INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Millersville University
P. O. Box 1002
Millersville, PA 17551
717-872-3379
April 6-8, 2014

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Dr. Helena Tuleya-Payne, Interim Dean
Helena.Tuleya-Payne@millersville.edu

Dr. Doyin Coker-Kolo, Associate Dean and NCATE Coordinator
dcokerkolo@millersville.edu

NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Guidelines for Institutional Report and Exhibits

The **Institutional Report** (IR) and **Exhibits** outlined below should be used for the professional education unit seeking **continuing accreditation** with an onsite visit scheduled between spring 2014 and fall 2015.

1. **Scope of Review**

The unit must address in its IR and Exhibits **all programs** in the institution for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and for preparation of other professionals to work in P-12 settings. For clarification of terms, please refer to NCATE glossary presented in the *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions* (Unit Standards).

2. **Reporting Requirements**

- *Meeting the Standards*. The unit is expected to address in its IR and Exhibits how programs are meeting the Unit Standards and their elements. It is critical that the unit uses the **rubrics** in addressing the expectations for each of the elements as articulated in the Unit Standards.
- *Movement Toward Target*. The unit is required to demonstrate movement toward and/or performance at the target level for one or more standards at the initial and advanced levels. The unit may select the same or different standard(s) for the initial and advanced programs, and is expected to report and provide evidence on the following:
  - Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
  - Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
  - Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in the unit standard.
- The Unit Accretion Board will grant a distinct decision on Movement Toward Target based on the following criteria:

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

	attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	

3. Institutional Report

The unit should submit its report using the Institutional Report and Exhibits for Continuing Accreditation template in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) with prompts and maximum character limitations for each of the responses.

4. Exhibits

Exhibits supporting the IR should be uploaded in AIMS under the last prompt of the standards sections. It is critical that the exhibits are made available at the time of IR submission and prior to the Offsite Review for use by the Offsite Board of Examiners (BOE) team.

5. Data Expectations

NCATE expects institutions to regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, analyze, and use data throughout the full (five to seven years) accreditation cycle between onsite visits. For the purposes of unit accreditation, a limited number of years of data are required. Data reported on assessments in the IR for unit accreditation should be for the most recent **12-month period**. When the BOE team conducts the onsite visit, it should find evidence that the institution has **three years of data** for continuing accreditation. Institutions that do not meet this minimum requirement will have an area for improvement (AFI) cited under Standard 2, indicating that the unit is not regularly and/or systematically collecting and summarizing assessment data.

For programs that were nationally reviewed through Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or through a state process that required the review of assessments and data, units are required to report in the IR only assessments and data on (1) professional dispositions and (2) proficiencies identified in the unit's Conceptual Framework. No additional assessment data for these programs are required for Standard 1. Assessments and data collected after the submission of programs for national or state review must be available at the time of the onsite visit. When the state review process does not require reporting of assessments, scoring guides, and data on candidate outcomes, the unit is required to provide information listed in the first paragraph under Data Expectations.

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

I.   Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1   Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious). [4,000 characters]

From its inception, the institution that became Millersville University was committed to the ideals of teacher training and classical learning as essential components of public education and enlightened citizenship (http://www.millersville.edu/about/history). Millersville University (MU) began as an Academy established in the 1850's to provide more education for local pupils than what was then available in Lancaster public schools. On November 5, 1855, the Academy became Lancaster County Normal Institute, the first school of its kind in the state. In 1927, Millersville became a State Teachers' College and was empowered to grant the Bachelor of Science in Education degree. With another name change in 1959 to become Millersville State College, the institution broadened its mission and curriculum into other disciplines and in 1963, was authorized to grant the Master of Arts degree. In July I, 1983, with the passing of Senate Bill 506 creating the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), Millersville State College became Millersville University of Pennsylvania.

Institutional Mission:
According to its mission statement, "Millersville University recognizes excellence in teaching and learning as its reason for being and is committed to offering students a high quality, comprehensive university experience of exceptional value. Dedicated to providing nationally recognized programs that embrace the liberal arts, the university provides academic opportunities which are supported by outstanding faculty who are accomplished scholars, artists and practitioners and are supported by a talented and dedicated professional staff" (1.5.c#2).

Unique University Characteristics:
Located in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Millersville is a comprehensive university and one of the 14 public universities in the PASSHE system. MU has increased its presence in its urban communities with its purchase of the building at 42 North Prince Street, Lancaster and then with the establishment of the University Center campus in downtown Philadelphia. To provide rich technological and creative learning opportunities for students, the university renovated and expanded the School of Education building in 2009 and most recently renovated the Winter Visual and Performing Arts Center, the Library and the Student Memorial Center. MU has consistently ranked well in U.S. News and World Report under the category of "Top Public Universities in the North region." In 2010, MU was awarded the prestigious Carnegie classification for Civic Engagement and in 2011 it received the re-affirmation of its accreditation from the Middle States Commission for Higher Education. The University was named to the

President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll three times and was the only PASSHE institution to receive this recognition with distinction in 2012.

Millersville University provides a comprehensive range of baccalaureate and graduate programs in arts, sciences, education and professional majors. MU offers 55 bachelor's degrees, and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies offers 62 graduate programs including 22 master's degrees and 40 certification programs (6.4.e#2-3). In fall 2012, the student body comprised of 7,644 undergraduate students and 1,081 graduate students. Of the total university enrollment, 57.2 % were female and 19.1% minority students. There are 229 full-time faculty, 98% of who have their terminal degrees, 122 part-time faculty and 540 full-time staff members and administrators.

Dr. John Anderson assumed presidency in April 2013 after the retirement of Dr. Francine McNairy who led the University for 19 years, as Provost and then President (6.4.b#1-4). Her tenure marked the development of a strategic plan focusing on program quality and student success (1.5.a#2). This dedication to excellence is reflected in the accreditation of the university and many of its programs by various professional associations (1.5.a#3).

I.2   Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators. [2,000 characters]

Educator preparation is regarded as the business of the entire University with oversight provided by the School of Education (SOE) and its Professional Education Unit (PEU). The unit leadership recently changed with the retirement of Dean Jane Bray on June 28, 2013 after 11 years of exemplary service. Dr. Helena Tuleya-Payne, who has been at the university for over 20 years, now serves as Interim Dean. According to its mission statement, the PEU is committed to the preparation and continuing development of education professionals. Its steadfast commitment to a liberal-arts based education, a strong knowledge of pedagogy and content, ample field experiences, and the development of dispositions support the University's mission of preparing educators who can succeed in a diverse, multicultural, and technologically complex society. The PEU's shared vision is reflected in its Conceptual Framework (1.5.c#1) that describes communities of learners guided by 1) inquiry and action, (2) focus on students, and (3) exemplary professional practice.

The PEU oversees all education programs offered within the unit regardless of where they are administratively housed. It works with the College of Graduate and Professional Studies to coordinate its advanced programs. One of the core ideals of the Professional Education Unit is collaboration. Candidates and faculty collaborate with one another, between and among schools at the university, with P-12 students, and with local schools and other educational units. In spring 2013, the SOE was re-organized from 6 to 5 academic departments. The department of Special Education was integrated with other discipline areas for improved curriculum and in compliance with Chapter 49-2 (1.5.d#3). In 2012, the total number of candidates enrolled in initial educator programs was 1,849, and the total number of candidates in advanced educator preparation programs was 327. There were 74 full time professional education faculty and 58 part time faculty.

I.3   Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals. [2,000 characters]

The School of Education at MU is nationally accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and all its programs are approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. As shown in AIMS, 17 out of 18 programs submitted to the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) between 2011 and 2012 received national recognition. 1.5.d#4 provides a listing of programs offered by the unit and their approval statuses including those in Arts and Music departments (1.5.d#1-2) that are accredited by other agencies. The unit maintains institutional memberships with the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE), National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) and Professors of Middle Level Education (POMLE). The unit does support the delivery of courses off-site each semester (1.5.d#5). While some individual courses within the unit are delivered through distance learning format, only the advanced Gifted Education Certificate program is delivered solely on-line. The unit has a state-approved Intern Program for teacher preparation available to all candidates seeking initial certification as graduate candidates. The unit's Professional Development School Network in Secondary Science and English is one of a few of its kind in the nation (3.4.a#6).

The current School of Education building, Stayer Hall, is a complete renovation and expansion of an existing structure and was designed to meet the technological needs of today's students and to prepare for an updated curriculum. This state of the art facility offers classrooms that are well equipped with modern technologies to enhance instructional delivery. The building also has an Assistive Technology Laboratory, a children's literature library and a digital learning studio which supports pedagogical innovations and collaborative projects between faculty and students using a variety of instructional technologies.

I.4   Summarize the basic tenets of the Conceptual Framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. [6,000 characters]

The Professional Education Unit's Conceptual Framework, Communities of Learners, is a working document that serves to communicate a coherent set of values and expectations for candidates enrolled in Initial Certification and Advanced Professional programs (1.5.c#1). In 2002, an intensive and exhaustive process was initiated by the Dean of the School of Education to develop a Conceptual Framework that has classic education theory as a foundation while reflecting current and relevant theoretical approaches. The document was titled "Communities of Learners" to reflect the multiple disciplines and stakeholders' input woven together in the preparation of highly effective candidates. During the development process the various iterations of the developing framework were vetted by stakeholders including faculty, candidates and community educators.

The nature of this guiding document calls for its ongoing review to ensure that it continues to reflect the goals of Millersville University, current standards of accrediting bodies and best practice as evidenced by research-based strategies. In fall 2005, a subcommittee of the original writing team met to revise the outcomes/indicators to assess more accurately the advanced programs. In spring 2012, the dean initiated a review of the literature that supported the Knowledge Bases portion of the Conceptual Framework. The current version of the framework includes the following changes to the document:

- An updated Knowledge Bases section that provides current literature references and an enhanced section on acquisition of dispositions that create a climate of respect and support for all members of the learning community (pp. 6-10).
- Updated linkages between Conceptual Framework outcomes and Millersville University 2007 Strategic Directions, current Pennsylvania Department of Education Standards, and 2012 INTASC Principles (pp. 18-19).
- Added current assessments aligned with the transition points for initial and advanced program completion (pp. 22-25).
- Updated list of programs to reflect the State's changes (Chapter 49-2) to certification programs and to align the programs with the Specialized Professional Association (pp. 24-25).

The Professional Education Unit (PEU) is committed to stakeholders' adoption of the tenets of the framework. Towards this end, its guiding principles are included on every course syllabus (1.5.b#1-23) used in the preparation of initial and advanced candidates. This effort was intensified, first by conducting a spot check of all syllabi in 2008 and ensuring that all courses, content or methods, consistently incorporated the tenets of the Conceptual Framework. Second, in November 2010, the programs within the PEU submitted documentation (including syllabi) to the Pennsylvania Department of Education to demonstrate curricular experiences that not only supported the Commonwealth's new Chapter 49-2 regulation regarding Adaptations and Accommodations for Diverse Learners and English Language Learners but aligned with the second theme of the framework which is a "Focus on students" (1.4.a#1).

Key elements of the Conceptual Framework include the PEU's mission, vision, philosophy, purpose and goals. The mission of the PEU is the preparation of professionals in a diverse and technologically complex society, who are able to understand and appreciate students as individuals; who develop habits of mind that support inquiry, reflection, and collaboration; who demonstrate exemplary professional practices; and who serve as a resource for the surrounding community. The PEU's vision is the preparation of education professionals who recognize, respect and respond to the promise of every child, seek to better the lives of individuals in a changing, diverse, and complex society and improve society through the education process. The goals of the PEU are that all members will:

      • create <u>Learning Communities of Inquiry and Action</u> in which reflection, collaboration, lifelong learning and habits of mind are developed and nurtured.

      • <u>Focus on Students</u> by balancing professional and state standards with an appreciation of all students' individuality, diversity, and cultures, and

• demonstrate <u>Exemplary Professional Practices</u>. In doing so, all will be supportive of students, families, and the school and community and will serve as catalysts for positive and responsible change.

Outcomes, Indicators and Assessment
The Conceptual Framework includes seven outcomes and associated indicators for knowledge, skills and dispositions for all PEU candidates. The indicators are behaviors candidates demonstrate to indicate meeting learning outcomes and are differentiated between initial and advanced programs. The PEU created an assessment system to provide a continuous assessment of the learning outcomes and provide feedback for improvement for candidates, programs, and the unit centered on the Vision, Mission, and themes of the Conceptual Framework. The assessment system is built around transition points at both the initial and advanced levels. Major assessments in every program are aligned with SPA standards and with Conceptual Framework outcomes. The PEU uses multiple forms of internal and external assessments including, but not limited to, surveys of graduates, surveys of cooperating teachers and school partners, student evaluations of faculty, and Praxis exams. Data collection is supported through the use of a program on Millersville University's Student Information System (Banner) where designated individuals (e.g., instructors, chairpersons, program coordinators) input information about specific student performance on assessments and dispositions.

I. 5   Exhibits

I.5.a	Links to unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual Framework(s)
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

II.   Unit Standards and Movement Toward Target

Movement Toward Target
Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

Initial	Advanced	Standards
		Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
		Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
		Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
		Standard 4: Diversity
X	X	Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
		Standard 6: Governance and Resources

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   Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results. [10,000 characters]

1.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
   ▪ Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
   ▪ Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
   ▪ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

1.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
   ▪ Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
   ▪ Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

1.1   What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results. (10,000 characters)

All of the unit's initial and advanced programs currently have state approvals; many of them just in the past 3 years because of changes to certifications in PA (Chapter 49-2) discussed in section 1.2.b. These changes resulted in the establishment of new programs and the redesigning of some existing ones. As seen in AIMS, 17 of the 18 SPA programs submitted in 2011 and 2012 received national recognition. The only program not nationally recognized at this time, Middle Level Education, needs further development. The status report on our programs in 1.5.d#4 shows that four of the programs recognized with conditions have submitted revised reports and the

others will submit in fall 2013. 1.4.k#3 provides an update on the assessments, data collection and notable changes for programs without the SPAs. Title II reports in 1.4.b#1 also speak to the quality of our programs showing an institutional pass rate of 80% or higher on the Praxis exam for program completers in all majors.

Content Knowledge: Initial Preparation Programs

SPA reports in AIMS and Praxis II data (1.4.k#2) clearly indicate that teacher candidates at MU demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the content in their disciplines. This performance is also illustrated in Art and Music that do not have a SPA but are accredited by other agencies (1.5.d#1-2). Clinical experiences data (1.4.d#2) shows that both the university supervisors and cooperating teachers rated candidates as superior in their knowledge of the content. Testimonials from employers (1.4.j#1) show that in 2010, 2012 and 2013, 100% of employers surveyed "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the MU candidates they interacted with "exhibited attributes suitable to the profession," "displayed professional behaviors," "provided evidence of their content knowledge and awareness of state standards," "provided evidence of their ability to plan for instruction" and "provided evidence of their ability to assess student learning." Alumni follow up surveys at the initial level in 2009-2012 confirmed the above assertion. 86% of participants rated the content related item "be competent in my content area" 4s and 5s on a 5 point scale. 92% had the same rating for "developed standard based curriculum" (1.4.i#1).

Content Knowledge: Advanced Programs

The recognized advanced SPA programs in AIMS (ELCC, IRA and SPED Supervisory) utilized the Praxis II data as evidence of content knowledge and had a 100% pass rate. Praxis II data for candidates in non-SPA advanced programs also show an above the required 80% pass rate (1.4.k#2). In response to its "Response to Conditions" report, the advanced Gifted program is replacing one of its current content assessments with Praxis II and will re-submit on 9/15/13 (1.5.e#2). Grades for 2012-2013 for core courses taken across the advanced programs affirm that candidates are mastering the content (1.4.c#1). 80% and above of alumni in the 2010 -2012 follow-up surveys rated their advanced programs highly in preparing them well for mastery of the content knowledge (1.4.i#2). Finally, clinical experiences data from university supervisors and cooperating teachers (1.4.d#2) and employers' survey results (1.4.j#1) rated our candidates in the advanced certification programs as "exemplary" in their mastery of the content.

Pedagogical content knowledge and skills for teacher candidates (Initial and Advanced Programs)

Programs without a SPA, including Art and Music submitted a summary of their compliance with the elements of this standard in 1.4.k#3; 1.5.d#1-2. The alumni follow up surveys and employer surveys analyzed above also show that initial and advanced teacher candidates are considered well prepared by their programs to translate theory into practice. In the 4 items addressing pedagogical knowledge in the advanced graduate follow up survey, 80% or more of respondents rated the items 4s and 5s on a 5 point scale. Over 60% of graduates from the initial programs rated the 14 related items 4s and 5s. PDS in various secondary programs and anchored placements in the Elementary and Special Education programs offer extended field experiences which further lead candidates to acquire skills and strategies that have been proven to support effective planning and delivery of instruction.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates: Initial Preparation Programs
Every initial preparation program utilizes the MU Student Teaching Final Evaluation as an assessment in this area (3.4.f#16; 1.4.d#2-3). Data from PDE 430, an assessment tool used by university supervisors during student teaching shows that candidates were in the "exemplary" (3) and "superior" range (2) on all measures of this element (1.4.d#1). In 2012, candidates averaged 2.34 on planning and preparation, 2.27 in classroom environment, 2.27 in instructional delivery and 2.54 on professionalism. Information from employer surveys (1.4.j#1) indicates that candidates are well prepared to apply professional knowledge and skills and know their community well. Disaggregated data from the follow up alumni survey (1.4.i#1) shows that majority of the respondents rated the14 items under "pedagogical and professional knowledge" 4s and 5s on a 5-point scale.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates: Advanced Preparation
Each advanced program includes assessments measuring candidate's professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in their practicum. The practicum and subsequent reflection in these programs require candidates to plan, teach and assess individual children, and close the feedback loop. Data for the advanced programs seeking initial certification (1.4.d#3) shows that candidates performed at a proficient or exemplary level. Affirming this are the recognized SPA reports in AIMS and data from our employer survey (1.4.j#1). Alumni follow up survey data (1.4.i#2) shows that 80% or more of graduates rated the 4 items under this element 4s and 5s indicating a high level of preparation in pedagogical knowledge and professional decision making behaviors.

Impact on P-12 Learning: Initial and Advanced Preparation Programs
All initial programs utilize either the Teacher Work Sample Methodology (TWS) or the Collaborative Inquiry: Reflection and Questions about Learning Project (CIRQL). In fall 2012, EDSE 471: Differentiated Instruction (1.4.g#3) was added to the Secondary programs replacing the CIRQL as a capstone assessment designed to better prepare students for inclusive education and instruction for ELL. Available data for 2012- 2013 shows that on a 4 point scale from exemplary(4) to unsatisfactory (1), candidates scored an average 3 (proficiency) or higher on all five items including "knows students well" (3.02), "analyzes and assesses student learning" (3.02) and (3.00) for "monitors students progress" (1.4.g#3). Program-level data in 1.4.g#1 for TWS, in 1.4.g#2 for the CIRQL project and examples of student work in 1.4.h #1-23 reveal candidates' proficiency on this element. Examples and data from advanced candidates' works showing impact on student learning are found in 1.4.g#4-5; 1.4.h#24- 31 and in AIMS for the SPA programs. Data from student teaching evaluations (1.4.d#2-3), employers and alumni follow up surveys (1.4.i#1-2; 1.4.j#1) also affirm that candidates create meaningful learning experiences for their students, assess student learning, make appropriate adjustments for instruction and monitor students progress.

Candidate Dispositions
The unit utilizes the Professional and Ethical Dispositions of PEU Candidates assessment for all its' candidates (1.4.e#1). This assessment features proactive involvement of teacher candidates and collaboration with school partners. Categories include: Communicates professionally;

demonstrates professional growth; demonstrates professional relationships; and exhibits attributes suitable to the profession. Data from this assessment (1.4.f#1) clearly indicates a high level of professional and ethical behavior exhibited by our candidates. In the Foundations Bloc, a faculty recommendation is required for candidate's admittance to Advanced Professional Studies and continuation in the teacher preparation program. Dispositions are also assessed in both the final student teaching evaluations (1.4.d#3) and PDE 430 (1.4.d#1) in which data clearly shows candidates are within the superior range (average 3 on a 4 point scale). Employers' survey confirms this as well as data from alumni follow up survey.

Knowledge, skills and effect on student learning for other professionals
SPA reports in AIMS (NASP and ELCC), and state program approval reports (1.4.a#1) show that candidates in programs for other professionals demonstrate mastery of the content in their fields, integrate diversity, apply research to educational contexts and use technology to support and improve student learning. Candidates in the Leadership for Teaching and Learning program (ELCC) had a 100% pass rate on the Praxis exam measuring content knowledge. They also performed above satisfactory on the portfolio completed during the clinical practicum and clinical internships experiences, a measure of their leadership skills. A case study is utilized by the certification program in School Psychology to measure candidates' knowledge and skills. 1.4.f#2 presents the assessments, rubrics and candidates' work samples for impact on student learning in the School Psychology program. Data on professional disposition in this program from a checklist administered during practicum and internships by field and university supervisors are also presented in 1.4.f#2. School Counseling (1.4.f#3) assesses candidates' understanding of their professional activities at four transition points aligned to their professional standards and gathers data for program improvement. Employer and alumni follow up survey results substantiate that these candidates are meeting the required standards of the profession.

1.2. b Continuous Improvement (10,000 characters)
Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

Across the Professional Education Unit (PEU) at Millersville University, teacher candidates and other professionals are being effectively prepared for their roles as educators. This is evident in the recognition of individual programs by the state and their professional accrediting agencies (1.4.a#1; AIMS). Despite the strong quality of our programs, we have continued to use our assessment data and feedback from accrediting agencies and other stakeholders to update/refine programs.
Much of the continuous improvement has focused on these main areas: (1) responding to the sweeping changes mandated by the state of PA in Chapter 49-2; (2) revisions to programs/assessment based on feedback from alumni and other sources; (3) refining the assessment and data collection on dispositions; and (4) addition/deletion of courses based on assessment data and student needs.

Response to Chapter 49-2 and revisions to programs/assessment based on feedback from alumni and other sources:
- New programs were developed addressing state level competencies outlined in Chapter 49-2. New programs included Early Childhood Education (PreK-grade 4); Early

Childhood/Special Education dual certification (PreK to grade 4/K-8); and four Middle Level Education concentrations (grades 4-8; Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts). Chapter 49-2 outlines specific competencies for beginning teachers in each program area and grade band. Significant revision of courses and programs has occurred to meet the new state mandates.

- All teacher preparation and specialized programs have been revised to include the mandated Accommodations and Adaptations for Diverse Learners in Inclusive Settings and the preparation of English Language Learners. Most programs needed to be revised to include 9 credits or 270 hours of Special Education and 3 credits or 90 hours of ELL coursework while staying within state- mandated credit limits. The advanced School Psychology program had exceeded the new State requirements and submitted a report to document what they were already doing.

- A new capstone assessment EDSE 471: Differentiated Instruction (1.4.g#3) was added to some initial programs in fall 2012 based on data from the alumni follow up survey and Chapter 49-2 mandate. In the alumni follow up survey, candidates at the initial level rated the diversity items "implement accommodations for students with special needs" (57%) and "individualize instruction" (64%) at 4 or lower on a 5 point scale. This assessment either replaced or is done in addition to the CIRQL for some of the programs. It represents a capstone assessment designed to better prepare candidates to provide instruction in accommodation and adaptation and in instruction for English Language Learners.

SPA resubmission
- Three of the SPA programs recognized with conditions in fall 2012 (ELCC, NCTM and ACFTL) submitted revised reports in spring 2013 (See AIMS). Two programs (ELCC and ACTFL Post Baccalaureate) attained national recognition and NCTM retained its recognized with conditions designation. Five more (CEC, AMLE, NAGC, NAEYC and NCTE) are on target to re-submit in fall 2013. 1.5.e#2 shows the timeline and action plans they have developed in response to their conditions report.

Refining the Disposition assessment
- As a response to an area for improvement on the last NCATE review, the unit developed a new disposition assessment system. Candidates' understanding of the system was monitored through a survey completed by 1,400 candidates over the course of three years (2009-2012). The initial results indicated that the candidates had limited knowledge of the dispositions system but awareness improved on the third and the last administration showing most candidates had a greater knowledge of dispositions. However, the semesters in between the first and last administration displayed stronger percentages than during the last semester. Based on a review of all of the data, the unit made changes to all syllabi to include statements about dispositions. The unit also included the discussion of dispositions in the courses offered during the Foundation Bloc which is a group of courses required of all candidates. A process for the submission of dispositions concern notices was developed for the initial and advanced levels and this addition has contributed to the heighted awareness of dispositions for both faculty and candidates. (2.4.b#4).

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Standard 1

- As we look to the future in terms of sustaining and enhancing performance, a crucial area will be gathering the first data from our new programs, including Early Childhood, Middle Level, and the dual Early Childhood/Special Education programs. The first cohort in the new programs completed them in May 2013. Of particular interest will be teacher candidates' performance on the new certification exam for the Early Childhood and dual majors. Instead of the Praxis II, the State now requires the Pennsylvania Educator Certification Test (PECT) for these certifications.
- The Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, which houses the Early Childhood, Middle Level, and dual programs, has formed dedicated committees for each program to ensure enhanced performance. The committees are charged with reviewing data, ensuring data entry in the PEU assessment system, and writing any required reports. An additional measure taken by the department is to hold certification area meetings with multiple stakeholders to elicit qualitative feedback on our new programs. In April 2013, the first of these meetings was held and focused on the Early Childhood Education program. Principals, teachers, curriculum specialists, faculty, and students met for 2.5 hours. Similar sessions are planned for the dual and the MDLV programs in the fall 2013 semester. The department needs to analyze the feedback received from the multiple sources and plan for program improvement as appropriate.
- Another area of focus is to consistently collect data for common assessments in the advanced programs and close the feedback loop. The unit needs to include all these assessments in the PEU assessment system. Examples would be the common assessments in EDFN 545: Advanced Educational Psychology and 590: Social Foundations of Education (usually taken together) and EDFN 601: Research Methods.
- The only items in the alumni follow up survey for advanced programs in which fewer than 80% of the graduates rated 4s and 5s were "work collaboratively with families and community member" (70%) and "utilize available community resources" (61%). Even though these ratings were still acceptable, all programs (especially those without SPAs) need to evaluate the emphasis placed on these areas in their curricular and clinical experiences.

1.3   Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

Assessment and corresponding rubrics that demonstrate candidates' knowledge and skills in content and pedagogical content are not aligned with specific <u>content area standards</u>.

The unit's response to the area for improvement is first and foremost reflected in continual changes to our Conceptual Framework ending in spring 2013. The unit ensured that the narrative and literature references that support our themes of *Learning Communities of Inquiry and Action, Focus on Students and Exemplary Professional Practices* were updated. In addition, changes to linkages to institutional goals, INTASC Standards, and assessment transition points have been

made. Finally, the Specialized Program Association standards and programs have been updated to reflect programmatic changes.

Programmatic changes:
- Field and clinical Experiences: Our field experiences evaluations were updated to align with PDE guidelines and content standards that delineate the kinds of pedagogical skills expected of candidates at the different levels- foundation, professional block and student teaching or exit from the program (3.4.a#5). This was necessary because of the new certifications. The field experience rubrics were also aligned to the SPA standards for the new programs (especially the Middle Level, dual- Special Education and Early Childhood programs).

Alignment of assessment to SPA standards: See 1.5.e#2 for timelines for revised SPA reports. Changes to assessment and corresponding rubrics occurred in all these programs. For example:
- Gifted Education—Advanced Level: In preparation to submit a response to conditions report, all GFED faculty met and reviewed each assessment in the program in terms of their alignments with NAGC/CEC standards. Based on this work, a new course was developed and added to the program which expands the role of the Gifted Individualized Education Program (GIEP) and includes more depth of teacher preparation on models appropriate for gifted learners. The program also added Praxis II as a measure of candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy.
- Social Studies—Initial Level: A primary focus of continuous improvement for this certification area has been the alignment of assessments with National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) standards and the Commonwealth of PA Standards for Social Studies.
- Early Childhood—Initial Level: In the response to conditions report being submitted in September, all of the assessments will be aligned to the NAEYC standards and state competencies.
- Middle Level—Initial Level: This is a new certification area for the Commonwealth of PA. All of the assessments that have been identified for this new program are currently being aligned to AMLE and State standards.

Revisions to programs/assessments
- Biology—initial level: The Biology Department engaged in a complete overhaul of their programs in the fall 2009 as a result of two program reviews by outside reviewers and assessment data. This revision included the BSE Biology program. A major addition has been the implementation of the Biology Major Field Assessment Test (MFAT) to establish a baseline for majors under the old curriculum. The first cohort in the new curriculum will complete the program in May 2013. These results will be used to make data-based decisions about the program and assessments.
- Chemistry—initial level: The Chemistry Department changed its course requirements based on an American Chemistry Society program review. These changes have led to substantially improved scores in content knowledge assessments.
- Earth Science—initial level: The ESCI department is using assessment data to make modifications in five different courses and to restructure their curricula.

- Physics—Initial Level: Using MFAT scores, feedback from graduating seniors, and 5-year review program recommendations, the department identified optics as an area of weakness. New faculty members were hired to fill this gap and a new course was created.
- English—Initial Certification: There is a planned transformation of the final year to a Professional Development School model. The methods bloc is being updated from a 5 class bloc to a 3 class bloc.
- Mathematics—Initial Certification: The Mathematics Department previously used a course-embedded assessment that required the completion of a single assessment item embedded in one exam. The faculty of the Math department, based on data from this assessment, found this to be lacking as an accurate indicator of the comprehensive knowledge required of the courses. A new assessment was planned and implemented that utilizes scores from one 20-question exam in Math 405 (Teaching Mathematics in Secondary Schools). This assessment allows for in-class follow-up and connections to future teaching.
- Mathematics—Initial Certification: The Mathematics Content Portfolio assessment tool has been under ongoing review. It now will serve as a teaching tool as well as an assessment tool. A formal procedure for notifying teacher candidates in Professional Bloc of their deficiencies was developed and administered in fall 2010. This revision serves as a way to better communicate with teacher candidates exactly what must be done for them to demonstrate competency of the standards. A one-on-one meeting with a member of the portfolio assessment team is part of this process.
- In the response to conditions report in 2012, NCTM-initial linked all its assessments to specific standards that can be assessed using the tools given. In doing so, they realigned the assessments and mapped to them to indicators, so that each indicator can be measured individually. The assessments were further strengthened with more specific rubrics, and detailed descriptions.
- As seen in 1.4.f#3 the School Counseling program recently developed four formal transition points and corresponding assessments with which to measure student learning outcomes and have made significant changes based on the data. These transition points align with the program standards.
- In the response to a conditions report, ELCC aligned their assessments to the grading rubrics, and added a follow up survey to assess how graduated students are applying their skills as leaders to support student learning in fall 2012. This survey is aligned with ELCC standards. They also updated their data for the most current reporting year.
- The English as a Second Language certificate program was recently redesigned to ensure that its field experiences align with PDE competencies and requirements.
- Exit Assessment Interview is a summative evaluation where candidates in the School Psychology program present their Case Study to a group of program faculty. Data gathered from this instrument led to the following changes in the School Psychology Program regarding the standard on effect of intervention on students:
    - **Increase coverage of statistical procedures to measure effect size of interventions.** In 2008, only 50% of candidates were reporting effect size. Requirements and instruction to the Case Study requirement resulted in 100% inclusion of this metric in 2010 and 2011.

> o **Changing requirement for the Case Study to include making positive changes in student academic functioning**. The results of the Exit Interview Assessment in 2005 indicated that candidates were focused on finishing an intervention project regardless of whether positive changes were indicated. Requiring candidates to demonstrate a positive impact on academic functioning resulted in mean effect sizes for interventions in 2009, 2010 and 2011 of 2.87, 2.69 and 3.05.

Course changes

- Language and Literacy: Advanced Program—a new course was written to meet the needs of students who need to develop additional background applicable to reading practitioners. It is required of individuals with limited experiential background. The course is RDED 620: Current Practices in Literacy Education.
- Language and Literacy: Advanced Program—one of the required courses in this program, RDED 623: Diagnosis of Reading and Writing Difficulties has previously been offered in a technology-enhanced format. This course houses several key assessments for the program and faculty were concerned that the format did not allow for sufficient feedback to students. Thus, the decision was made to offer this course in only the face-to-face format.

1.4   Exhibits for Standard 1

1.4.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.4.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.4.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's Conceptual Framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.4.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's Conceptual Framework (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.4.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.4.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.4.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.4.h	Samples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.4.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates

1.4.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.4.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1   Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations? [10,000 characters]

2.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

2.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

2.1 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations? [10,000 characters]

2.2. b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.**

Standard 2: Assessment Systems and Unit Evaluation

Assessment System

The purpose of the Professional Education Unit (PEU) Assessment System (2.4.a#1) is to provide a continuous assessment and improvement process for candidates, programs, and the unit centered on the vision, mission, and themes of the Communities of Learners Conceptual Framework. We view the work of preparing educators as so important that we see the decisions we make related to assessment in terms of a moral responsibility to candidates, our school partners, and all communities of learners who are part of the Professional Education Unit (2.4.a#2).

As seen in our Conceptual Framework (1.5.c#1, pp. 22-25) and SPA reports, decisions about initial and advanced candidates' performance are based on multiple assessments at key transition points from entry to program to program completion.

The development of the Assessment System starting in the fall of 2003 (2.4.a.#1) involved stakeholders from all Millersville Communities of Learners and included the appointment of an Assessment Coordinator (2.4.a#3) and the creation of a Unit Assessment Committee, which holds regular meetings (2.4.a#4). The Assessment Committee has representation from all departments with education programs, candidates in initial and advanced programs, the Associate Dean for the School of Education, and the Coordinator of Field Services. The Assessment Committee works as a liaison group reporting developments and changes in the Assessment System to their respective departments. There is a designated staff member from Information Technology to help with technical issues. The staff member, along with colleagues, helps the coordinator to continually evaluate the assessment system and revamp/redesign as needed. The Unit has developed a strong vision statement for the assessment process (2.4.c#1) and also has an Assessment Handbook to guide all faculty, candidates and educational partners (2.4.c#2).

The belief in the importance of assessment development by those closest to the teaching and learning process leads the Assessment Committee to regularly scan all major assessments currently in use. In doing so, the unit considers the themes and outcomes of the Conceptual Framework (2.4.b#1). In addition Specialized Professional Association (SPA) and Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) standards are used in the development of major assessments for each program (See SPAS in AIMS).

The Assessment Committee and the Assessment Coordinator are charged with evaluation of assessments and data that are used on the Unit level. The development of our current student teaching instrument was in response to an analysis by the Assessment Committee of the content validity of our old student teaching instrument. "Data Day" meetings (2.4.d#2) are the primary method used for comprehensively evaluating validity and utility of data for the Unit. Data Day meetings occur each semester and are well attended by PEU faculty and invited school partners.

The development of our internal Banner PEU assessment system met the criteria for keeping abreast of changing assessment technology. Assessment data input into the Banner system not only allows us to review the overall strengths of programs using individual assessments, it also allows us to conduct studies of the validity of all major assessments. Assessment of the validity

and utility of major assessment data takes place in all programs, both in the assessment development process and in the interpretation of data. Content validity is assured through the development of rubrics that are well-aligned to SPA standards and to CF outcomes. In addition, the utility of major assessment data is continuously reviewed by individual programs and faculty. An example is the development of the CIRQL assessment of Student Learning for secondary candidates during student teaching. Each semester data is collected on the effectiveness of the assessment, and the assessment has been revised several times based on this data. At this time, in light of new PDE requirements, only a few departments use CIRQL. A new tool is being used for secondary candidates in the Diverse Learners course simultaneous with student teaching. This assessment tool (EDSE 471) and supporting data showing how candidates impact the learning of their students is available in 1.4.g#3.

The assessment system is in its 8th year of service and currently houses assessments for 12 departments and 31 programs. On average each semester, 60 faculty members evaluate and input data for over 2970 assessments of teacher candidates using 114 different instruments as defined for the transition points for both Initial and Advanced programs (2.4.b#2).

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation
Our assessments represent a strong diversity of both internal and external measures (2.4.b#3) as well as a variety of assessment types including: standardized tests, GPA, multiple performance-based measures, affective as well as cognitive assessments.
Data collection is supported through the use of a locally developed add-on to our Student Information System (Banner). Data for all major assessments connected with courses are input into this system by faculty teaching the courses. Data for assessments not associated with a course are input by department chairs or their designee. The Banner system allows department chairs, program coordinators, the Dean of the School of Education, faculty, and the Assessment Coordinator to access reports for all major assessments for individual candidates, programs, and for the Unit. MU delivers advanced programs at off-campus locations and the assessment system is designed to allow for users to access course data separate from other course offerings.

As described earlier, the Assessment Coordinator regularly collects, compiles, summarizes, and analyzes unit data including Praxis data, student teaching data, and surveys of graduates. Each program has at least one faculty member responsible for collecting data on major program assessments. Unit assessment data is reported publicly in the PEU Assessment Committee and in PEU "Data Day" meetings. Departments share programmatic assessment data with faculty within the department and with the Assessment Coordinator. Reports on individual candidates are also available to appropriate faculty for purposes of advisement. Assessment data and resulting curricular and programmatic changes are also reported annually to NCATE in AIMS.

There are two processes available for candidate complaints. The first is for Academic Appeals, as outlined in the university catalog on page 51 (6.4.e#2). The second, Customer Service Procedures, is a procedure for candidates to submit complaints directly to the university President (2.4.e#1). Formal records of the complaints are kept in the Dean's office and the Provost's office and will be available during the onsite visit.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

Data on individual assessments is shared with candidates by the faculty who assess them. All assessments can be used by candidates for improvement. This process is explicit and systematic for candidates through the outcomes of our Conceptual Framework that call for continual reflection using feedback from faculty and peers as well as from data on impact on student learning. We also integrate similar criteria into our dispositions assessments and in our student teaching instruments.

The university's policies and procedures for campus wide assessment is found at 2.4.d #3 with a listing of the unit annual reports summarizing departmental program outcomes at 2.4.d #4. There are two aspects of our system that assure regular and systematic use of data. First, each department is required to produce annual reports including an analysis of current programs and plans for improvement. In each report, "evidence must be presented…that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program." This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and resulting changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result (2.4.c#2, p.22).

Second, the Assessment Committee and Assessment Coordinator are charged with regular analysis and distribution of data. The Assessment Committee sponsors regular "Data Day" meetings for unit faculty and external partners. The ultimate goal of these meetings is to use data for improvement of courses, programs, and clinical experiences, particularly across the unit. The processes described above assure that our approach to these criteria is systematic. Evidence of implementation of the criteria can best be seen through concrete examples (2.4.g#2).

While all assessment can be used by candidates for improvement, several specific examples highlight how we make this purpose explicit. First, the instruments assessing impact on student learning include reflective pieces where candidates are asked to self-evaluate and to make plans for improvement. They are also asked to constantly reflect on their teaching and student learning. Second, the Millersville student teaching instrument is used twice during a candidate's placement (3.4.f#16; 1.4.d#2-3). The rating scale used at mid-placement 3.4.f#7 provides formative rather than summative criteria (e.g., "Reasonable progress evidenced vs. Exemplary: candidate consistently and thoroughly demonstrates"). A third example is the Professional Development plan used with Special Education candidates (3.4.d#2). Candidates self-assess professional dispositions, develop a plan for improvement, collect data, and do a post analysis of their improvement.

2.2.b Continuous improvement
Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

Multiple changes to program quality and the continuous improvement of candidate performance have resulted through our ability to collect, store, retrieve, and analyze data. Data is represented

through a variety of different formats including but not limited to the major assessments in programs, the student teaching instruments, the early field experience instruments, surveys, focus groups, and through feedback received working collaboratively with educational partners. External reviews and annual Title II reports (1.4.b#1) also provide us with quantitative and qualitative data for continuous examination and improvement of our programs. The following examples represent changes that have resulted directly from the use and application of data.

- All Specialized Professional Association program reports require information regarding how data has been used to change their programs or courses (2.4.g#1).
- Examples of particularly strong consumers of data include our Reading Specialist and our School Psychology programs both at the advanced level. Samples of the changes described in their Specialized Professional Association reports best explain programmatic changes based on data that they collected (2.4.g#1).
- The Technology Education program added a new requirement in Architectural Drawing & Design to address slightly lower scores (compared to state averages) in "construction" as documented on the Praxis. This new course covers basic construction information and it also helps candidates to develop more computer-aided drafting and design (CAD) skills. Focus group meetings with candidates and cooperating teachers identified the need for more CAD skills (2.4.g#3).
- Based on data gathered from focus groups for new Early Childhood programs, new lesson observation and evaluation forms were developed for the Professional Bloc semester. (2.4.g#4).
- The growth and development of the secondary Science-based Professional Development School (PDS) 3.4.a#6 was supported with data collected annually from the educational partners. With such positive data, the secondary Professional Development School has expanded to include secondary English candidates and in fall 2013 will include a second PDS bloc. The data utilized for this approach to the Professional Development School has been widely disseminated on the national level by faculty directing the Program. The creation of the PDS has resulted in the gathering of additional data as the faculty from the University worked collaboratively with the school-based educational partner, particularly during joint workshop days held at MU. This has resulted in the greater appreciation for a co-teaching model to be utilized during clinical field based opportunities. MU collaborated with a sister institution to host a two-day workshop on the co-teaching model. This workshop was delivered by a nationally recognized expert in the field of co-teaching, Dr. Theresa Heck and was attended by 80 cooperating teachers, building principals, superintendents, and also by 30 university professional education faculty (3.4.d#1).
- Due to our leadership candidates' lack of experience with Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS) data analysis (as shown in that module of the Principals' Preparation Inventory, PPI, results, 2012), the ELCC program (see AIMS) inserted an additional experience into EDSU 701 related to PVAAS. Administration practitioners (principals and district level supervisors) are utilized to present this content to the leadership candidates.
- Chapter 49-2 (1.5.d#3) in PA called for significant changes to the certifications delivered in the Commonwealth. One of the most significant elements of these changes was the elimination of Special Education as a stand-alone major. New certification directions in the Commonwealth support dual certifications with Special Education and other content

areas. The unit discussed the impact of these changes to our existing university departmental structures and made a decision to re-organize the departments. These changes included the reorganization of the Special Education department allowing for Special Education faculty to be included in other educational departments based on the data collected from their professional work and areas of professional preparation.

- In addition to the re-organization of the Special Education department, Millersville University reviewed the data collected from graduates of the PEU at 1 year, 3 years and five years into the profession. Based on this data (1.4.i#1; 1.4.i#2) the PEU programs found the candidates scored lower on two of the items focusing on diversity. This data provided additional support for the changes proposed by the state through Chapter 49-2. Based on this supporting information, all teacher preparation programs at MU now include two courses in Special Education and one course in English as a Second Language.
- The AEST program created or revised 12 courses in response to own data collection on the needs of majors. Programmatic changes are not directly impacting other programs; however, they are being shared in case there is a potential benefit for other programs.
- The Early Childhood education department hosted a school partner dinner. They presented multiple questions for discussion regarding feedback for the preparation of our Early Childhood education candidates. One of the outcomes from the feedback was the determination that the literacy knowledge that is taught to these candidates is most appropriate providing cutting-edge information in the field of literacy (2.4.g#7).
- Research conducted in association with the Philadelphia Urban Seminar revealed that candidates were not connected enough with individuals from the community and their service projects appeared general rather than focused on community issues. This was corrected by adjusting the service learning project to be smaller in scope, partnered with community members, and focused on qualitative data. The results of this change have been analyzed and the conclusion is that the change produced projects that were far more productive in dispositions toward urban teaching (4.4.f#2).

2.2. b Continuous Improvement
Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement.

Sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement is critically important to this institution and we work to ensure that our approach to these criteria is systematic and systemic. Evidence of this is identified through the multiple forms of data collection followed by varying opportunities to analyze the data, discuss and promote changes. These multiple venues include the systematic organization of the Data Days each semester, a simplistic method for accessing data through our assessment system, our frequent collaborative workshops, departmental reviews of data, annual reports required for all programs which include a significant focus on assessment and a variety of focus groups with our educational partners. Because of the growing body of data that is available to us, Data Days are now organized around a theme that is common to all programs. The following selected examples demonstrate our commitment to sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement:

- Many of the areas of needed improvement can be conceptualized as the integration of theory with practice. Therefore one suggestion is to develop an earlier field experience for secondary education candidates. Currently, Early Childhood candidates have a significant amount of field experiences as part of their program and Secondary Education candidates have less. Our approach to continuous improvement is to increase the field experiences to be accompanied by a more structured and vertically integrated developmental approach to the clinical settings.
- One area of needed improvement was identified to support teacher educators with the skills to integrate literacy skills throughout the curriculum and to support English Language Learners and preparing candidates to support students with special needs. We have developed two new courses at the secondary level to address this need for our candidates and simultaneously recognized that many faculty members would benefit from professional development in this area. We should continue with special programming like the Education Colloquium series of spring 2013 that supports faculty scholarship and pedagogical content knowledge in these areas (5.4.e#2).
- Two Memorandums of Understanding were developed with local urban school districts for the following purposes: (1) to conduct research regarding the required urban experience for all teacher candidates and (2) to conduct research on functions of supervision when utilizing a co-teaching model for student teaching. The results of each of these research projects have great implications for the PEU since all candidates are required to have an urban experience and the new co-teaching model is planned to include all programs (2.4.g#6).
- Praxis data is utilized as a tool to assist departments in recognizing the changes needed in their programs. The overall passing rates for programs are strong (1.4.b#1) and at first glance appear that no changes would be needed. However, drilling down to the subscores reveals competencies that departments need to focus on for enhancement (1.4.k#1-2).

2.3 Areas for Improvement cited in the Action Report from the previous accreditation review

Following the last accreditation review, one Area for Improvement was cited for this standard:

- Assessment data are not regularly summarized and analyzed to improve unit operations and candidate performance.

The PEU seriously examined this area for improvement and is confident that our actions clearly indicate that this concern has been significantly addressed. At the time of the last accreditation visit, the PEU assessment system at Millersville University was in the initial stages of development, and assessment overall at MU could be categorized as deliberate and in progress. The culture of assessment has advanced significantly since that time. The constant collection of data and the on-going review of data can now be categorized as systemic and strategic. Using data to improve unit operations and candidate performance is now a part of the culture of preparing educators and is recognized as such across the institution. There are several major elements that have contributed to this change and they include: (1) the systematic presentation of data through the vehicle of the data days has contributed to this, (2) the cultivation of a stronger Assessment Committee and a clear identification of their roles on this committee (3) the

technical aspects of the operation of the assessment system have improved for ease of faculty and candidate use, (4) systematic reminders are sent each semester for faculty teaching courses where there are key assessments, and (5) systematic reminders are also generated for faculty who may neglect entering the data for the key assessments. While this has become routine in operation, the outcome of the reminders is that they simultaneously serve to bring assessment to the forefront for all faculty each semester. Other supportive elements have also helped to promote assessment data for use to improve unit operations and candidate performance:

- The PEU Data Days were expanded to include candidates on both the initial and advanced levels, as well as school partners. The addition of these educational partners during Data Days has significantly changed the conversations to provide a larger unit view of assessment. This change has also resulted in the need to develop themes for Data Days to ensure that a more systematic view of data is presented.
- Assessment issues have become a reporting agenda item at the Teacher Education Council (TEC). The person responsible for sharing this information is the Dean for the School of Education who holds a seat as an ex-officio member of the TEC and who also leads the PEU.
- The current Assessment Coordinator is a faculty member from the Department of Mathematics. This has provided an unexpected result for PEU faculty from the content areas to engage more intently with the assessment process.
- The university engaged in a Middle States review process that examined assessment across all programs at the institution supporting significant dialog about the importance of assessment and continuous improvement (6.4.d#2).
- The university instituted a new electronic reporting system (Weave Online) for the submission of annual reports. These reports were required by the leadership to include a report on assessment outcomes for all departments.

These changes provided an easier pathway for the collection of data, the examination of data and for making decisions following the review of the data. However, the outcomes of these changes using assessment data at the unit level are best exemplified with specific examples as follows:

- In 2006, the NCATE accreditation team concluded their review of our programs and shared that they had discussions with some candidates who were not aware of the dispositions or the dispositions system that had been adopted in 2005 by the PEU. This concern was discussed by the PEU and it was determined that more data was required to address this concern. The Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Committee designed a survey that was administered to all teacher candidates in their student teaching semester. The survey (2.4.b#4) was piloted with a small group of teacher candidates and then administered for three years on a semester basis in a large group session offered during a mid-semester meeting of the candidates. 1,400 candidates completed the survey over the course of three years. The results indicated initially that the candidates had limited knowledge of the dispositions system. In the first administration, the candidates with the least knowledge of dispositions were in Biology, Earth Science and Mathematics programs. The candidates with the greatest knowledge of dispositions were the dual Special Education and elementary candidates, the dual Special Education and Early Childhood candidates, and the elementary candidates (Elementary Education was a

program at that time but is no longer offered due to changes in certification at the state level). At the last administration, most candidates had a greater knowledge of dispositions. However, the semesters in between the first and last administration displayed stronger percentages than during the last semester. Based on a review of all of the data, the unit made changes to all syllabi to include statements about dispositions. The unit also included the discussion of dispositions in the courses offered during the Foundation Bloc. A process for the submission of dispositions concern notices was developed for the initial and advanced levels and this addition has contributed to the heighted awareness of dispositions for both faculty and candidates (1.4.e#1 and 1.4.f#1).

- The Pennsylvania Department of Education provided an option to change the grade point average (GPA) required for entrance into programs at the initial level. The change permits candidates with an overall grade point average of 2.8–3.0 to enter their teacher preparation programs. However, candidates exiting programs with a GPA of 2.8–3.0 are required to gain a higher passing score on their Praxis content examinations. This proposed change raised concerns for the PEU and discussions were held to determine whether or not to accept the change. Assessment data with grade point averages documenting the numbers of candidates this change could impact was examined. The result of the examination of the data concluded that less than 10% of the candidates would be impacted by the change. No data was able to be utilized to determine the future impact; however, it was felt that the data regarding current candidate grade point averages was sufficient. Data was presented to TEC, and a conclusion was reached to allow candidates to enter the teacher education programs with GPAs between 2.8 and 3.0. The decision was made to announce this requirement to students on a semester basis via distribution of the Millersville University Criteria for Advanced Professional Studies (APS) admission and retention. Compliance with this policy is enforced by student and faculty usage of the "Permission to take Advanced Professional Studies Course: Undergraduate and Graduate forms" stipulating the GPA requirement. It was also decided to eliminate the appeal process for GPAs as done in the past. Exhibits 2.4.g#5 and 2.4.g#8 show the progressive changes made to the APS guidelines and forms based on this decision.

- Additional changes from PDE through Chapter 49-2 regulations mandated that all candidates in all programs receive instruction in Special Education and English as a Second Language. The requirement stated that all candidates receive three courses (nine credits) or 270 hours of instruction in Special Education and one course (three credits) or 90 hours of instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL). The PEU supported these changes but was not confident whether courses or hours of instruction would meet the needs of our candidates. Assessment data collected from graduated candidate surveys was shared and utilized to make this critical decision for the unit. The data indicated that graduated candidates identified a weakness in their preparation in serving students with special needs and students whose first language was not English. Based on the examination of this data, the PEU concluded that adding hours of instruction to existing courses would not sufficiently meet the needs of our candidates. Two courses in Special Education and one course in ESL were added to all programs at the initial level. May 2013 represented the first candidates who graduated with these additional courses and the

future graduate surveys will provide information regarding the effectiveness of the new courses. Anecdotal and qualitative information already reveals that these new courses are providing a great benefit to our candidates.

- In 2008, the Assessment Committee made the decision to change to an electronic submission of the student teacher assessment for teacher candidates completed by the cooperating teacher. The paper process for the collection of this data was determined to be cumbersome resulting in omissions and errors and data entry was an inefficient use of time. The Assessment Coordinator and staff from Information Technology automated the system to collect the cooperating teacher student teacher evaluations electronically. This required a pilot test followed by the systematic inclusion of all programs utilizing the new process. During the three year implementation process, surveys were distributed to the cooperating teachers. The data collected from the surveys served to identify how the electronic submissions for cooperating teachers expedited the process, to understand if the process required additional time and effort or required additional assistance, whether the process allowed for resolving issues efficiently, and overall satisfaction with the process. This data was utilized to refine the process and based on the data the decision was made to continue to expand the implementation stage. Currently, all cooperating teachers submit their student teachers' performance assessments electronically and this allows the unit to receive more accurate data in a timely manner.

- Examining data on a regular basis is of critical importance for the PEU for continuous improvement. An example of this is currently in progress and involves the concerns at this institution for new examinations that are required for all teacher candidates. Prior to 2012, the Praxis I examinations in Reading, Mathematics and Writing were required for teaching certification in the Commonwealth. Currently, the Pre-Service Academic Performance Assessments (PAPAs) are required for certification. The cut-off scores as established by the state have proven to be strong and as a result, current data indicates that our candidates are experiencing difficulty with the examinations. The first set of data was collected at the end of the Spring 2013 semester and this data process will continue in order to serve as the guiding information for the PEU. Preliminary data indicates that decisions to support and improve candidate performance on the PAPAs must be examined and implemented in the future. (2.4.d#5)

In conclusion, the PEU at this institution regularly summarizes and analyzes assessment data to improve unit operations and candidate performance. The structure for allowing this to occur is supported by the work of the Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Committee. The easy access to data and reports that summarize the data has proven to be invaluable to this process. Data Days provide an important and expected format for reviewing the data and departmental representatives allow for the continual examination of data. Finally, the Teacher Education Council holds the appropriate authority to enact changes to the unit when determined as necessary based on the data.

2.4   Exhibits for Standard 2

2.4.a	Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key

	assessments used at transition points
2.4.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.4.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.4.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.4.e	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.4.f	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.4.g	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

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 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn? [10,000 characters]

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2. a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

3.2. b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation
Review
- Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs
cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000
characters]

The PEU and its school partners have collaborated in the design, development, implementation,
and evaluation of clinical and field experiences for initial and advanced candidates that are
extensive and effective. The focus is to facilitate candidates' professional development by
providing them with opportunities to experience all aspects of the roles of an educator including
observation in schools and other agencies, actual classroom teaching, interaction with families
and community members, participating in school events and collaborating with peers and veteran
professionals. Candidate and clinical faculty roles and responsibilities and the assessment of
candidate performance are described in Millersville University's " Early Field Experience
Handbook" (3.4.e#5) and "A Guide for Student Teaching" (3.4.e#1) and in the individual
departmental supplements (3.4.e#19-26) that have been created and which are tailored
specifically to the assignments and initiatives of each discipline. These resources are provided to
candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors; and are available on the Early Field
Experiences website at 6.4.e#4 and on the Student Teaching Website (6.4.e#5).

Early Field Placements
In response to the 2009 Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) requirement for increased
early field placements, faculty reviewed and modified all education programs to meet PDE
competencies and 150 hours of field experience in diverse settings in urban, suburban, and rural
schools (3.4.a#5, 3.4.b#1,2). Partnerships exist with school districts and Early Childhood settings
in four to five counties, offering experiences to work with students with disabilities, linguistic
and/or cultural diversity (2.4.g#6). There are two types of partnerships with schools: 1) the
traditional partnership schools where candidates are placed in schools for a specified number of
hours, and 2) the professional development school (PDS) partnership where candidates complete
a full year placement in the same classroom. Candidates must apply for placements in the PDS
partnerships. In some cases, candidates are interviewed by university faculty and school
practitioners; in other instances, applications are reviewed by university faculty and school
partners. In addition, candidates may elect to participate in the Philadelphia Immersion program
that provides authentic experiences working with a diverse population in an urban setting.

For all field placements, the Office of Field Services (OFS) works with a liaison in each school
district to secure field and clinical placements for candidates. The OFS sends a request to public
and private schools and Early Childhood settings detailing the type of placement needed, dates
and time of the placement, requirements of the teacher candidate, and expectations of the
cooperating teacher (3.4.e#4, 10). District liaisons submit names of qualified and interested
cooperating teachers who are matched by OFS with teacher candidates based on candidate
background information and prior field experiences. The assignments are sent to partner schools
for final approval. Each member of the partnership has the opportunity to reject or request a
different placement.
At all levels of initial certification, cooperating teachers evaluate candidates' proficiency in
content, pedagogy, and professional dispositions (3.4.f#2-4, 6-7, 10-15). For example, in

Foundations Block for Early Childhood and Special Education, Middle Level, and Secondary Education (a required urban placement), the cooperating teacher evaluates the candidate's abilities on a four-point scale for criteria under the headings of Professional Competencies, Instructional Competencies, and Dispositions, and comments on the candidate's strengths and areas for growth (3.4.f#6,7,9). In addition the cooperating teacher makes a judgment as to whether or not the candidate should continue in a teacher preparation program. Field experiences are supervised and evaluated by both cooperating teachers and Millersville faculty, who, in the case of the Foundations Block evaluation, make a recommendation as to the candidate's admittance to Advanced Professional Studies and continuation in the teacher preparation program.

Student Teaching
Candidates must have completed all of the necessary degree requirements and have attained Advanced Professional Studies (APS) (3.4.f#1) status to be eligible for student teaching. Candidates submit an intent to student teach packet that includes background information, in- or out-of county placement preference, the nature and location of their previous field experiences, and completed coursework.
The Office of Field Services makes placement requests of districts and describes the minimal requirements to be considered as a cooperating teacher (3.4.c#1-3; 3.4.e#10). Districts submit the names of qualified potential cooperating teachers and their assignments in the schools (e.g., grade level, the certification area under which they are working, etc.). Faculty members who serve as departmental liaisons to the Student Teaching Contact Team recommend a placement for each candidate based upon the particular area of certification and prior field assignments. With this recommendation, the OFS makes the specific request to the district. Once the district confirms placement, OFS mails the cooperating teacher a packet of information that includes the student's background and contact information. Candidates are notified of their placements by e-mail and are given the opportunity to request alternative placement; however, such requests have to be evaluated by the director OFS on a case by case basis and if warranted, are approved.

Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluate candidates' progress. In addition to daily observation and informal feedback, the cooperating teacher completes mid-placement and final evaluations. The university supervisor observes the student teacher formally a minimum of three times in a half-semester placement, and six times in a full semester placement. The mid-placement evaluation serves as a formative assessment and is completed independently by the candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. During a three-way conference individuals share their perspectives and discuss areas of strength, areas for improvement, and the means to that improvement under the categories **Professionalism, Preparation, Teaching Performance,** and **Effect on Student Learning**. See ratings in Student Teaching Mid-Evaluation 3.4.f#17. The criteria for the final evaluation are the same with different ratings. See ratings in Student Teaching Final Evaluation 3.4.f#16. In addition to the MU evaluation, university supervisors complete the state evaluation instrument (3.4.f#8) two times during the semester.

Feedback regarding the design, implementation, and evaluation of the clinical experiences and the existing programs comes from P-12 teachers and administrators in various ways. For example, in spring 2012, school partners and faculty were invited to attend a meeting on campus

to discuss programs and field placements (2.4.d#2). Each year faculty who participate in the PDS programs invite school partners to participate in planning and debriefing sessions (3.4.a#1,2,6; 2.4.g#6; 3.4.e#8). In spring 2013, the Elementary and Early Childhood Education department hosted a dinner for faculty and school partners to discuss strengths and needs of the program curriculum and field experiences (2.4.g#7). Feedback from all of these events was summarized and shared with faculty who then used the information to guide decision making for programs and field practices. In spring 2012, the Field Services Office sent a survey to P12 central office administrators to seek feedback on how to meet mandates for increased field experience hours (3.4.a#4). Several districts requested that co-teaching be used during student teaching. Based on the results of this feedback Millersville sponsored several trainings for co-teaching (3.4.d#1) and plan to implement the model beginning fall 2013.

Post-baccalaureate programs
Field experiences and practicum for post-baccalaureate candidates pursuing initial certification are similar to other initial programs. At the Foundations level, candidates take graduate level courses of Social Foundations of Education and Advanced Educational Psychology that include a sixteen-hour field placement with a diverse population in an urban setting for each course. The Office of Field Services works with local urban schools to identify classrooms in the certification field. Other experiences for post-baccalaureate certification candidates are identical to those for undergraduates in initial certification programs.

Advanced Programs
All advanced programs require field experiences and clinical practices that can be defined as field observation and participation, case studies, internships, action research projects, or other approved P-12 related activities. A common field experience for MED programs is provided in EDFN 545 that assesses candidates' abilities to connect their theoretical understanding of psychological principles to actual classroom observation. Candidates who are currently in teaching positions and are seeking an advanced degree in the same certification area use their own classrooms and schools as sites for field experiences. Candidates who are pursuing a new field at the advanced level, e.g., M.Ed. in Leadership for Teaching and Learning, school counseling, and nursing, work with university faculty to identify appropriate sites for field experiences and practicum. PEU faculty and practicing professionals work collaboratively to identify placements that will meet the needs of individual candidates. Each advanced program has evaluation tools that allow both Millersville faculty and practitioner-mentors to evaluate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates, and their ability to implement best practices.

3.2b
- *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*
- *Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.*

Examples in this section represent activities and practices used to continuously improve and sustain teacher candidate performance. Compliance with state and professional organization standards and the themes of our Conceptual Framework led to improved and high quality

programs that enable candidates to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Field Experiences
In response to mandates adopted by the State Board of Education May, 2007, the PEU developed new certification areas for Pre-Kindergarten-grade 4, Middle grades 4-8, and Special Education Pre-Kindergarten- grade 8. Program outcomes included strong subject matter content preparation, extensive field and clinical experiences, and use of technology in curriculum and instruction to enhance P12 student achievement. The standards-based system prepared all teachers with the knowledge, skills and abilities to effectively provide instruction to diverse learners in inclusive classroom settings. All programs, initial certification and advanced, provided 9 credits or 270 hours of Special Education instruction and 3 credits or 90 hours of instruction of English as a second language. Current programs were evaluated and modified using key assessment data that resulted in programs of higher quality. For instance, an analysis of student teaching evaluations and graduate surveys indicated that our secondary majors were in general competent in their understanding and accommodation of the needs of students with special needs (2.4.g#1). However, to insure that these candidates were better prepared to meet the needs of all students two courses, Secondary Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings and Differentiating Instruction (3.4.e#22), were required of all secondary education candidates beginning spring 2012.

Four stages of field experiences based on competency-based assessments and a minimum number of hours were required of all Instructional 1 certifications. Field experiences and clinical practices provided candidates with a scaffolded introduction to the field of professional education, initially emphasizing observation and reflection and gradually shifting to teaching with a focus of impact on student learning. Stage 1: Observation occurred in a variety of education and education-related settings including community-based facilities as well as school districts. In Stage 2: Exploration, candidates worked with individual or small groups of students under a teacher's supervision. A minimum of 40 hours was recommended for Stages 1 and 2 combined. All of our initial education candidates were placed in an urban setting for stage 2 to enable candidates to gain knowledge of and experience in working with a truly diverse population. During Stage 3: Pre-student teaching, candidates prepared materials and taught to individuals, small groups, and whole class for approximately 150 hours. Stage 4: Student Teaching required a minimum of 12 weeks of full time teaching with a certified teacher. Course assessments aligned with the Conceptual Framework and PDE competencies were developed or modified for every field experience. Both cooperating teachers and Millersville faculty evaluated candidates on PDE competencies of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instructional delivery, professional conduct, assessment, and knowledge of diverse learners (3.4.a#5). These competencies were subsumed under the themes and outcomes of the Conceptual Framework: learning communities of inquiry and action, focus on student learning, and exemplary professional practices. See specific assessment examples for a variety of field experiences in exhibits 3.4.f.#4, 5, 15.
In addition, PDE provided competency-based guidelines for extensive practicum and internship experiences for administrative, education specialist, and supervisory certificates (3.4.a#5). All programs were modified to meet these requirements and included assessments to evaluate candidate understanding and application of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the areas of

assessment and evaluation, curriculum and instruction, professionalism, statutory and regulatory compliance, organizational leadership, and diverse learners. These competencies and expectations aligned with the Conceptual Framework and NCATE standards.

Expansion of Professional Development Schools
Collaboration with school partners was essential for continuous program improvement. The development of Professional Development Schools (PDS) demonstrated positive effects on candidate preparation for teaching and improved relationships with our school partners. In 2009, a number of faculty implemented PDS-type field experiences with three different school districts. Secondary education implemented a Science experience for 5 candidates and provided each candidate with an iPad; Special Education initiated an experience with 5 candidates; and elementary initiated an experience termed Anchored Placements in a third district. All had similar goals and characteristics. Candidates were paired with certified teachers for a full year – in the fall during their senior year professional block methods classes and in the spring during student teaching. Teachers received training in their role as mentors and shared in the selection process of candidates. In the case of the secondary education model, mentor teachers and candidates met to introduce themselves and to learn the expectation of their roles and of the program. Host teachers then confirmed the selection of the teacher candidates. The secondary PDS model expanded to include all secondary education Science majors and 5–10 Social Studies and English majors. In fall 2013 it is anticipated that all Science majors, all foreign language majors, and about half of the Social Studies and English majors will be placed at PDS sites. Host teachers at the elementary and Special Education PDS sites have requested 10 candidates each. These expansions are largely the result of the benefits seen by our partner schools. During a PDS workshop held for secondary education, candidates shared the following benefits: ease of transition from block student to student teacher; recognition of ability to teach; positive relationships with students; and ease of classroom management. Host teachers described these benefits: felt like a university instructor and appreciated the role; saw the candidate grow into a professional; reflected on and modified their own instruction; became a better teacher; felt less afraid of "giving-up" the classroom due to co-teaching; learned instructional techniques using technology from candidate; differentiated instruction more easily and effectively. Both the host teachers and candidates mentioned reflection, becoming a member of the team, and attendance at professional development activities as benefits. The PDS model led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality. In addition to expansion of the model, we plan to develop formal memoranda of agreement with our partner schools.

Co-teaching Model
PDE implemented a new teacher evaluation process for practicing teachers that links student learning as documented on standardized state test scores to teacher effectiveness. Teachers expressed concern with sharing their classrooms with teacher candidates. Research from St. Cloud State University indicated that co-teaching with student teachers benefitted P12 students, teacher candidates, and classroom teachers. Based on these research findings and results of co-teaching in the PDS placements, it was felt that co-teaching opportunities would enhance candidate understanding of pedagogical and professional knowledge, improve focus on student learning, increase opportunities and skills to meet individual student needs, and enhance reflection skills. The Director of Field Services presented the concept to faculty and school partners and received training from experts of St. Cloud State University to be a trainer of co-

teaching (3.4.d#1).   In May 2013, Millersville University provided training for administrators, teachers, and university faculty (3.4.d#1). Additional trainings were planned for June and August 2013 for cooperating teachers, teacher candidates, and university supervisors

Support for Candidates and Clinical Faculty
Support to candidates and clinical faculty was provided in several ways. Candidates received information related to professionalism, expectations, and interviewing at the first day orientation meeting and Dean's interviewing seminar (3.4.e#16-18). Candidates received support from the cooperating teacher through immediate feedback and by the university supervisor following observations, orally and in writing. Supervisors and cooperating teachers identified candidates who were experiencing difficulties early in the field experience and reported their concerns to the Director of Field Services. If traditional methods of feedback did not lead to improvement, a professional development plan/remediation plan (3.4.d#2, 4) was designed to assist the teacher candidate. The plan was developed jointly by the university supervisor, candidate, cooperating teacher, and Director of Field Services and included specific goals, timelines, and strategies to improve the deficiencies. This practice supported the candidate, supervisor, and cooperating teacher. A majority of students placed on a professional development plan/remediation plan demonstrated improved knowledge and skills and successfully completed the field experience and education program.

Supervisors received support primarily through orientation meetings held each semester. Topics discussed included procedures for evaluating student progress, areas to focus on based on student teaching evaluation results, and supervision styles (3.4.d#3). In addition, contact teams met each semester to discuss early field and student teaching concerns (3.4.e#2-3).

3.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Advanced Preparation : The unit does not ensure that field experiences are required in all programs.

In the last NCATE review the advanced programs were cited as not ensuring that field experiences were included in all programs. The following describes the field experiences provided in each advanced program, partner collaboration, mentor selection and requirements, and assessment. All advanced programs that submitted a report received full national recognition or recognition with conditions from their Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and met the elements of their clinical experience standards. See 3.4.g#1 for number of candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice experiences.

MED in Leadership for Teaching and Learning
As required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Act 45 requirements for principal certification, all PA programs must include a 360 hour supervised internship over a 12 month cycle of the school year. Early field experiences/internships of 30 hours each occur in EDLD 614

School and Community Relations and EDLD 669 Special Education Competencies Seminar. The Leadership for Teaching and Learning program has two three-credit internship courses, EDSU 798 (150 hours) and EDSU 799 (180 hours) that are supervised by an MU clinical or regular faculty member and an on-site administrative mentor. Mentors are selected in consultation with the candidate, the partner school district, and the program. The on-site mentor's supervisor attests to the certificate and experience of the on-site mentor. University mentors, if part time, follow the university procedures for hiring. These adjuncts are recently retired principals and clinical faculty. The candidate internships are planned and evaluated by both the MU supervisor and the on-site mentor. Formal memoranda of understanding exist with partner school districts. In the 2012 NCATE - ELCC SPA Recognition Report, Millersville University's Preparation of Educational Leaders, School Building Level, met all elements of Standard 7.0 Internship including 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6 (3.4.e#6, 7, 9; EDSU 799 Syllabus in 1.5.b#11).

MED in Gifted Education
The clinical practicum for gifted education is designed with flexibility to meet the needs of full time teachers, part time teachers, teachers looking for permanent positions, regular education and gifted education teachers, and parents. Candidates complete two major field experiences for GFED 690, a six credit course. The first field experience includes preparing and teaching 5 hours of lessons, observing one student, writing a Gifted IEP, and developing a series of programming materials of their choice. Candidates select a placement in public, private or cyber schools; tutoring programs; or after school programs where they can work with gifted students. In the second field experience, candidates evaluate a gifted program for which they are not directly responsible, identifying strengths and areas for improvement. Candidates select a partner school district and mentor based on personal contacts, personal needs, schedules, and research interests. Candidates are supported and supervised by the GFED 690 course instructor through feedback on the materials created for the program, videos of their direct instruction submitted digitally or on VHS, and dialogue via online discussion boards, emails, and phone calls. University mentors, if part time, follow the university procedures for hiring.

MED in Language and Literacy
The foundational class RDED 621: Foundations of Reading and Writing Ability contains an initial field experience, entitled Classroom-Based Exploration- TRY IT OUT. Practicing teachers enrolled within the course select a practical strategy for use within their own classrooms and implement, reflect on, and report on the merits of that strategy. Candidates who are not teaching observe for one half day in an elementary, middle, or high school classroom and reflect on practices seen. In RDED 622: Reading in the Content Areas class, candidates use their own classrooms to try "before," "during," "after," activities; a readability study; writing activities; and a research/project-based possibility. Within the RDED 623: Diagnosis of Reading and Writing Disabilities class, candidates administer and interpret varied assessments, both formal and informal, to students of varied ages and ability levels. The estimated time requirement for this field experience is twenty hours. In the capstone course, RDED 626: Literacy Leadership, candidates engage in a coaching cycle with a practicing classroom teacher and complete various literacy assessments of a student or students. School age children who have been assessed apply for participation in the reading clinic. During the 200 hour supervised reading clinic practicum candidates plan and implement interventions with one or two students and with groups of

children. Candidates are supervised by an MU clinical or regular faculty member. University supervisors, if part time, follow the university procedures for hiring and must have a reading supervisory certificate.

MED in School Counseling

The School Counseling Practicum, a fifteen week semester long internship, is the culminating practical experience for certification as either an elementary or secondary professional school counselor. Candidates enroll in either SCCN 675 Supervised Practicum in the Elementary School, SCCN 676 Supervised Practicum in the Secondary School, or both SCCN 675 and 676 if they are pursuing dual certification. Per PDE guidelines, for each level of certification, students complete a minimum of 60 hours of Pre-Practicum experiences and 300 supervised hours at a self-selected practicum site. Candidates assume the responsibilities of a regularly employed professional school counselor, under the supervision of a state certified professional school counselor (3.4.e#11-15).

Practicum students secure their own Practicum sites. The site and the site supervisor must be able to offer the required elements of the PDE regulations for school counseling. Site supervisor mentors are frequently graduates from our program who volunteer to mentor current Practicum students. The site supervisor must have the following qualifications: a) be employed and present on site during the times the candidate is at the site; b) be state certified as a school counselor in the area for which he/she will be supervising; and c) have worked as a school counselor for a minimum of 2 years after receiving state certification. In addition, the School Counseling program requires that mentors be able to a) involve the candidate at least 50% of the time in direct service work with students and other clientele; b) help the candidate become familiar with and involved in the full range of professional activities and resources at the site; c) provide minimally one hour of individual supervision each week; and d) sign a weekly log documenting hours at the site. Candidates are assessed by faculty and on-site mentor.

Program Specialist Post Bac Certification in School Nursing

The School Nursing Program requires a minimum of 100 hours of clinical experience that is associated with NURS 560 School Nursing. The clinical site is selected based on prior experience with personnel at the site and current status of the school district. The clinical facility is evaluated using a five point scale (1 = deficient; 2 = poor; 3 = fair; 4 = good; 5 = excellent) on six criteria (3.4.a#7). A score of 12 or less indicates the clinical facility must be re-evaluated for continued use. Selection of mentors is determined by prior relationships, site visits, and contact with School Nurses. Candidates are assessed using the Clinical Performance Outcomes with ratings of Met, Not met, Need more information, or N/A. The following fourteen major areas are assessed: School nursing Science, quality of care, quality of practice, performance appraisal, education, collegiality, ethics, collaboration, research, resource utilization, communication, program management, health education, and special health needs.

MS in Psychology with a Certification in School Psychology

The Masters in School Psychology includes both a practicum and internship. Candidates enroll in PSYC 685, Practicum in School Psychology, the semester prior to the full-year internship and participate in 120 hours of supervised experience in appropriate school settings and/or non-school settings that serve children. Candidates perform the roles and functions of school

psychologists under the supervision of a certified school psychologist and University faculty supervisor. Several student products and supervisor evaluations are completed during the semester using rubrics.

Candidates enroll in PSYC 686 Internship Seminar in School Psychology, the capstone course of the program that encompasses an entire school year. Candidates must log a minimum of 1200 hours in a school setting performing the roles and functions of school psychologists under the supervision of a certified psychologist and University faculty supervisor. The University supervisor evaluates candidates on the completion of multi-tiered intervention projects and a case study using rubrics.

Field Supervisors must be a certified school psychologist with either a doctoral degree or three years of experience as a school psychologist. He/she must provide a minimum of one hour face-to-face supervision per each 40 hours of service to the practicum student or two hours per week of face to face supervision for the intern. Persons serving as field supervisors in non-school placements must be licensed psychologists. The Field Supervisor evaluates the practicum student twice during the placement using forms provided by the Certification in School Psychology Program.

The University and school district develop a job description for school sites that must be approved by both parties and voted on by school board officials. Candidates apply for internship and receive information on "approved school districts" from which they select a school site.

Post Masters Special Education-Supervisory I
The field experience for Special Education Supervisory 1 program is a 640 hour clinical experience. In SPED 799 Applied Supervision-Special Education, candidates commit to a full semester of 40 hours per week with an administrative mentor, usually a principal or supervisor, within the same school district as the candidate's placement. On site mentors are selected in consultation with the candidates, the partner school district and the program coordinator. Candidates who are already employed are able to conduct the clinical practicum within their own district. Candidates who are not employed in a public school setting work with the Educational Foundations Department and the Office of Field Services to secure a placement. Each candidate is assigned a Special Education certified faculty member to serve as the practicum supervisor. University mentors, if part time, follow the university procedures for hiring. The requirements for the clinical practicum are individualized to meet the candidate's Process/Product Prospectus, CEC standards, Pennsylvania standards, and the objectives of the Educational Foundations department. A major assessment is a professional portfolio that contains a detailed narrative and evidence pertaining to the successful completion of course objectives. The practicum supervisor evaluates the portfolio using a rubric. As a capstone activity, the candidate presents an overview of the clinical practicum accomplishments via an informal one hour presentation.

3.4 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.4.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding

3.4.b	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
3.4.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty
3.4.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.4.e	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.4.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
3.4.g	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

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 school faculty; candidates; and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Diversity

How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area? [10,000 Characters]

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2. a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

4.2. b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]

- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences:
The PEU faculty and its P-12 partners have made extensive revisions to the curriculum and clinical experiences in all programs to better prepare candidates to demonstrate appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions in working with diverse P-12 students. In 2009, a State mandate called Chapter 49-2 (1.5.d#3) required that all initial and advanced programs include additional coursework and/or field experiences in adaptation and accommodation and instruction for English Language Learners (ELL). PDE reports in 1.4.a#1 show that they did so successfully. In addition to the state's mandate, feedback from school partners, alumni follow up survey and other assessments contributed to the enhancement of the unit's curriculum and the preparation of candidates to work effectively with all students.

Initial Programs:

Every candidate in all initial programs is required to take Foundations Bloc, consisting of the courses EDFN 211 and EDFN 241. (1.5.b#2-3) These courses are taught in adjacent time periods to facilitate the major curricular emphasis on diverse student populations and to accommodate a four week, eight day field experience in an urban, multicultural, low socio-economic status (SES) elementary, middle or secondary school with a high percentage of ELL. The rubric for and data on candidates' performance in the diversity assignment in these courses for spring 2013 are shown in 4.4.c#1. EDFN 211 was revised extensively and two additional diversity enriched courses were added to all initial programs to meet the requirements of 49-2. Upper level courses in each initial program also integrate elements of diversity as evidenced in course syllabi, course assessments, and in field and practicum experiences 4.4.b#1. Data and examples of Teacher Work Sample units (1.4.g#1;1.4.h#1-10) (required of candidates in Early Childhood, Middle Level and Special Education programs during student teaching) reveal that candidates demonstrate proficiency in contextualizing teaching and adapting instruction and services for all children. Secondary education candidates complete a CIRQL unit (1.4.g#2;1.4.h#11-23) which includes the pre-assessment of student diversity and corresponding lesson accommodations for students with diverse needs. In 2012, a new seminar on diversity (EDSE 471: Differentiated Instruction) shown in 1.4.g#3 was added to student teaching in the secondary certification programs (replacing CIRQL) to assess the impact on student learning.

Ratings submitted by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on final student teaching evaluations in 1.4.d#2-3 affirm that candidates in the initial programs demonstrate proficiency in their understanding of student diversity. Additionally, recognized programs in AIMS adequately met the diversity standards in their SPAs and these program reports referenced the assessment instruments, scoring guides and data related to the candidates meeting proficiencies and evidence of their positive impact on student learning. Alumni follow up survey in the initial programs from 2009-2012 (1.4.i#1) shows that candidates rated most of the diversity items 3.70 or higher on a 5 point scale, but some items were rated slightly lower prompting the unit to make changes to its courses and assessments.

Advanced Programs

All instructional and professional advanced programs have updated their curriculum to reflect changes mandated in Chapter 49-2 (1.5.d#3). As seen in 4.4.c#2, all of the courses within the

Social Foundations block in the advanced level programs have diversity components and those programs recognized by their SPAs sufficiently met the diversity standard (see AIMS). Post baccalaureate level teacher candidates take the two courses, EDFN 590 and EDFN 545 (4.4.c#2), which are similarly structured to emphasize the needs of diverse students and use similar assessments to EDFN 211 and EDFN 241. Post baccalaureate candidates in School Psychology are further required to take SPED 601 and PSYC 674, which focus on the assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse students. For the MED in School Counseling and for the post-Master's certificate in Elementary and Secondary Counseling, all candidates take SCNN 630, Multi-Cultural Counseling. In addition to these common courses, exhibit 4.4.c#3 provides candidates' work samples showing the effects on student learning in the advanced programs relevant to diversity. Data from the alumni follow up survey in 1.4.i#2 shows that graduates from the advanced programs in 2012 gave high ratings to the diversity items including "treat students equitably (4.36 on a 5-point scale)," and "respect diversity (4.39 on a 5-point scale)."

Experience working with diverse faculty
Great effort is made by the university and the unit to recruit and retain high quality diverse faculty (see 6.4.a#1 for the hiring policy in the CBA). Demographic data presented in 4.4.d#1-2 shows that teacher candidates in the conventional and online programs in initial and advanced programs interact with male and female professional education faculty with a broad range of diverse backgrounds from the unit, other schools and P-12 schools. All faculty searches in the unit are vetted by the dean to ensure compliance with affirmative action procedures. The university participates in the Fredrick Douglas Scholars and Campus Compass initiatives targeting doctoral students in historically black colleges and universities Last year, the unit participated in the Holmes Scholars Recruitment Fair hosted by AACTE. Through special unit sponsored programming like the Pennsylvania National Association for Multicultural Education (PA-NAME) conference and the Third World Studies Association international conference, teacher candidates have additional opportunities to learn from and interact with minority faculty. The Latino Pedagogy Institute held at the University of Puerto Rico in Mayaguez was offered by the Special Education department and exposed candidates in the advanced programs to faculty of Hispanic origin. As shown in 1.5.e#1 and 5.4.b#1 faculty with whom candidates work in clinical experiences and methods classes have exemplary knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including ELL and students with exceptionalities and they model these experiences for teacher candidates through their teaching, scholarship and professional services.

Experience working with Diverse Candidates
The university is conscientious about enhancing the recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented groups as evidenced by students' demographics in 4.4.e#1 showing that the percentage of the minority student population at MU was 19% in 2012. Data from the 2012 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)(4.4.e#2) used to explore students' perception of their ability to engage others of diverse backgrounds shows the percentage of students in the School of Education that perceived that relationships with other students "are friendly, supportive, create a sense of belonging" was higher for students in their senior year than in the first year. In the 2009-2012 initial and advanced alumni follow-up surveys, all the diversity items were rated 3.70 or higher on a 5-point rating scale showing the alumni were satisfied with how the university prepared them for diversity.

The unit's premier recruiting and retention program called the Color of Teaching is an exemplar mentoring program in which teacher candidates engage with others in carrying out academic and community projects as reflected in 4.4.h#4. Candidates further interact with students of diverse backgrounds across the campus in general education classes, on service learning projects, in content and professional education classes and through class presentations and clinical experiences. Discipline-based clubs like "Aaron's Acres" and "Best Buddies" (4.4.h#5; 4.4.h#6) provide activities for candidates to work together in helping students with special needs. In the "BEST" Language & Literacy Clinic (4.4.h#7) graduate students in the Reading Specialist and the ESL Certificate programs work collaboratively to tutor ELL and other students who are behind in reading.

Experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools:

The unit policy, procedures and practices support extensive and substantive field and clinical experiences for both conventional and distance learning programs to encourage candidates to interact with students with exceptionalities and students from a broad range of diverse backgrounds (4.4.f.#1). Candidates in the initial programs participate in field experiences at each of their program's transition points that occur, in diverse geographical locations, with over 50% of placements occurring in urban schools (4.4.f#1). These candidates also have an opportunity to participate in a two week urban education immersion program in Philadelphia. (4.4.f#2).

In response to internal and external reviews and mandates, all advanced programs have strengthened their field experience requirements and all now integrate diversity (1.4.a#1). Specific examples of diversity in advanced program courses are in presented in 4.4.c#2 and in AIMS. Aggregated data from early field experiences and student teaching evaluations showing that candidates' mastered proficiencies in competencies related to supporting students from diverse backgrounds are provided in 1.4.d#2-3. The dispositions assessment in1.4.e#1 and data in 1.4.f#1 show that initial and advanced candidates exhibit the belief that all students can learn at high levels, demonstrate the ability to treat individuals equitably and collaborate with all appropriate individuals in planning for the success of students with exceptional needs.

    4.2. b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The PEU's commitment to diversity is evident throughout its mission statement and Conceptual Framework and in a pattern of policy, programming and curricular initiatives that focus on preparing candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area. The unit has followed the university's strong historical commitment to diversity expressed with the creation of the Office of Social Equity in 1987and a diversity statement in 2003. In 2007, the university completed a strategic plan with six strategic directions or goals. One of the six goals focuses on diversity and "cultivating a community of diverse people, thoughts and perspectives." The unit programs have undergone many curricular changes in the last five years in how they prepare candidates to develop diversity competencies and to apply them in P-12 classrooms. Some of these changes were due to external mandates (Chapter 49-2) but they coincided with data from the unit and institutional self assessments.

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

- In fall of 2007, a state legislative act called Chapter 49-2 (1.5.d#3) mandated changes to all initial and advanced programs requiring them to add at least 9 credits or 270 hours, or an equivalent combination of credit and hours regarding accommodations of, and adaptation for, students with disabilities in inclusive settings by 2009. Additionally, at least 3 credits or 90 field hours, or an equivalent combination of instruction, were required to be added to programs for coursework on serving English Language learners. The mandate resulted in the addition of two new courses and significant changes to the foundation course -EDFN 211 in all initial programs. The advanced instructional and professional programs redesigned their curriculum to include competencies and assessments in course work and clinical experiences that provide candidates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to work in diverse classrooms, and to positively impact the learning and social development of all P-12 students, regardless of their linguistic backgrounds, learning styles and exceptionalities. For example, in the Educational Leadership program, the legislation required the completion of 31 competencies in Special Education and that these be completed under the instruction and supervision of a faculty member who held a PA Special Education certificate, and a principal's certificate. Exhibit 1.4.a#1 documents our programs' compliance with Chapter 49-2 and approval from Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE).
- Also part of the Chapter 49-2 mandate is the elimination of stand-alone Special Education programs. P-12 Special Education was split into Special Education PK-8 and Special Education 7-12 and candidates are expected to become dually certified in Special Education as well as in a content area.
- Mandates from Chapter 49-2 that led to curricular changes coincided with data from the survey of our graduates 1, 3 and 5 years out. Data from a 2011 survey in 1.4.i#1 shows that compared to other areas of diversity, candidates in the initial program gave lower ratings to "implement accommodation for students with special needs" (3.70 on a 5 point scale) and to "individualize instruction" (3.77/5) in the area of Special Education. Candidates in the advanced programs had higher ratings on the diversity items including "treating students equitably" (4.36/5), and "respecting diversity" (4.39/5) but ratings were lower on items like "working collaboratively with families" (3.85/5) and "accessing community resources" (3.49/5). Even though these ratings in themselves were average, the unit coupled this feedback with Chapter 49-2 and made appropriate changes to their programs (see bullet #1).
- In spring 2010, a "Data Day" panel discussion on 'Classroom Management: Preparing Candidates to be Effective in Socially Diverse Environments' was organized by the PEU and attended by student teaching supervisors, faculty from all bloc courses, and their invited student guests. Presenters included representatives from local districts, faculty members, and a local probation officer. Their observations and suggestions also factored into the redesigning of our programs for an increased emphasis on diversity.
- A study co-authored by the Associate Dean using teacher candidates in the foundation classes in 2011 found that candidates obtain their diversity experiences more from field and clinical experiences than coursework, readings and other sources showing that the

unit's emphasis on urban placements is not misplaced. (Coker-Kolo, D & Ziegler, E., 2012) available at www.pbcohe.org.

- In 2007, the university conducted a major revision to the general education curriculum including a requirement for a diversity (D) course in all programs. In response, the unit increased its contribution to Diversity Course offerings that support the Gen Ed Curriculum of the University. EDFN 211, a required Foundations course for all teacher candidates was redesigned as a diversity course to specifically address issues of race, ethnicity, language, gender, disability, sexual orientation, geography, socioeconomics and religion in the teaching profession.
- The Noyce scholarship grant obtained by a PEU faculty in 2011 increases the number of highly-qualified middle and secondary school Mathematics teachers that Millersville University is supplying to high-need school districts. This grant provides candidates with scholarships and programmatic support and knowledge of working in diverse classrooms.

Experience working with diverse faculty
- As seen in 4.4.h#2 the unit recently reconstituted its diversity committee and developed a new diversity strategic plan consistent with the unit's strategic goals and findings from the university's workforce assessment data (4.4.h#3) conducted by the Office of Social Equity and Diversity. The overarching goal for the committee was to "Increase the recruitment, retention and achievement of students, faculty and staff from underrepresented groups." The Dean and the School Council have pledged financial and moral support.

Experience working with Diverse Candidates
- In continuation of its commitment to enhance the recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented groups , the university recently implemented some initiatives that include the hiring of a multicultural recruiter in 2011 and a director of multicultural affairs in 2012, the creation of a multicultural center (2012) and most important, the establishment of the Millersville University Scholars program that includes the Pre-Scholars Summer Institute, an intensive summer bridge program aimed at serving first generation students and those from low SES (4.4.h#8).
- In 2009, the university established One book, One campus (4.4.h#9). The project stimulates discussion and critical thinking around a common book's theme and enhances a sense of community among students, faculty and staff. The book selected this year is *How Does it Feel to be a Problem* by Moustafa Bayoumi. It addresses issues directly related to being young and Arab in America. These activities increase the opportunities for candidates to interact with students from diverse backgrounds.

Experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools
The PEU has done tremendous work in focusing candidates upon the required standards of their professional behavior that impact how they work with students from diverse backgrounds through increased attention to the disposition assessment (1.4.f#1) (i.e. Disposition Statements in syllabi, MyVille assessment results, Data Day, Case Study discussions, etc.). As seen in 4.4.c#4 this effort has caused improvement in the understanding and perceptions of our candidates of the disposition requirements. Standard 3 also show the efforts made to ensure that field and clinical experiences occur in placements that reflect the diversity of P-12 students.

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit's plans for enhancement and sustainability include, but are not limited to the following:

- Assess the changes made to the curriculum from Chapter 49-2 in all instructional and professional programs and close the feedback loop. This should include data collection on the new diversity courses (SPED 312 and EDSE 471) to assess their veracity in addressing weaknesses pointed out in the alumni survey in initial programs.
- Assess the resources needed and begin to implement the unit's new diversity strategic plan especially the focus on minority faculty recruitment.
- Consistently collect data through the PEU assessment system on candidates' performance on the diversity assessments in EDFN 590 and EDFN 545, and EDFN 211 and EDFN 241, the two paired courses that are offered across the board in the advanced and initial programs respectively. This will ensure consistency in the availability of this data for program improvement.
- Based on the result of the University Campus Climate survey (4.4.a#1) showing the need to increase awareness of LGBTQIA issues in curriculum and co-curricular activities, the foundations courses in initial and advanced have recently included a 3 hour workshop on LGBTQIA issues. An assessment for the workshop will be incorporated into these classes and data will be gathered for program improvement.
- The unit will continue its effort to further engage candidates in professional experiences with candidates and students from P-12 institutions from a broader range of diverse groups through study abroad student teaching experiences. As seen in 4.4.h#10 in 2010, two students participated in student teaching overseas. The number increased to seven in 2011 and to nine in 2012.

4.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

4.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

4.4.a	Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning
4.4.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.4.c	Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.4.d	Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)
4.4.e	Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)
4.4.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)
4.4.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining

	diverse faculty
4.4.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.4.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

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 Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance? [10,000 characters]

5.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2. a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
  - Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.

5.1 Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

The unit unreservedly chose this standard as the standard to move to the target level in recognition of the distinguished record of its professional education unit (PEU) faculty and the institutional policies and resources that help define and sustain their accomplishments**.** The unit also wishes to assess faculty performance on the different elements of the standard and identify areas of aspiration. As appropriately defined in the third theme of the Conceptual Framework "modeling appropriate professional practices," faculty in educator preparation programs at the initial and advanced levels engage candidates in authentic learning that goes beyond the classroom and extends into the immediate community and beyond. Faculty focus on high impact learning projects that add value to candidates' overall experiences, including service learning, independent research and participation in professional meetings. Most of their research provides examination of contemporary trends and issues relating to teacher quality and school reform including studies of educator dispositions, integration of technology and diversity into teaching, clinical experiences and effective teaching strategies. As the university has progressed in its existence, so have faculty's aspirations in the area of scholarship. Faculty have come to see

teaching, scholarship and service as a three legged stool that constitutes professionalism and have taken seriously their responsibility to model this approach for teacher candidates.

Qualified Faculty

Millersville University has highly qualified faculty (1.5.e#1) with a distinguished record of teaching, research, scholarship and professional engagement. Faculty members are teacher scholars who collaborate in the development of innovative and responsive teaching and learning programs that impact the achievement of teacher candidates and P-12 students. As shown in the Contractual Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (6.4.a#1), state and institutional policies set expectations for the hiring processes and describe the qualifications and experiences required for all full-time and part-time faculty positions.

P-12 School Based Faculty
Well qualified and credentialed educators in public and private schools serve Millersville University as cooperating teachers and university or intern supervisors for an array of field experiences and clinical practices for initial and advanced programs. Data in 5.4.b#1 shows that over 80% of in school faculty from P-12 schools serving in these roles have master's degrees or higher, have served for 6 or more years (with 48% having 15+ years experience) and are certified in the areas in which they instruct or supervise. This surpasses the State (PDE) requirement that clinical faculty have a minimum of 3 years' experience in the area they teach or supervise, and one year must be at their recent institution. (3.4.c#1-3).

Millersville University Faculty
In fall 2012, the unit had 74 full-time faculty and 58 part-time faculty. 100 percent of full-time faculty teaching content or methods and serving as university supervisors in the initial and advanced programs have their doctorates, hold academic rankings within the university and engage in meaningful professional experiences (1.5.e#1, 5.4.d#3). The policy for reappointment, tenure and promotion contained in the CBA (6.4.a#1) also sets expectations for faculty to develop and maintain ongoing professional development and requires the institution to provide support and resources. All methods faculty must have at least 3 years P-12 experiences either as teachers, principals, counselors or superintendents. They are also certified in the content areas and grade bands in which they teach or supervise. (1.5.e#1)   Those certified in the State of Pennsylvania are required to comply with ACT 48 (5.4.c#1) by maintaining the currency of their certifications through hours of continuing professional education, activities or learning experiences. PEU faculty are involved with contemporary school settings in a variety of roles and activities in schools. Faculty Outcomes Form (5.4.d#1) shows that during the 2012 academic year, PEU faculty engaged in 71 consulting activities and served in 38 leadership positions in academic and professional organizations. Faculty information in AIMs also illustrates faculty experiences in the schools including supervision of course field-based experiences and student teaching. 5.4.d#2 further highlights the work of PEU faculty within P-12 schools, which illustrates how they gather contemporary experiences.

 Modeling Professional practice in teaching:
Millersville University has teaching as its primary mission, thus having highly qualified faculty teaching for the university as well as the PEU is essential to the institution and the unit's

missions, and reflected in its governance policies. Article 4 (a) of the CBA (6.4.a#1) clearly states that "The universal responsibility of the teaching faculty is effective teaching." 1.5.e#1 shows that PEU faculty regularly research teaching strategies, participate in professional development on timely topics in their content and pedagogical content areas, and contribute to the existing body of knowledge in their fields. The unique characteristic of Millersville faculty is their emphasis on collaboration with students and the community in all areas of academia. The School of Education annually organizes "Education on Location" (5.4.e#1) and an Education Colloquium Series (5.4.e#2) for unit faculty to explore and present on issues relevant to the teaching profession that are somewhat controversial like Teacher Performance Evaluation, School Funding and tenure for teachers. As seen in 5.4.e#4 faculty also engage in dialogues about the design and delivery of instructional programs in both professional education and P-12 schools.

Integration of technology
Faculty are well supported with appropriate technology, utilize it effectively to enhance their teaching and model its usage as a pedagogical tool with the main purpose of improving learning. In addition to technology infrastructure provided in the classrooms, faculty offices, the library and in computer rooms across campus, PEU faculty are provided training and equipped with technology resources including discipline based software, ipads, iclickers and Acrobat LCD Electronic Magnifier for Low Vision. Although the rubric for this standard separated the reporting for the three academic areas, faculty at MU view teaching, scholarship and service as integrated. As shown in 5.4.g#1, nowhere is this interconnectedness more apparent than in the use and modeling of technology in their teaching.

Adjusting instruction and integration of diversity
PEU faculty value candidate learning and adjust instruction appropriately to enhance learning. Faculty conduct mid-term course evaluations to identify improvement for the teaching and learning process. All SPA programs in AIMS had to provide evidence for closing the feedback loop in section V of their reports (2.4.g#1). As shown in AIMS, 95% or 17 out of 18 of our SPA programs submitted between 2011 and 2012 were nationally recognized. Other methods of valuing and adjusting instruction by faculty are illustrated in 5.4.f#2 most focusing on the integration of diversity into instruction and clinical experiences in the initial and advanced programs. This is an area in which the PEU faculty have demonstrated tremendous growth in the last five years. As shown in AIMS and 5.4.d#1, faculty members are master teachers who are widely recognized in their field. Unit faculty have also shown leadership in promoting effective teaching on campus and beyond.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship:

The first theme of the Conceptual Framework "learning communities of inquiry and action" and the school's goal "Increase collaborative scholarship, research and grant writing for faculty and students" set expectation for unit faculty and candidates. In response, PEU faculty have actively contributed to the educational dialog and educational efforts on the international, national, regional, and state levels. Faculty information in AIMS and 5.4.d#1 provide a sample of faculty scholarly activities. In 2011/12, PEU faculty and administrators gave a total of 130 scholarly presentations and papers at regional, national and international conferences. They published 4 books, 32 articles and edited 16 publications. Also, 40 articles and 7 books were in press. Faculty

also served as editors for 16 publications and reported 12 creative works. Additionally, faculty participated in 150 seminars or professional association group activities. They also supervised 4 graduate thesis and 48 independent studies with graduate (28) and undergraduate students (20). In 2012, through support from faculty, a graduate student published an article and students at the initial and advanced levels presented at six conferences. (5.4.d#1; 5.4.d#3).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

The unit's Conceptual Framework "Communities of Learners" embraces this concept of service which focuses on collaboration with colleagues and candidates in the PEU, in partner schools and the professional community (5.4.d#3). Faculty information in AIMS and 1.5.e#1 provide a comprehensive view of how faculty model professional practices in service by collaborating with P-12 practitioners and faculty in other colleges or university and providing services to the broader communities. In 2012, faculty offered 47 service learning courses with 2,085 students participating showing evidence of how knowledge is used to benefit the community.

5.2a: Summary of unit activities in areas that the unit is performing at target level and their impact on candidates' performance and program quality that have led to target level performance (In Teaching, Scholarship and Service)

Qualified Faculty

The credentials of faculty in the Professional Education unit with regards to academic degrees, P-12 certifications and contemporary professional experiences are superior as seen in faculty information in AIMS and presented in 5.1 above. **The unit is performing at the target level on this element of the standard.** Having advanced qualifications and professional experiences help ensure that teacher candidates and other professionals are exposed to faculty with strong preparations who can challenge them and set high expectations for their performance (See faculty information in AIMS). A survey of graduated students in 1.4.i#1-2 shows that teacher candidates in initial and advanced programs in spring 2010 and 2011 expressed high satisfaction regarding the quality of the unit faculty and how they prepare candidates in different areas of teaching effectiveness, knowledge of the content, collaboration and diversity. Initial candidates gave ratings higher than 4 on a 5 point scale on areas like "effective instruction," "impact on student learning," "collaborating with other professionals," and "advocating for students and their families." Candidates in the advanced program rated very highly items that included "treated students fairly," "respect diversity," "promote the success of all students" and "apply the knowledge of human growth and development to improve student learning and well-being." Their ratings on all these items were also higher than 4 on a 5 point scale. In addition to graduates' satisfaction, records of their superior performance on Praxis II examinations (1.4.k#2) attest to the fact that they were exposed to programs of quality offered by faculty. In many of the SPA reports (see AIMS) submitted in 2011 and 2012 (for example, ELCC, IRA, NCCS and NASP), faculty were commended for maintaining program integrity through rigorous content, strong assessments, integration of diversity and collaborations with stakeholders.
Faculty have worked extremely hard in the last six years to make changes to improve the overall quality of their programs and enhance the knowledge, skills and dispositions of all candidates. While some of these changes were caused by external mandates (Chapter 49-2 or NCATE),

many of the changes were based on faculty evaluation of candidates, candidate feedback, faculty creativity and feedback from school partners (for example, co-teaching, PDS, diversity courses, etc). As noted in other areas of this report, faculty-student collaboration is a unique feature of MU and 5.4.d#3 highlights a few examples of ways in which faculty have enhanced candidates' performance through such collaborations.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

There is overwhelming evidence of faculty performing at the target level on this element. As experts in their fields, faculty members model appropriate content knowledge and pedagogical skills for their students. Faculty is also committed to working to enhance professional practices for future teachers. The PEU, through its third CF theme, "focus on exemplary professional practices," acknowledged that this commitment cannot be accomplished unless its faculty have an in-depth knowledge of their disciplines and incorporate best professional practices in their own classrooms. In alignment with the CF, the unit's mission statement states "Faculty members guide undergraduate and graduate students in applying the appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes in diverse communities." Course syllabi in 1.5.b#1-23 show evidence of how PEU faculty demonstrate in-depth understanding of their subject matter, how they model teaching and assessment and how they monitor students' demonstration of the appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions through in class and field experience assignments. Validating these attributes of faculty is data from alumni follow up surveys in 1.4.i#1-2, employers' testimonials in 1.4.j#1 and candidates' performance on the Praxis examination (higher than the state average in many subject areas) in 1.4.k#1; 1.4.k#2. These data and SPA reports in AIMS are clear evidence of close alignment of course objectives and assessments with the proficiencies outlined in state and national standards. Candidates have the opportunity to evaluate faculty's teaching effectiveness in the following areas- course content, learner outcomes, the instructor and instructional methods. 5.4.f#1 provides evidence showing superior ratings for unit faculty on student evaluations which are often higher than institutional averages. Additionally, 5.4.d#4 shows awards received by faculty recognizing their excellence in teaching and innovations. PEU members provide professional development on effective teaching and pedagogy for faculty across campus through various sessions by the MU Center for Academic Excellence (5.4.e#3). The current and past directors of the CAE are SOE faculty who have been instrumental in creating an agenda that places emphasis on effective teaching and pedagogy.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Institutional policies and practices and faculty accomplishments demonstrate that the **unit is moving towards the target level on this element of the standard**. As shown in the faculty information in AIMS (1.5.e#1), individual PEU faculty demonstrates a high level of scholarly work related to teaching, learning and their fields of specialization**.** The university strategic directions, academic affairs strategic plan and the unit's strategic plan all have goals that specifically set expectations for faculty performances in scholarship. Also the CBA (6.4.a#1) sets guidelines for faculty evaluation and for tenure and promotion which include expectations for professional development, scholarship and research. Unit faculty are increasingly working together in pursuit of scholarly activities. Led by the EDFN department, faculty in several

departments are working collaboratively to develop a project design for longitudinal research of teacher education. Other forums showcasing faculty scholarly work and accomplishments are the university research newsletter, the Exchange, the unit Colloquium series in Education, Education on Location, Faculty Accomplishments Ceremony and the Center for Academic Excellence. (5.4.d#5-8; 5.4.e#1-3).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

While teaching is the primary mission of Millersville University and the PEU, contributions in service hold importance as well as scholarly efforts. **This is an element that the unit is operating at the target level.** As seen in the "historical context" Millersville University has been recognized nationally for its record in civic engagement. As noted in the CBA (6.4.a#1) faculty must first establish a solid foundation in teaching and are then expected to contribute to the educational community. PEU faculty receive performance evaluations as mandated by the CBA which includes a focus on service. 5.4.d#1 show that PEU faculty recognize the importance of service, serve on key university committees and diligently serve the educational communities in different capacities at the state, national and international levels. PEU faculty collaborate extensively with other P-12 practitioners and with faculty in other college or university units and are actively involved in professional associations at state, national and international levels. This collaborative spirit is the crux of the unit's Conceptual Framework appropriately titled the "Communities of Learners." Further evidence is presented throughout the IR from the historical context to standards covering assessment, clinical experiences and diversity. 5.4.d#1 also presents a listing of faculty's involvement in professional associations from 2009 to 2012. Overall, in 2012, faculty members and administrators in the School hold 46 leadership positions in state and national professional associations. Specific examples are provided in 5.4.g#2.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The professional quality of the PEU faculty is maintained through a supportive, collegial environment in which professional accountability is the expectation and norm. The guidelines for evaluations for full-time and part-time faculty by their peers, department chairs and deans in the traditional academic areas of teaching, scholarship and research are set in the CBA (6.4.a#1) and systematically applied and adhered to. **The unit is definitely at the target level on this element.** Each department has an evaluation committee that oversees this process. The Provost's office (5.4.f#3) has the overall responsibility to ensure full compliance with the CBA and provides resources to support the process. Candidates in the educator preparation programs also participate in the evaluation of faculty through systematic and regular course evaluation. Faculty use data from course evaluations (5.4.f#1) to reflect on their teaching and make improvements when appropriate.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

There is ample evidence that the unit is moving towards the target level on this element. In spite of deep cuts in state allocations, declining enrollments and growing expenditures, the university has done its best to protect and promote the core of its existence, which is quality

faculty. There are different policies and practices established by the institution and the unit to support its faculty in meaningful professional development activities in the three areas of teaching, research and service. First, institutional commitment is reflected in the strategic directions (1.5.a#2) of the university, especially the second – "nurturing a passion for learning," in the unit's Conceptual Framework (1.5.c#1) "Communities of Learners" and in the allocation of resources. The university's theme- "engage, innovate and connect" (which is funded), speaks to the value of collaborative professional development and innovation. The recently approved CBA (yet to be released) specifically requires institutions and the university system to earmark funding for support of faculty professional development especially for training in on-line teaching. Second, the commitments are translated into meaningful practices including recognition of accomplishments, mentoring, committee appointments and others as described in exhibits 5.4.d#1-8.

It is evident from the narratives above that the unit is on target on almost all the elements of standard 5 but moving towards target in the connected elements of scholarship and facilitation of professional development. Even in those two areas, the policies and procedures for target performance have already been established, faculty performance is sufficiently high but these are resource intensive areas and in these days of budget cuts and competitive university needs, maintaining top performance is a challenge. For example, PEU faculty would like to be more competitive in earning promotions (5.4.g#3). As teacher scholars, faculty in the unit subscribe to Boyer's definition in "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1997)" that research should be integrated with teaching. However, this definition is not often agreed to by some of their colleagues especially those in the hard Sciences. This often impacts how their promotion portfolios are evaluated and rated. The unit will continue to provide support for faculty development in all areas but intensify its support for collaborative scholarship. As the unit embarks on its new strategic planning in the fall of 2013, these changes would be included in its goals, action plans and assessments.

5.2.b Discuss plans and timelines for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.
Below are examples of the areas for continuing growth and enhancement.

- The unit faculty plans to intensify professional development for all faculty (content and clinical) in co-teaching strategies so that faculty could begin to model the strategies in their classrooms. A train the trainer workshop is already planned for fall 2013. The plan is to incorporate co-teaching strategies into student teaching by fall 2014 and a state grant is in the works to provide resources for its implementation 3.4.d#1.
- The unit faculty should continue to use the PDS as a forum for collaborative research with P-12 schools and assess its efficacy in comparison to traditional placements 3.4.d#6.
- Some departments within the unit have established forums for sharing research projects that are under development (examples are scholarship socials in the department of Educational Foundations, research laboratories in Psychology and research duos in ELED). Faculty need to assess the goals and objectives of these scholarship based learning communities and establish plans for improving their outcomes.
- One of goals of the unit as listed in its strategic plan is to increase the number of grants, research and published works that are collaborative in nature especially with colleagues

outside the university, within the PASSHE system and P-12 partners. Faculty need to monitor their efforts in this area, and look for ways to improve. The restructuring of the director of grants and development's position from Advancement to Academic Affairs should provide faculty with resources and support to improve on this goal.

- Peer mentorship in research and scholarship within the unit currently exists in a few departments. This should be systematically extended to all the departments with the understanding that each department decides what works best for its faculty and that mentors are not limited to peers or colleagues in the department but could extend outside and that the mentoring is goal-oriented or project based.

- A growth in scholarship will be for faculty researchers to increase ways in which to market their innovative ideas and intellectual properties. This could be an extension of services being provided to the State and other agencies and through grant writing.

- Faculty should maintain its high record on tenure (all full-time faculty that are eligible for tenure are tenured at this time) and competitiveness in earning sabbaticals (5.4.g#3). In order to enhance its record on promotion, faculty needs to increase collaborative scholarly activities with colleagues in other disciplines especially those in the Sciences. It also needs to be a strong advocate for its concept of scholarship. For instance, credit could be established on the promotion criteria for faculty's work in accreditation. The institution and the unit should also increase resources for faculty professional development after a needs assessment has been conducted and data produced on the specific areas that need enhancement.

5.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters] N/A

5.4 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.4.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.) *
5.4.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice) *
5.4.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations *
5.4.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities *
5.4.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.4.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service*

| 5.4.g | Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results* |

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   Unit Governance and Resources

How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards? [maximum of three pages]

6.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a   Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

6.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

6.1.a Unit Leadership and Authority
The Professional Education Unit (PEU) provides the coordination and support for all teacher preparation and other school personnel programs. The Dean for the School of Education (SOE) serves as the head of the PEU providing leadership and structure for all initial and advanced teacher education programs. Policy and curricular issues for educator programs are addressed through the Teacher Education Council (TEC) which includes representation from all educator programs across campus. The PEU and the TEC meet on a regular basis to support the mechanisms for collaboration and decision making. The Deans' Council, under the leadership of the Provost, provides additional leadership and collaborations regarding resources, policies, and curricular actions that apply to the educator programs. See 6.4.b#1-4 for clarification of the governance structure.

Teacher preparation and other school personnel programs are housed in the SOE, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Science and Mathematics. The College of Graduate and Professional Studies coordinates the unit's advanced programs. P-12 practitioners are involved in the program design, the implementation of programs, and the assessment of candidates through a variety of different methods. They are included in focus group meetings, supervision of candidates during clinical experiences, panel presentations, and participation in professional development opportunities.

Admission policies are published in university catalogs (6.4.e#2-3), including criteria for entrance into teacher preparation programs. This information is also regularly distributed during advisement meetings. Incoming first year and transfer candidates receive information about policies in their programs during orientation and through other mail communications. All teacher candidates in secondary preparation programs are assigned an academic co-advisor in education to assist in the process of advisement. Academic class schedules include designations for Advanced Professional Studies (APS) courses and teacher candidates' records include information as to their compliance with entrance into their programs (6.4.e#6-8).

All candidates have access to a wide range of resources and services to ensure their success at MU. The university web site is the primary source of quick-access information including academic calendars, catalogs, publications, policies, services, etc (6.4.a#1-2). Candidates also receive direct access to information through advisement meetings. Every candidate is assigned an advisor upon entering MU and must meet with the advisor at least once per semester in order to acquire a pin number needed for class registration. This system ensures that candidates make contact with faculty who can provide accurate guidance and support.

6.1.b Unit Budget

The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards. Each school receives an operating budget from the Provost's office. Each department subsequently is allocated an operating budget from the Dean. The table provided in 6.4.g#1 includes comparison budget data for all three schools in regards to operating budgets, equipment budgets, student wages, special study budgets, academic searches, new faculty computer support, and maintenance and repair. The unit receives strong support and funding for the purpose of supporting work toward accreditation. Regular budget allocations are supplemented by grants received to support various teacher preparation initiatives and also by scholarship funding (6.4.g#1) to assist candidates as they matriculate through their programs.

The Field Experiences Office receives separate budget allocations from the university to support their expenses (6.4.f#2). Cooperating teacher stipends are established by the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. Budget allocations for the Field Experience Office are adjusted accordingly by the institution based on the demand of the current academic year. Some comparison budgets for other campus programs with clinical components (i.e., Social Work, Nursing) can be found in 6.4.g#1.

6.1.c Personnel

The workload for MU faculty is defined by the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) in Article 23, A.1 (6.4.a#1). This policy defines workloads, office hours, workloads for Graduate Assistants, and faculty teaching all advanced courses. The CBA also defines the three areas of the academy where faculty are expected to contribute. Faculty within the PEU are strongly encouraged to be professionally involved at the state, national, and international levels to contribute to their professional growth and to also share their professional expertise with the larger educational community. See faculty information in AIMS for evidence of faculty professional development activities.

MU has established a formal electronic system for tracking adjunct and full-time faculty workloads. MU does not utilize teaching assistants in the classroom. It does utilize the services of highly credentialed school practitioners as adjunct teaching faculty and clinical supervision faculty. This system tracks teaching opportunities both on and off-campus, as well as distance learning opportunities. The opportunity to teach on-line courses has been established by the university. The new CBA (not yet disseminated) established requirements for institutional financial support and technical training for faculty teaching online courses.

All departments at the university have a department secretary for support and a faculty member who serves as the department chairperson. Some larger departments have additional staff support. All advanced programs have faculty serving as Graduate Coordinators. Some departments have Program Coordinators for Initial level programs.

The SOE Dean has sufficient staffing to assist in the operations of the School and the unit as seen on the SOE organizational chart (6.4.b#4). The Field Services Office and the Certification Office are also part of the Dean's support system. These offices include a Field Services Director (.75 release time) and three Administrative Assistants. Several student workers assist in all offices and one graduate assistant is assigned to support the Field Services Office. For the past two years, an additional graduate assistant has been assigned to the Dean's Office.

All departments receive a student wage allocation to support student workers. Each department assigns these workers independently to faculty. All departments with advanced programs are assigned Graduate Assistants. Campus-wide distribution of graduate assistants is included in 6.4.f#1.

6.1.d Unit Facilities

MU is committed to keeping its facilities updated to ensure quality for all initial and advanced programs. Nearly every building associated with teacher education programs has undergone some measure of facility improvement. The plan began with the renovation and expansion of Roddy and Caputo Hall which houses all of the secondary Science programs. The renovation and expansion to McComsey for secondary programs for Humanities and Social Sciences followed. Osburn Hall underwent an expansion in 2004 resulting in a state-of-the-art facility for Technology Education programs. Wickersham Hall (Math Education) underwent a life cycle renovation as well. In Fall 2012, the new Winter Visual and Performing Arts Center, home of Music Education, opened. Many teacher education programs at MU were fortunate to move into

their new building in 2008. See detailed information about the addition of Stayer Hall in the "Continuous Improvement" section.

6.1. e Unit Resources Including Technology

Every department receives resources for their operating budgets, including additional allocations for equipment. This support is used to purchase hardware and software products for faculty and candidates to meet technology standards in their field of study. Recent renovation projects have provided support for use of instructional technology in the classroom. This has enhanced teaching methods and the equipment necessary for faculty to model exemplary professional practices.

The unit's assessment system is sufficiently supported. Significant financial support was provided to establish the system and to enable the programming. Continual support is provided to ensure that the system is functional. This includes assistance from Information Technology (6.4.i#3) and it also includes support for one faculty member to serve as the Assessment Coordinator.

Library facilities sufficiently support candidates and faculty across campus 6.4.i#4. As seen in 6.4.i#5, our current library is undergoing extensive renovations that will bring the facility into the 21st Century. Allocations for non-subscription purposes for each School are documented in 6.4.i#1. The library houses a plethora of curriculum materials, kits, videos, and books related to teacher education programs on campus. Support from the library includes online resources; for example, EBSCO Host, electronic articles, electronic databases, and various search engines. Substantial resources for distance learning programs are provided to faculty and candidates including course management system (Desire 2 Learn), professional development for distance learning, an assistive technology laboratory and a Digital Learning Studio. Distance learning courses are well supported by the Information Technology Department ensuring confidentiality for students, 24 hour technical support and confidence in the reliability and speed of the course delivery (6.4.j#2).

6.2. b Continuous Improvement
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit has demonstrated continuous improvement on this Standard since the last review period. Below are some of the highlights that provide evidence of continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

Unit Leadership and Authority
The Dean and the Associate Dean hold significant leadership roles in the larger educational community serving as exemplars to the PEU on state and national issues. The recently retired

Dean serves on the board for AACTE, is a Commissioner for the Professional Standards and Practices Commission in Pennsylvania and is President-elect for the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The Interim Dean, Dr. Tuleya-Payne serves as a Member of the Board of Directors and on the Multicultural Committee for The Pennsylvania Psychological Association (PPA). She also serves as a Member of the Awards Committee for the Pennsylvania Psychological Foundation and is also a member of the Pennsylvania Inter-College Council for School Psychology Professors. The Associate Dean has been elected to serve a second term on the board of the Association for Middle Level Education at the national level (5.4.g#2).

To assist the PEU in ongoing collaborative efforts in addition to the Teacher Education Council, the following committees serve the unit. These committees have been instrumental in ensuring continuous improvement of candidates' performance, curriculum, and program quality.

- **NCATE Steering Committee** –serves in an advisory capacity for the reaccreditation process.
- **Assessment Committee** –serves as the body for ongoing development of the assessment system, the dissemination of information on assessment, the ongoing evaluation of the assessment system, and for the ongoing improvement of the unit's programs. Assessment efforts, including leadership for this committee, are provided by an Assessment Coordinator to handle these responsibilities on an annual basis.
- **School of Education Diversity Committee**-provides oversight for the unit in implementing its goal on diversity and inclusiveness.

The unit collaborates with practitioners in the field for program design, delivery and evaluation. Multiple efforts on a variety of levels are provided below to illustrate these ongoing collaborative efforts supporting continuous improvement.

- Since 2011, the SOE has organized and implemented a 3-5 day event called *Education on Location*. This special programming brings together the entire community – both internal and external to MU – to focus on the educational system's hottest topics and to make connections locally. Many of these events are the result of partnerships with individuals and organizations such as local school superintendents, the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Hourglass Foundation, and United Way (5.4.e#1).
- "Data Days" are scheduled twice per academic year. These events bring together faculty and practitioners from the field to examine and evaluate data related to teacher education. This input is considered as programs and policies are implemented or revised (2.4.d#2).
- Due to new PA legislation (Chapter 49-2) for teacher education programs, PEU faculty members have been deeply engaged in program revisions over the past several years (1.5.d#3). This legislation challenged faculty in all teacher education programs to work together to revise program requirements to ensure compliance and increase quality of graduates. This also entailed working with practitioners in the field who were able to provide meaningful input that helped to inform decisions.
- Training on Co-Teaching was provided for cooperating teachers, principals, and university faculty (including adjuncts) in an effort to prepare for expected changes in

student teaching assignment requirements and supervision. An expert in the field was brought on to campus to provide this training. Additional training is expected through a train-the-trainer approach beginning fall 2013 (3.4.d#1).

- Faculty in Science Education, Special Education and Early Childhood Education areas developed and successfully implemented new Professional Development Schools (PDS). This collaborative effort between MU faculty and P-12 faculty/administration has helped to reshape how candidates engage in their clinical experiences (3.4.a#6).

- PEU members provide professional development on effective teaching and pedagogy for faculty across campus through various sessions sponsored by the MU Center for Academic Excellence (5.4.e#3).

Budget

The budget for MU decreased for the past three years resulting from declining budget allocations from the state. Despite reductions that were equitably applied across campus, the PEU remained well funded for equipment, technology, and for supporting clinical experiences. Funding also remained to ensure that accreditations were maintained.

Personnel

Since 2007, the SOE has benefited from the addition of an Associate Dean. She provides guidance and oversight for external reviews of all professional and instructional teacher education programs with the PA Department of Education (PDE) and NCATE. She serves as the Certification Officer coordinating the Post Bac program and supporting the School of Graduate and Professional Studies in coordinating and monitoring summer educational workshops. She is also responsible for evaluating adjunct professors and support staff.

Facilities

The SOE moved into the new Stayer Hall in 2008 which includes approximately 37,000 square feet and significantly enhanced teaching and learning opportunities that were not available in the past. These enhancements include more classroom space, state of the art technology podiums in each classroom, some smart boards, a laptop lounge, multiple student lounges, a children's library, a beautiful courtyard, a testing center, an assistive technology laboratory, a Digital Learning Studio, several computer labs (6.4.i#2), and several oversized classrooms which can be used as one large classroom or two smaller classrooms. Other improvements included large operable windows in all faculty offices, new furniture for all faculty, new classroom furniture for all classrooms, a reception room for use by students and faculty, an improved suite of offices for the Dean and supporting staff, and easier access to other academic buildings on campus. A strong focus for this building was to follow a green process; the majority of the materials were bought locally, windows were designed to minimize heat loss, recycled materials were used where possible, body sensing lights and faucets were included, efficient lighting was installed and supplemented with multiple large windows for natural lighting in all areas of the building.

Unit Resources Including Technology

- Innovation Block Grants were offered to MU faculty for the first time beginning in 2013. These grants ($500-$1000) were meant to help individual faculty members or small teaching teams identify a need that can be met through the purchase of instructional

technologies specialized to their content area or to receive support to incorporate innovative pedagogies in their classroom. Several of the grants were received by SOE faculty. The university anticipates continuing these grants in the future to encourage innovation in the classroom. In addition, faculty who receive the grants will share their accomplishments with peers through program offerings sponsored by the Center for Academic Excellence.

- MU acquired a new learning management system in 2010 called Desire2Learn (D2L) (6.4.j#1). This required extensive training and development for faculty to learn and acquire new skills in engaging students in their classes through this new medium. The number of faculty integrating D2L into their courses increases annually as more individuals get the training and support they need. This is made possible through the leadership of two full-time staff members including an instructional designer and an instructional support specialist (a newly created position to meet the growing demand for faculty support of instructional technologies on campus).

- The university initiated a new professional development program in 2011 called Camp IDEA (Innovative Digital Education and Assessment). The purpose of Camp IDEA is to develop or strengthen Millersville Faculty members' understanding of the pedagogical principles which support learner centered instruction in an online environment. Instruction focuses primarily on D2L, while incorporating a variety of technological tools that enhance instructional design and assessment. The weeklong Camp IDEA has been offered five times (serving roughly 75 faculty members) thus far with plans to continue it during winter and summer breaks.

- In Fall 2010, the SOE opened the Digital Learning Studio (DLS) on campus with the Director reporting to the Dean (earning 1/4 release time Fall & Spring semesters). The DLS replaced the former Instructional Materials Center and provides students and faculty with an abundance of resources to enhance their use of instructional technologies (e.g., iPads, digital video). The DLS offers assistance to candidates, faculty and students across campus to work on projects for classes or for presentations.

- Several years ago, the unit participated in a grant that provided the funding to purchase assistive technology equipment. The Assistive Technology Lab resulted from this funding. The Lab is available to all students on campus in addition to being utilized by candidates learning how to implement the use of assistive technologies in the classroom.

- iPads were purchased and provided to all teacher candidates and faculty in the secondary PDS. Candidates and faculty were supported in using this technology within instruction and were encouraged to model exemplary professional practices in their clinical based environments. Additional iPads were provided to all teacher education faculty.

6.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

6.4 Exhibits for Standard 6

6.4.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit

6.4.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.4.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.4.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.4.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.4.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning , and alternative route programs when applicable
6.4.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.4.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.4.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.4.j	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable