TExES examination, Analysis of student learning outcomes (see separate student learning outcomes matrix)	Candidate end of program survey (being developed), Informal but regular program faculty discussion about success of past year candidates, Alumni survey/focus group

<sup>1</sup> Transition point assessment criteria established by faculty guided by state requirements and professional association guidelines

*3. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?*

Candidates seeking initial teaching certificates are assessed using measures based on the State of Texas' 13 Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility competencies. The student teaching evaluation form, the professional portfolio, and the TExES examinations reflect these competencies. The Texas competencies are consistent with the standards of specialized professional associations and are part of the knowledge base included in the TTU conceptual framework. Candidates in advanced programs are also assessed using measures based on state and national standards. TExES exams for certificates in counseling, special education, and educational leadership are based on state standards. Student learning outcomes in programs leading to advanced certificates are also derived from standards from their respective professional associations.

In addition, an [alignment of COE goals](#) with professional and state standards is a part of the Educator Preparation Assessment System. Therefore data that are regularly collected not only pertain to college goals but also to state and professional standards.

Finally, candidate proficiencies are measured through Program Assessment Plans (PAP), in which each program specifies program goals, student learning outcomes, and assessments of those outcomes. Examples of early PAPs for the [Elementary Initial Teaching Program](#) and the [Principal Advanced Program](#) may be reviewed online. Program (or unit) Assessment Plans are now being transferred to a new university software program, TracDat. Examples in this format are also available for review: [elementary](#), [secondary](#), [principal](#), [superintendent](#), and [counselor](#).

*4. How does the unit ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?*

The unit works to reduce sources of bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments. A major way this occurs is through program and course development based on rigorously developed state standards and state licensure examinations. All initial teaching and advanced programs are based on these standards, and all candidates must pass the appropriate Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) before being certified. The 13 competencies that the state of Texas expects to be developed throughout teacher preparation programs are consistently used in the development and implementation of the curriculum, as well as in assessing candidate development. Key components of the development process for the TExES tests, including [validation and bias prevention](#), may be reviewed online.

The 13 competencies also form the basis of two other important assessments of teacher candidates: student teaching evaluation and the professional portfolio completed during the culminating Capstone Course. This common basis provides consistency across assessment measures for initial teaching candidates. Consistency of practice is supported through training sessions provided for university supervisors, who, in turn, work with mentor teachers, and for Capstone course instructors. Each semester, new university supervisors are given specific training in the assessment of student teachers. Capstone instructors meet each semester to review the rubric used to evaluate the professional portfolio assignments.

Fairness is also promoted by making assessment policies and procedures transparent to the individuals being assessed, and by ensuring due process for all candidates throughout the

assessment process. Certification handbooks and course syllabi inform candidates from the initial stages of their work about the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be developed and assessed throughout individual courses and the program. Program Assessment Plans, including the program purpose, student learning outcomes, and associated assessments are posted online. Furthermore, by university and college policy, course syllabi must be available to students on the first day of class. Learning outcomes, methods of assessing the outcomes, and grading policies are clearly described and stated in [all syllabi](#). University policy specifies that the student learning outcomes and assessments included in all syllabi of all faculty members be reviewed annually by the department chairs as part of annual faculty review.

It also should be noted that candidates who feel assessments are not fair may formally appeal, following procedures stated in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog. Candidates who wish to appeal a final course grade may do so following procedures outlined in [OP 34.03: Student Grade Appeal](#). Since May, 2005 there were ten [grade appeals](#), three of which were approved, and during fall 2008, there were 13 [student teaching problems](#), all resolved. Additionally, student teachers are given a document titled, “[Code of Conduct](#)” that outlines the due process to be followed when resolving a student teaching problem that may result in dismissal from the program.

Whenever possible, performance of candidates and faculty members is assessed with multiple measures. As indicated in measurement literature, the process of using multiple measures provides more convincing evidence of performance than any single criterion approach. For example, to assess preparedness of teaching candidates, multiple sources of information and multiple measurements are utilized, all of which were based on the [State of Texas 13 competencies](#). These competencies are assessed with the following multiple measures, the use of which adds to the validity of the measurements.

- student teaching/internship
  - [daily observation form](#),
  - [midterm assessment form](#),
  - [student teaching final evaluation form](#), and
  - [student teaching evaluation rubric](#);
- [electronic portfolio](#) directions and rubrics; and
- [candidate end-of-program assessment](#).

There is a well conceived faculty evaluation system including an annual review process. Each faculty member completes an annual report and receives an annual written review from the department chairperson. The report and review serve as a basis for a yearly evaluation conference. Faculty who are tenure-seeking, also are reviewed by an Annual Review Committee. Faculty members with tenure undergo periodic post-tenure reviews.

Expectations for faculty members’ performance in teaching, research, and service are also clearly delineated in the *COE Handbook*. Evaluation procedures, including those utilized in faculty annual review, third-year review, tenure and promotion review and post-tenure review, are explained. Like candidates, faculty members who feel they are treated unfairly regarding performance assessment may appeal following procedures delineated in the University Operation Policies ([OP 32.05](#)).

Conducting assessment in a standardized manner is one way to eliminate or reduce bias in the process and promote consistency. For example, the college standardizes the manner in which candidates assess courses and instructors. The process is conducted by independent evaluators, instead of by course instructors as in an earlier practice, and with standardized instructions for

the evaluation. In all events conducted by the college to assess candidate and faculty performance, effort is maximized to maintain anonymity of respondents and confidentiality of information obtained so people can freely express their true perceptions or opinions. Some assessments are conducted online, which also promotes standardization.

The COE is committed to diversity and monitors the numbers and percentages of minority candidates, faculty, and staff. In addition, the COE monitors assessment results for candidates to ensure that the system is free from bias. Each year the State's Assessment System of Educator Preparation (ASEP) develops data on the application, acceptance, and retention of candidates. These data generally indicate that teacher certification candidates, across all demographic groups, are treated fairly and consistently as they progress through various program transition points.

**Certification Candidates**  
**Applied/Accepted/Retained in a Program, 2007-2008**  
**Undergraduate and Post-baccalaureate Combined <sup>1</sup>**

Gender/Ethnicity	Applied	Accepted	% Accepted/ Applied	Started Program	Retained	% Retained/ Accepted	% Retained/ Started
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
African Am.	30	26	87%	20	19	73%	95%
Hispanic	104	98	94%	85	79	81%	93%
Other/Unknown	27	27	100%	22	22		100%
White	590	549	93%	460	445	81%	97%
<b>Gender</b>							
Female	549	502	91%	434	422	84%	97%
Male	203	188	93%	153	143	76%	94%
<b>Total</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>96%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Assessment System of Educator Preparation (ASEP) Annual Performance Report

The following data indicate that by the conclusion of programs, all groups perform above the State of Texas' "acceptable" levels in respect to certification examinations. ("Acceptable" requires at least ten individuals in a group with an 80% passing rate on the final data.) This is another indicator that all groups are treated fairly as they move through College of Education programs.

**State Board for Educator Certification  
Texas Tech University  
Test Pass Rates  
for Completion Years 2003-2007 1**

Period	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
2007 Final (9/1/05-12/31/07)	97% (621)	98% (496)	92% (125)	100% (11)	93% (78)	73% (9)	98% (523)
2006 Final (9/1/04-12/31/06)	95% (620)	96% (500)	91% (120)	79% (11)	89% (59)	92% (12)	97% (538)
2005 Final (9/1/03-12/31/05)	97% (521)	98% (385)	94% (133)	91% (6)	96% (60)	95% (21)	98% (434)
2004 Final (9/1/02-12/31/04)	96% (401)	97% (318)	92% (80)	76% (9)	86% (34)	100% (16)	98% (342)
2003 Final (9/1/01-12/31/03)	95% (597)	96% (459)	92% (138)	86% (12)	91% (64)	88% (12)	96% (509)

<sup>1</sup> Assessment System of Educator Preparation (ASEP) Annual Performance Report

The assessment process in respect to hiring faculty and staff is also lacking in bias. Ethnic minority numbers are on the increase. The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity provides data pertinent to faculty diversity as follows:

**College of Education  
Full-time Faculty Demographics <sup>1</sup>**

Fiscal Year	Total	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	A/PI	AI/AN	Total Minority	Per Cent Minority
2001	54	22	32	48	2	3	0	1	6	11%
2002	60	18	42	49	5	5	1	0	11	18%
2003	64	19	45	53	4	5	2	0	11	17%
2004	72	17	55	57	5	7	3	0	15	21%
2005	74	20	54	55	5	10	4	0	19	26%
2006	83	22	61	61	6	11	5	0	22	27%
2007	80	22	58	61	6	11	5	0	22	28%
2008 <sup>2</sup>										

<sup>1</sup> TTU Office of Equal Employment Opportunity

A/PI: Asian/Pacific Islander

AI/AN: American Indian/Alaskan Native

<sup>2</sup> Not Available

Note that the percentage of minority faculty members in the COE for 2005 at 25.7% is considerably higher than that the national average of 14.2% as indicated by data from 489 educational units in the AACTE Professional Education Data System (PEDS). Also, the COE has 73% female faculty members, above the 63% reported by PEDS for fall 2005.

5. *What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?*

The Educator Preparation Assessment System focuses on the assessment of College of Education's strategic goals. Embedded within the assessments are metrics that relate directly to unit operations. Such assessments of unit operations are found throughout the college's strategic goals, but most specifically in Goal 2.

Goal 2 Human Resources, Infrastructure and Accountability: Increase and use resources to recruit and retain high quality and diverse faculty and staff, and to support an optimal work environment. Strengthen mechanisms inside the college to conduct academic, student and administrative affairs effectively. Maximize the appropriate use of technology in the delivery of COE programs and services. Utilize an assessment system that supports accountability and promotes data-informed decision making.

Assessments indicate the COE has a productive and diverse faculty; a student/teacher ratio consistent with the one for the university; and good technology support. Assessments also indicated a need to modify some candidate advising services. Modifications have been put in place. A summary of Goal 2 outcomes with associated data sets may be [reviewed online](#).

## **2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

1. *What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?*

Data collection is overseen by the Assessment Team following the [COE Assessment Calendar](#). Much data collection (or storage) is a matter of accessing appropriate college, university, and state [repositories](#) as the data become available. In some instances, the Assessment Team will contact specific offices for data, such as requesting special reports from the university's Office of Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM). Or, department chairpersons will direct faculty members to complete their annual faculty reviews, which is a source of considerable faculty data.

Data are summarized and analyzed as rapidly as possible following availability. For example, the Assessment System utilizes much fall semester only data. Depending on the source, those data become available anywhere from January through April. The availability of fiscal or calendar year data also varies greatly depending on the source. The COE Assessment Calendar guides data collection; with plans that the next generation of the calendar will include more specifics about data availability.

Responsibility for summarizing and analyzing data mostly rests with the Assessment Team, either collectively or individually. A typical example is the Annual Certification Report. Personnel in the Certification Office, particularly the Certification Officer, gather the data, summarize it, and do some initial analysis. That information then goes to the Assessment Team for further discussion/analysis before the report is sent to the college's Leadership Council, the university's Teacher Education Council, and appropriate department chairperson around campus, and eventually all faculty and staff. At each level, analysis and actions may occur.

Data are summarized and analyzed into a set of reports such as the college's [Annual Assessment Report](#), annual [Certification Report](#), and the university's [Strategic Planning Assessment Report](#). Within each report, data are mostly formatted into tables, with occasional use of charts and graphs.

A variety of information technologies are used to maintain the assessment system. For example, faculty annual reports are [completed online](#), with the contents of the reports being archived into databases, which may be searched by topic. Also, candidate and faculty surveys are administered and data organized electronically such as the "13 Competency Surveys" for [graduates, employers and alumni](#) and the [Graduate Student Survey](#), which have numerous components are organized through archiving and indexing, such as program assessment plans, [course syllabi](#), and [NCATE documents](#).

Improvements have occurred with university support through the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM), an enlarged university [Office of Planning and Assessment](#), and an increased budget for assessment/technical solutions, such as [TracDat](#), [Digital Measures](#), and [SharePoint](#).

#### Standard 1 Addendum

The Unit Accreditation Board, during the 2006 review, indicated a Standard 1 area of improvement as follows: "The unit does not systematically collect, analyze, and report data on the skills and dispositions of candidates across all advanced programs." This concern relates directly to Standard 2 and has been greatly addressed through the overall growth and maturation of the assessment system, including those aspects related to advanced programs. The Educator Preparation Assessment System (EPAS) is well integrated into the college's conceptual framework, with major components fully developed including strategic goals with associated benchmarks; a directory of repositories where data and documents are organized, archived, and accessed; a calendar of assessment activities, including schedules of when assessments occur, data utilized, and reports due; and a research base to support the system.

Goals and benchmarks, the heart of the assessment system, have been extensively reviewed and refined for all advanced programs. This is particularly true of Goal 4, Graduate and Advanced Certification Education, which states, "Enhance graduate degree and certification programs, which develop candidates who are academically and professionally prepared, technologically literate, and who can adapt instruction, service, and/or programs for diverse populations."

Candidate preparedness, including advanced program candidates, is primarily assessed in two ways. First are transition point assessments. These are completed at admission and exit from programs, admission and exit from clinical experiences, and follow-up to programs. Second are assessments of student learning outcomes focusing on knowledge, skills, and dispositions at the conclusion of a program. Every program has developed a Program Assessment Plan, which includes the program purpose, student learning outcomes, and associated assessments of the outcomes.

The Educational Leadership Program (principal and superintendent certification) is a prime example of assessment changes made in advanced programs, including skills and dispositions. That 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, including:



- principal [program assessment plan](#) (student learning outcomes);
- principal [site supervisor instrument](#);
- principal [mid-program assessment instrument](#);
- principal [alumni survey](#);
- principal [end-of-program assessment](#);
- principal [comprehensive examination rubric](#);
- principal [assessment overview](#);
- superintendent [program assessment plan](#) (student learning outcomes);
- superintendent [knowledge, skills, and dispositions—governance](#);
- superintendent [knowledge, skills, and dispositions—finance](#);
- superintendent [knowledge, skills, and dispositions—curriculum](#);
- superintendent [knowledge, skills, and dispositions—ELCC Standards](#);
- superintendent [assessment of program](#);
- superintendent [mock grievance video analysis](#);
- [transition point assessment plans](#) (principal and superintendent);
- [leadership assessment instrument](#) (principal and superintendent);
- [diversity survey](#) (principal and superintendent);
- [assessment alignment](#) with standards (principal and superintendent);
- [disposition self-assessment](#) (principal and superintendent); and
- [disposition peer assessment](#) (principal and superintendent).

2. *How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?*

The COE maintains a record of formal candidate complaints. The resolution of those complaints is guided by the following statement from the [College of Education Handbook](#).

**Resolution of Student Concerns/Complaints**

Students occasionally approach faculty or staff members with concerns or complaints. As a faculty or staff member you should attempt to resolve such problems, but only if it is appropriate for you to do so, and if you can do so in a manner consistent with established procedures. We want all student concerns to be heard and if possible, resolved. Concerns should be settled in an efficient, consistent manner, making certain the rights of all individuals are preserved and due process is followed.

Student complaints in the College of Education are resolved in a manner consistent with university operating policies and procedures such as the following:

[OP 34.03: Student Grade Appeal](#);

[OP 34.04: Academic Regulations Concerning Student Performance](#) ;

[OP 34.12: Grading Procedures](#); and

[OP 77.04: Ombudsman for Students](#).

Candidate concerns are also considered based on guidelines such as those in the Student Teaching Handbook, which specify a [Code of Ethics](#), [Responsibilities of the Student Teacher](#), and [Withdrawal/Dismissal/Intervention](#) procedures. In addition, sections of the 2008-09



[Undergraduate/Graduate Catalog](#) and [Student Handbook](#) provide guidelines for student rights and responsibilities.

Furthermore, a “chain of communication” is to be followed as problems are addressed. Generally, this means the candidate should first discuss the concern with the faculty member most directly involved, often the course instructor or clinical supervisor. If the problem is not resolved, an increasingly higher level of supervisors becomes involved as follows:

- faculty member(s) most directly involved;
- department chairperson or specific office administrator (Coordinator of Student Teaching or Coordinator of Field Experiences);
- appropriate Associate Dean or Certification Officer; and
- Dean of the appropriate college (often the dean of the COE, but for example with grade appeals, may be the dean of another college).

In addition, each semester candidates have the opportunity to express concerns about courses and instructors through the end of course evaluation procedure. These data are returned to the instructors for purposes of reflection with possible resulting modifications, and are also used as a basis of instructor and department chairperson discussions during the annual review process.

## **2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

1. *What are assessment data indicating about candidate performance on the main campus, at off-campus sites, and in distance learning programs?*

Initial teacher education programs are currently housed on the Lubbock campus. However, an undergraduate elementary education program is being piloted in the Hill Country. Data are being gathered on that program. An Educational Leadership Program is also being offered in the Hill Country, and several special education programs are being offered across the state. In both cases, these are single programs that are offered at multiple sites, including Lubbock. Therefore assessment practices are the same across all sites.

2. *How are data regularly used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance?*

Candidates are assessed throughout their preparation programs. They receive feedback in their course work and from mentor teachers during field experiences. Midterm evaluations are used as formative assessment in the student teaching semester. Candidates are given ample opportunities to take TExES practice exams and receive extensive feedback on their performance. Candidates who take and fail a TExES exam meet with a designated staff member who works with them to develop a plan for success.

Faculty members are evaluated by their department chairs. There is an annual review process that is conducted with all full-time faculty members that is intended to help them improve their efforts in teaching and service. Faculty members receive student feedback through course evaluations which are included in their annual review. For tenure track faculty members there is also a focus on scholarship. The annual review is also intended to help tenured faculty

meet the standards for post tenure review and for graduate faculty status review, both conducted every six years. Untenured tenure track faculty members also meet annually with a faculty review committee to support their progress toward tenure.

3. *How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis?*

Data are provided to departments and programs via e-mails, monthly Assessment Alerts, and handouts/discussions at college-wide meetings. Such data are then brought to department and program meetings with resulting actions developed. College-wide meetings occur once or more per semester. Departments and programs each meet monthly.

4. *What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?*

Many data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years in the College of Education. These changes have also included development of diversity and technology related assessment instruments, and the modification of several other instruments. For example, the student teaching evaluation has been placed online for more accurate and timely data collection. An extensive listing of [data informed improvements](#) are available for online review.

5. *How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?*

Candidates each receive a copy of their TExES data. Candidates who fail the exam meet with the Director of Field Experiences to develop a plan to succeed. Faculty and other stakeholders receive data through regular reports, such as the annual [Certification Report](#), the [Strategic Planning Assessment Report](#), and the [COE 2008 Assessment Report](#) (COE homepage, follow Assessment and Accreditation to Assessment Plan and 2008 Assessment Report). In addition, stakeholders receive the monthly Assessment Alert, with other data sent via e-mail as appropriate. Recent Assessment Alerts may be viewed online: [February 2009](#), [January 2009](#), and [December 2008](#). Also, for the last several years data-informed assessment convocations have been the major focus of the beginning of semester general faculty/staff meetings ([agendas may be reviewed online](#)).

## Optional

*What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?*

An Office of Assessment and Accreditation has been established in the College of Education. In turn, the Office has formed an Assessment Team that meets twice per month to constantly and regularly address assessment concerns and needs. Such work by the Assessment Team has resulted in the COE Assessment Plan and the 2008 Assessment Report. The Team has also helped position the College of Education in an assessment leadership role within the university and noted by this [memo](#) from the university's Office of Planning and Assessment.