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Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. **There is a lack of data that would support continuous improvement in content knowledge.**

   **Rationale:** Scores within some programs have fallen below 80 percent, but no evidence was presented to show how the unit has chosen to address this.

   **Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the Williams Teacher Education Programs (WTEP) will present past and current strategies that have been implemented to improve content knowledge of students.

2. **There is a lack of data that shows the areas of continuous improvement in Standard 1 upon which the unit has focused since the last NCATE visit.**

   **Rationale:** Little evidence shows what the focus of continuous improvement in Standard 1 has been over the last few years.

   **Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the WTEP will present past and current strategies that have been implemented to improve content knowledge of students.

3. **There is little evidence to show that the unit’s candidate dispositions are integrated directly with the conceptual framework, external professional standards, and assessments.**

   **Rationale:** No structure, chart, or narrative indicates that the unit’s candidate dispositions are measured against the conceptual framework or external professional standards.

   **Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the WTEP will present the alignment of candidate dispositions with the conceptual framework and external professional standards.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. **Ways in which the unit is working toward continuous improvement of content knowledge.** (Interviews of faculty, documentation of work sessions, documentation of meeting between the unit and arts & science faculty)

   **Response:** The requested documentation will be available and requested interviews will be arranged for the BOE onsite visit.
2. **Need impact data on P-12 students.**

**Response:** The Arkansas Department of Education has agreed to make available to the WTEP this data for the 2011-12 program completers. The WTEP anticipates having this data available for the BOE onsite visit.

3. **Need employer survey data disaggregated by programs.**

**Response:** The WTEP has disseminated an employer survey to school districts that have recently hired WTEP graduates. A link to the survey can be found in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum (exhibit 1.5.3 Employer Survey).

4. **Need program evaluation data.**

**Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, WTEP internally collected data and Outcome Assessment Reports for each program will be made available for review. The state report for the Health and Physical Education Program can be found in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum (exhibit 1.5.4 State Program Review Documents).

5. **Need update on Praxis II pass rate in the WTEP Physical Education Program.**

**Response:** The most recent Praxis II pass rate in the WTEP Physical Education Program will be made available during the onsite visit.

6. **Ways in which the unit is working with arts and science faculty to address the low pass rates in specific content areas. (Interviews with arts and science faculty, documentation of meetings and/or staff development)**

**Response:** The majority of the Williams faculty for the arts and sciences are on the Williams Teacher Education Program council. Therefore, the faculty for the arts and sciences meet during the regularly scheduled and special called WTEP meetings. During these meetings, the topic of low rates is commonly discussed. The Chair of the WTEP encourages each specific content area to develop and implement strategies that will improve teacher candidate performance on the respective standardized assessment. Minutes of the WTEP regular and special called meetings, as well as meetings for each content area, will be available during the onsite visit.

Furthermore, the WTEP has recently explored the purchase of in-depth test preparation materials that are available in addition to the ETS-generated study guides to aid our students in passing the mandated Praxis content exams. During the onsite visit, this guide should be made available.

Students who struggle to pass any Praxis exam, including content tests, and who encounter problems with any course are encouraged to seek tutoring from the WBC Counseling and Career Services Center.
7. Ways in which the unit is measuring content knowledge throughout the program. (Course syllabi, informal/formal assessment, documentation of reports and advising plans)

Response: All students are assigned an advisor with whom they are encouraged to meet. They have access to degree plans online, and completion of degree plans is a course requirement for ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching.

Specific samples of the requested documents will be available for review during the BOE onsite visit. Degree plans (advising plans) can be found in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum (exhibit 1.5.7 Degree Plans).

8. Data that would support candidates’ knowledge of differentiating learning to address all students. (Employer surveys, cooperating teacher interviews, candidate interviews, faculty interviews, course syllabi and assignment examples)

Response: Data from specific samples of the aforementioned documents will be available for review during the BOE onsite visit.

9. Ways in which candidates demonstrate “in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and are able to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn.” (Interviews of candidates, student teachers, and examples of lessons taught during student teaching.)

Response: Examples of WTEP clinical interns’ electronic professional portfolios have been provided in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum (exhibit 1.5.9 Intern Digital Portfolio Sample 1 and exhibit 1.5.9 Intern Digital Portfolio Sample 2). These portfolios provide evidence of “in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and are able to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn.” During the onsite visit, more electronic portfolios will be made available, and the BOE team will be able to view videotaped lessons of clinical interns from each department, since videos are a requirement during clinical internship.

10. Ways in which faculty lead candidates to analyze education research and policies and provide opportunities for candidates to explain the implications of these into their own practice. (Interviews of faculty and candidates, work samples, detailed syllabi)

Response: Educational theorists are studied by all education students in ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching, as well as in ED 4113 Study of the School. WTEP candidates have the opportunity to join National Education Association and receive publications as a result. Further examples, including interviews with faculty and candidates, will be made available during the BOE onsite visit.
11. Evidence of student learning for candidates’ acceptable standards—particularly the candidates ability to make appropriate adjustments to instruction and monitor student progress. (Interviews of cooperating teachers, interview of student teachers, interviews of alumni, interviews of employers)

**Response:** Requested interviews will be available during the BOE onsite visit.

12. Evidence that the unit’s candidate dispositions are measured against the conceptual framework or that they stem from external standards. (Interviews with faculty, interview with unit head, interview with candidates, documentation of alignment)

**Response:** Requested interviews will be arranged, and data from specific samples of the aforementioned documents will be available for review during the BOE onsite visit.

13. Examples of how professional dispositions that were lower than expectation were dealt with and the process that occurred. (Interview with unit faculty and head of unit)

**Response:** Department chairs are responsible for initial dealings with students who receive professional dispositions that were lower than expectation. The most noted areas of weakness on dispositions are grammar, professional dress, and overall conduct. In extreme cases, a student may be removed from the Williams Teacher Education Program. (See exhibit 1.5.13 Disposition Sample) Requested interviews will be available during the BOE onsite visit.

14. All relevant course syllabi and programs of study should be included as exhibits in order to provide evidence for this and other applicable standards (see NCATE list of required exhibits).

**Response:** A link to relevant course syllabi and a link to programs of study can be found in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum (exhibit 1.5.14 Course Syllabi and exhibit 1.5.14 Programs of Study). Additional course syllabi will be available for review during the BOE onsite visit.
2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. There is not clear evidence that the unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data (1) on applicant qualifications.

Response: As mentioned prior in the Institutional Report, the WTEP does gather data on applicants to ensure that they meet baseline entrance requirements before being interviewed and admitted into the program. These criteria are:

- 45 semester hours completed
- Copy of transcript submitted to WTEP office
- 2.0 or better GPA in English Composition I, English Composition II, Speech & Communication, College Algebra or Contemporary Mathematics, and Introduction to Teaching
- Overall GPA of 2.5 or better at time of admission request
- Official Praxis I scores on file in registrar’s office and meeting or exceeding minimum score requirements: 172 on Reading, 171 on Mathematics, 173 on Writing
- Degree Plan on file in registrar’s office and in WTEP office
- Autobiographical sketch on file in WTEP office
- Two letters of recommendation from Williams faculty
- Portfolio prepared for interview (if student has completed Introduction to Teaching at Williams)

In terms of collecting data, the WTEP office keeps a file for each applicant to ensure that all requirements are met; no candidate can enter the program without meeting all of these requirements (unless special conditions are approved by the Appeals Committee).

In terms of analyzing data, the WTEP uses aggregated data from Praxis I scores, GPA at time of admission, disposition scores, and Interview Rubric averages to compile an academic and professional profile of each incoming group (see Exhibit 2.3.b for data). These data help WTEP faculty to understand the range and the typical level of academic and professional performance of applicants entering the program.

2. There is not clear evidence that the unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on candidate and graduate performance.

Response: WTEP uses several ongoing evaluations to ensure that candidates continue to meet high standards. Candidate GPAs are monitored to ascertain that they meet the required level of overall academic achievement. Candidate dispositions are regularly assessed and submitted, allowing intervention if any deficiencies need to be addressed. Praxis II scores are assessed
both by WTEP and by individual departments/programs to ensure that candidates meet standards of knowledge in their content areas. Interns are measured with numerous evaluations, including the Student Intern Evaluation, Early Childhood Evaluation/Middle Level Evaluation, Cooperating Teacher’s Recommendations, Self-Rating Evaluation, and Student Teaching Reflections. Exit interviews provide evidence of what candidates have learned in the program and what they feel ought to be addressed better. Outcomes assessment programs of individual departments/programs within the unit measure performance of WTEP candidates in their content areas, allowing in some cases for comparison to other non-education students in the department/program.

3. There is not clear evidence that the unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates.

4. There is not clear evidence that the unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data consistently and systematically on the unit’s operations.

Response: Evaluating unit operations is a high priority for the WTEP, both to ensure candidate performance and to improve the quality of the unit’s programs. WTEP makes decisions about unit operations based on the candidate data mentioned above as well as several other sources of information. For instance, WTEP uses exit interviews to gather feedback from interns about their experiences in the program. WTEP internship supervisors talk with principals and cooperating teachers to learn not only how interns are performing but how the partnership between WTEP and cooperating schools is working out. WTEP faculty are invited to share their opinions on both specific and general aspects of unit operations at regular WTEP meetings. Because Williams is a small college that values personal interaction, qualitative data gathered from in-person meetings and communications plays a significant role in driving the unit’s efforts to meet needs once they are recognized—not just to address quantitative averages and means but also to respond to unique circumstances as they arise.

Individual departments/programs within WTEP conduct their own outcomes assessment programs to evaluate how well their programs foster the student learning outcomes they desire. Several of these outcomes assessment programs align with the standards of professional educational organizations in their fields, such as NASPE and NCTE. Data from outcomes assessment not only helps departments make decisions about their programs but also illuminates broader concerns that may be relevant to the WTEP.

2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Interview candidates, faculty, P-12 partners, and community to determine how and when data are shared.

Response: The WTEP will plan and facilitate these interviews during the BOE onsite visit.
2. Interview the WTEP Council members; what is their role as far as oversight and management of the assessment system; are data shared with the professional community?
Response: The WTEP will plan and facilitate these interviews during the BOE onsite visit.

3. Evidence is needed that the assessment system can provide for disaggregation of data by program (e.g. DST and dispositions data).
Response: Data, both aggregate and disaggregate, from the suggested samples will be available for review during the BOE onsite visit.

4. Interview the faculty member(s) are assisting the unit in developing an online management database. Need to see timeline of progress of this effort.
Response: The WTEP will plan and facilitate these interviews with Dr. Brad Baine, Ms. Tracy Henderson, and possibly Dr. Steve Corder. The Williams staff will be prepared to discuss the timeline of progress of this effort.

5. A clear articulation of the application of the appeals process and its application to candidate complaints is needed.
Response: Please see Exhibit 2.5.5 Policies, Procedures, and Practices for Managing Candidate Performance in the electronic exhibits of the IR Addendum. Furthermore, Dr. Brad Baine will provide verbal articulation of the procedures and process that the WTEP utilizes for the program appeals process and its application to candidate complaints, during the BOE onsite visit.

6. Three years of data will need to be available for review at the onsite visit.
Response: The WTEP will have these data available for the BOE onsite visit.
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.2 Moving Toward Target Level
3.2.a In the Addendum, the unit should address the target level rubrics for Standard 3 elements (pp. 29-31 of the NCATE Standards book) in order to demonstrate that the characteristics cited for target performance in the IR are consistent with the target rubric descriptors.

Response: In an effort to make the connections to the rubric language clearer, the rubric language has been noted in the heading with the supporting characteristics for target performance cited beneath that heading.

3.a Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “The unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning.”

Due to the size of our community, the close proximity to partner schools, and the strong, positive relationships that faculties have built with area teachers, the unit and partner schools have developed a shared vision for the level of accomplishment that we expect from WBC teacher candidates. As a unit, we invest our time and energies into the professional growth of our partner school faculties. We share expertise through collaborative activities such as the Algebra I Common Core State Standards Initiative which is explained in detail in the “Collaboration with Partner Schools” narrative in the Exhibits for 3.3.a. This grant-funded professional development was undertaken to assist our partner schools with the transition to CCSS.

The Northeast Arkansas Educational Cooperative administers a needs assessment survey to area teachers in the spring to determine the types of professional development in-service teachers need. Through collaboration with NEA Coop. staff, faculty members developed technology workshops that specifically address the needs survey results and these were presented to partner school faculties through the cooperative with WBC faculty teaching. This has been an ongoing relationship with the NEA Coop. for several years. In addition, faculty members have developed web-based resources to assist partner schools in integrating technology resources into their classrooms. Examples of these resources include the My Wiki Magic Training Site http://mywikimagic.pbworks.com/w/page/22005869/FrontPage and the Multiple Intelligences Training Site http://techmi.pbworks.com/w/page/28145091/Supporting%20Multiple%20Intelligences%20With%20Technology. In addition to training partner school faculties, many of the WBC teacher candidates attend these professional development activities. WBC maintains a partnership
with NEA Cooperative which allows our students to attend these events at no cost to the students.

Due to our willingness to invest in our partner school faculties, these schools, in return, are willing to invest in our candidates. In an effort to support our candidate’s success, partner school Superintendents provide mock interview experiences during DST seminar in which all interns participate.

Partner school faculties also share their expertise with our candidates in other ways. For example, upon learning that the students enrolled in Field Experience II were studying the brain-based learning strategy of “classroom celebrations”, Mrs. Blair Ballard from Lawrence County School District invited one of our candidates to her classroom to create a video of her students demonstrating their classroom celebrations. This video has been used in each Field Experience II class to afford many candidates the opportunity to see this strategy used in an authentic 4th grade classroom setting. Cooperating Field Experience teachers also share copies of classroom procedures, calendars, parent letters, lesson plans, and classroom management strategies with our candidates as they observe and assist during their field experiences. These are placed in the candidates’ field experience portfolios.

The examples listed above support the target level rubric component that the unit and partner schools share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. Much more supporting evidence for target level performance in standard 3a can be found in the Standard 3 Exhibits for 3.3.a, http://www.wbcoll.edu/departments_majors/education_department/caep/standard_3.aspx specifically on the document entitled, “Collaboration with Partner Schools and the Community”.

3.b Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit’s conceptual framework into practice.”

One area in which target level performance is evidenced is in the strong alignment of our assessment instruments with the unit’s Conceptual Framework; “Preparing Professional Educators to Be Effective Communicators Who Integrate and Care”.

Scaffolded throughout the program are opportunities for teacher candidates to build the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of an accomplished teacher. Our partner school teachers work closely with us to observe and evaluate the level to which our candidates are exhibiting the traits in our conceptual framework. Our evaluation instruments for Directed Student Teaching are designed specifically to measure our candidates’ success in meeting the criteria of communicating effectively in writing and verbally as well as integrating curricular areas and technology with a caring and compassionate demeanor. Specifically, in the Student Intern Evaluation which cooperating teachers complete three times during each eight week
Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults.”

This represents another aspect of standard 3b at which we are meeting target level standards. As evidenced on the WBC Field Experience Requirement website, our P-4 program majors have a wide variety of opportunities to apply and reflect upon their teaching practice, content knowledge, and professional dispositions. Best practices are modeled and taught extensively and then students observe effective teachers in the classroom and reflect upon those experiences. Early in the program, students have face-to-face teaching time in an actual classroom setting and then evaluate and critique their own practice and that of their peers. These teaching experiences begin with tasks such as read-alouds and progress to standards-based substantive lessons in which teacher candidates videotape themselves and participate in peer evaluation and collaboration. After each classroom lesson is taught, students respond to numerous questions that evoke in-depth reflection on their own classroom practice. Students in this program prepare two Field Experience portfolios in which they build a wealth of resources such as photos, classroom management ideas, exemplary lessons, and assessment pieces and other resources shared by their cooperating partner school faculties. Exit interviews with candidates in this program indicate that these teacher candidates agree that field experience in this program is exemplary.

Evidence of these areas can be viewed on the Standard 3 exhibit page, specifically in section 3.3e and 3.3f.

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “They [candidates] reflect on and can justify their own practice.”

This is an additional aspect in which the unit is performing at target level. It involves the implementation of the Directed Student TeachingDigital Portfolio Journal. During clinical practice, candidates in all programs design and create a digital portfolio which affords much opportunity for candidates to apply and reflect upon their teaching practice, content knowledge, and professional dispositions as well as reflect on and justify their own practice. One requirement of the portfolio includes a digital reflection journal in which students write a weekly entry to share reflections about their own practice, application of content and pedagogical strategies, and other areas of their classroom experiences. The DST supervisor
reads the journal each week and responds through the “comments” section of the website. This becomes a dialogue that demonstrates the candidate’s growth in practice, content, and pedagogy.

An additional requirement on the Digital Teaching Portfolio is the teacher work sample which is focused on student outcomes. In this aspect of the portfolio, candidates must develop a pre and post assessment for one standards-based lesson, compile and analyze the data, and finally show how the data will be used to drive instruction. The evidence that interns provide within the online portfolio for this work sample allows our interns to reflect on and justify their own practice based on assessment and student achievement to better understand the teaching profession.

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “They [candidates] interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually.”

This is another aspect of Standard 3b in which the unit is performing at target level. Through the digital teaching portfolio, candidates are required to show evidence of collaboration with school faculty or community organizations. For example, in the sample portfolio Evidence of Collaboration page linked here, the teacher candidate collaborated with the local prosecuting attorney to set up a mock trial for her 4th grade students during a unit of study on the branches of government. In another intern’s Evidence of Collaboration page, evidence is shared that shows the intern collaborated with an intern from another area university to create and implement a President’s Day activity which focused on Math and Literacy. This same portfolio page shows evidence that the intern also collaborated with a local university museum to allow her Kindergarten class to visit a dinosaur exhibit. This type of collaboration develops our candidates in the area of effective communication which is one aspect of our conceptual framework.

To further support this aspect of the target level rubric, each candidate also provides two pieces of digital evidence for involving families in each DST assignment. This sample from the DST Digital Teaching Portfolio shows several pieces of evidence for family involvement including a Science Buddy Lab Investigation that students took home to complete as a family activity as well as an online digital survey that was created to gather feedback from parents.

3.c Candidate’s Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “Candidates work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each others’ practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice.”
WBC teacher candidates collaborate with other candidates to reflect on their practice in regularly scheduled DST Seminars. During internship, candidates attend six hour seminars on four separate dates at which time they share with their peers and reflect upon the internship experience thus far. At this time, interns observe classroom instruction via video lessons and collaborate to analyze classroom methods, management, and pedagogical strategies utilizing the Pathwise criteria. The candidates have time to share ideas about best practices, utilizing available technologies in the schools, and share successes they have experienced. A more detailed explanation of seminar can be found in the exhibits for Standard 3.3e.

Teacher candidates work collaboratively with clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each others’ practice throughout the internship. Clinical supervisors meet regularly with interns during clinical practice. Visits are typically made at least once every two weeks but more frequently if the need arises. At each visit, an evaluation of the intern’s teaching and classroom management is done. The supervisor collaborates with the intern and the mentor teacher to discuss progress, evaluations, P-12 student learning, areas of improvement, and the integration of the intern’s learning into teaching practice. Supervisors work closely with administrators, mentor teachers, and interns through phone, e-mail, personal meetings both individually and collectively. Interns communicate and reflect upon their classroom experiences through their DST journal and this is uploaded to the digital portfolio for the supervisor to access online. Supervisors read journal entries on a regular basis and then comment upon those and offer necessary advice and encouragement.

In addition to completing a self-rating scale during DST, the intern also completes a detailed evaluation of the clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher. This is an opportunity for interns to critique the practice of the supervisor and the mentor teacher to ensure reflection and growth for all professionals involved in the process. All clinical supervisors take these evaluations seriously and use them for continuous improvement and reflective practice just as we encourage our interns to do.

Evidence to support target level performance in “some aspects” of the target level rubric which states: “Candidates develop proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools.”

Students in the Methods & Classroom Management courses design a one week integrated thematic unit as part of their coursework. This includes lesson plans, accommodations, assessments, technology-related activities, and other aspects of instruction. As part of the planning process, teacher candidates are randomly assigned a class composite that tells them the makeup of their class. Diversity is purposefully built into these class composites to afford candidates the opportunity to plan classroom activities for a group of students that is diverse in ethnicity, language, race, learning styles, and ability levels. Also included in these class composites are ELN students such as Oppositional Defiant (ODD), ADHD, and ADD students. For
example, one class composite is 10 boys and 10 girls with 12 Caucasian students, 4 African American students, and 4 Hispanic students that speak and read English well, but whose parents speak only Spanish. In addition to this, the class is made up of 60% kinesthetic learners, 30% visual learners, and 10% auditory learners. The class also has diverse ability levels in that there are 6 gifted learners, 2 learning disabled students, and 3 non-readers included in the group. These diverse class composites allow our candidates to plan for accommodations, remediation, modified assessments, and learning activities that address each learning style. Candidates are provided with web resources and handouts to prepare them to modify for the specific needs of their mock student population. Candidates are also provided with web resources to enable them to translate documents that will be sent home for non-English speaking parents. Accommodating and modifying for these ELN students is a component of the lesson plan rubric. The unit feels that having this experience built into our curriculum helps our candidates develop proficiencies that support learning by all students to enable candidates to fully meet the needs of their students no matter what type of differentiation is required.

Evidence to support acceptable level performance in “some aspects” of the acceptable level rubric which states: “They [candidates] begin a process of continuous assessment, reflection, and action directed at supporting P-12 student learning. Candidates collect data on student learning, analyze them, reflect on their work, and develop strategies for improving learning.”

As part of the digital teaching portfolio developed during internship, interns create a teacher work sample that demonstrates the intern’s ability to create and administer authentic assessments and use that data to drive instruction. This teacher work sample is linked on the digital portfolio and includes the intern’s analysis of contextual factors, defined learning goals, an assessment and instructional plan, analysis of P-12 student learning, and a reflection and self-evaluation. This project demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for interns to collect data on student learning, analyze them, reflect on their work, and develop strategies for improving learning. View work sample on portfolio.

Standard 3 Plans and Timelines for Attaining Target Level Performance

In an effort to continue developing toward the target level in the standard 3 areas, these plans have been made for attaining target level performance. Information about their implementation timelines is included.
WTEP Reading Project – Fall 2013

As part of our continuous improvement goal of moving toward target in area 3C, the WTEP has developed a reading project in collaboration with one of our partner schools, Baldwin Elementary in the Paragould School District. This project was designed by WTEP faculty.

Dr. Brad Baine, Education Department Chair, met with Mrs. Caroline Schenk, Principal of Baldwin Elementary, in early September, 2013 to develop implementation plans for the project. All candidates across programs that are enrolled in the block course ED4113 A Study of the School, will create a lesson that includes a read-aloud activity and a lesson extension that is relevant to their discipline. The candidates will choose their own books that relate to their degree area as well as create all materials necessary for their extension to the read-aloud. Candidates will travel together to Baldwin Elementary along with two WTEP faculty members on October 3rd and 8th, 2013 to deliver their lessons to whole class groups in 2nd – 4th grades. Students will each design and teach their own lessons but will have another candidate observing them as they teach. This will provide opportunities for candidates to critique the strategies, classroom management, and pedagogy of their peers. In subsequent Study of the School classes, candidates will have ample opportunity to reflect upon their own practice as well as that of the candidate whose lesson they observed.

This project also provided candidates another opportunity to collaborate with education professionals. An Educational Coach, Mrs. Melanie Spence, from the Arkansas Public School Resource Center provided professional development to all students in the Study of the School course. She modeled a read-aloud for candidates and provided them with many examples of extension activities across disciplines. Mrs. Spence also brought numerous books and allowed the candidates time to look through them and choose an appropriate book for their discipline.

The WTEP Reading Project is being implemented in Fall 2013 and candidate work samples will be available during the onsite visit.

Measurement and Evaluation Data-Driven Instruction Project – Spring 2014

As part of the WTEP continuous improvement goal of moving toward target in area 3b, the WTEP has developed a data-driven instruction project which will be implemented in collaboration with one of our partner schools. This project was included in the original IR but with minimal details and an earlier timeline. Three members of the WTEP met on September 19 and 24, 2013 to solidify plans for this project. With the focus on implementation and assessment of Common Core Standards in our state and nation, we realize that our candidates need many opportunities to use assessment data to guide instructional planning. Currently our candidates do this during DST but we realize this could be expanded. For this reason, the unit has decided to develop and implement by the spring semester of 2014 a data-driven instruction focused assessment which will be embedded into the curriculum for the ED 4133 Measurement & Evaluation block course. All teacher candidates across programs enroll in this course the semester prior to internship. As part of this project, candidates will develop and implement a
pre-assessment, teaching component, and post assessment of K-12 learners. This will be content specific for the respective education program and will be implemented in four phases. The focus will be on analyzing the data to determine the extent to which student achievement goals were met. The data will then be used to positively impact further instruction.

After candidates have completed six weeks of the Measurement and Evaluation Course, phase one will begin with systematic observation in a partner school. This will be accomplished by having candidates in the partner school for one and a quarter hours per week which is 50% of the course time. Phase two will follow with candidates implementing lessons. Assessment of the instruction will be phase three. In phase four of the project, candidates will showcase their professional portfolios to their peers while reflecting upon their practice. Time will be allotted to encourage peer critique and collaboration.

The unit knows that our candidates need to fully understand the purpose for and use of both formative and summative assessment data and we believe that this addition to our program will move the WTEP toward target in the area of “applying and reflecting on their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.”

Class Profile for Clinical Practice – Spring 2014

In an effort to move toward target in candidates “demonstrating proficiencies that support learning by all students” in the rubric for area 3c, we will begin to gather demographic information on each classroom in which our interns are placed for clinical practice. To accomplish this, the unit will develop a class profile which will require interns to gather and provide information about their K-12 students. The profile will show numbers in diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic status. This form will also be designed to gather information about the number of students with exceptional learning needs.

Additional Plans

As included in the original Institutional Report for Standard 3, plans are continuing on the development of a Formal Administrative Feedback Instrument for partner school administrators. The plan is to implement this in the Fall 2014 semester.

The Homeschool Partnership plan that was included in the original Institutional Report for Standard 3 is still in the beginning phases of planning and as yet, the WTEP has not developed a timeline for implementation.
3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement

The offsite report states, “For P-4 and 4-8 programs, field experiences have been added that allow for direct interaction with students; however, it is not evident that this AFI has been addressed at the secondary level. More information is needed to support removal of this AFI.”

Response

An online chart outlining all field experiences across programs has been created to clarify the field experiences being completed in all programs including the secondary programs.

In addition to the field experiences shown on the chart, the WTEP has a firm commitment from the Department Chairs of the Secondary Programs to include these additional field experiences by the given timelines. The WTEP believes that these additional field experiences that allow direct interaction with secondary level students in our partner schools strongly support the removal of this AFI.

Art Education P-12 – Fall 2014

Candidates enrolled in Art Education I, which is the Methods Course for this secondary program, will begin in Fall 2014 teaching one art lesson in a partnership school. Teacher candidates will be observing one another as they teach and will have opportunities to reflect upon their own practice as well as critique their peers.

As noted on the online chart of field experiences, candidates in Art Education II already teach 3 demonstration lessons.

Secondary English Education – Fall 2013 Observation and Fall 2014 Mini-lesson

Candidates enrolled in the Methods Course for this secondary program have begun this Fall 2013 semester completing 8 hours of observation in a partner school secondary English classroom. The students receive a specific document on which to record observations and reflections.

In Fall 2014, an additional field experience will be implemented in which candidates will teach a mini-lesson. This will be evaluated with a rubric that is currently under development and students will also write reflections of their own practice, content, skills, and pedagogy.
Health and Physical Education Methods and Resources II – Fall 2014 Mini-lesson

Candidates enrolled in this secondary Methods course already complete 10 hours of field experience observations. The additional mini-lesson requirement will begin in Fall 2014 and the assignment will be scored with a rubric. Students will also have opportunities for peer collaboration and critique of their practice.

Secondary Social Studies Education – Fall 2013 Observation and Fall 2014 Mini-lesson

Candidates enrolled in the Methods Course for this secondary program have begun this Fall 2013 semester completing 8 hours of observation in a partner school secondary social studies classroom. The students receive a specific document on which to record observations and reflections.

In Fall 2014, an additional field experience will be implemented in which candidates will teach a mini-lesson. This will be evaluated with a rubric that is currently under development and students will also write reflections of their own practice, content, skills, and pedagogy.

Music Education P-12 – Ongoing Field Experiences

Candidates enrolled in Methods & Resources I already complete 5 hours of observation and teach two music lessons in an elementary partner school. Candidates enrolled in Methods & Resources II also complete 5 hours of observation and teach one music lesson in a partner Jr. High.

The candidates collaborate with the music teachers at the partner schools to plan and present a unit of instruction with each candidate teaching a lesson. The instructor observes the lesson and completes a post-observation interview with the candidate to assist them in reflecting upon their own practice, skills, and pedagogy.

3.4 Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None noted in the offsite report

3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. An explanation is needed for how the unit assures candidates have diverse placements that increase their knowledge and skills.

2. Information or assurance is needed of prior diverse placements for candidates who complete their clinical experiences in non-partnership schools.
Response to 1 and 2

Every effort is made by the Education Coordinator to place candidates for field experiences in diverse P-12 partner schools through phone calls, emails, letters and face-to-face contact. The schools in our area are small and can only accommodate a certain number of placements. There is a much larger institution that is located nearby that places candidates in the schools that represent the most diversity in our partner schools. For that reason, we are sometimes denied access to the more diverse schools. Please see examples in the electronic exhibit room of denied attempts to place candidates in diverse settings (exhibit 3.5.1 Field Experience Placement Attempts).

Another factor in this issue is that due to being in a rural area, the schools that represent the most diversity are quite a distance from our campus. Some of these schools are a one hour drive from our campus one way. The condition of their vehicles, the cost of fuel, and the time between classes that they have to complete observations can make this a hardship for our candidates even if the schools can place them.

We are making efforts to partner with diverse schools for other projects, such as the WTEP Reading Project which is explained in this Standard 3 Addendum. For this reading project, our candidates are being transported to the partner school on a WBC bus.

3. The initial report stated that the WTEP has created scaffolded opportunities for candidates, however there is limited evidence of this. Examples of how these should be presented through interviews of faculty, candidates, cooperating teachers, and work samples.

Response to 3

The WTEP concur that the evidence for this will be best ascertained through interviews and work samples. In addition to that, please view the “Clinical Experience Schema” which shows the scaffolded levels that have been developed to demonstrate the progression of the teacher candidates’ growth and practice in the profession. The assignments that reflect this progression can be viewed in a chart format on the Field Experience Requirements website.

4. Clarification is needed as to the full criteria for P-12 mentor teachers, including the requirement for Pathwise training.

Response to 4

The criteria for P-12 mentor teachers is highlighted on the Partnership Agreement for Clinical Experience. The requirement for training in the Pathwise Mentoring Model is not specified on this document because this is the last year Arkansas will be using this model. No further trainings are being offered in this model. The new Arkansas Induction Mentoring Model (AIMM) will be implemented in all school districts across Arkansas in Fall 2014 according to a
commissioner's memo on the Arkansas Dept. of Education website. Two full time faculty members from WTEP will be attending an ADE training of trainers in February, 2014 and will then be qualified to train teachers in our partner school districts through the NEA Education Cooperative. These trainings in the new AIMM will begin in Spring and Summer 2014. At that time, WTEP will begin the transition of our partnership agreements to include the new Arkansas Mentor Qualifications.

5. Examples are needed for how evaluations of the P-12 mentor teacher and the unit supervisor have been used for continuous improvement and reflective practice.

Response to 5

The evaluations candidates complete for their mentor teachers and their supervisors are monitored closely to note patterns within the results over time. Those would be used to determine needs or future placement decisions. For example, if a faculty supervisor’s evaluations showed the need for further professional development in the Pathwise model, that PD would be provided to the supervisor.

The unit does not have specific examples because we have never had an issue arise. These evaluations are very positive.

Informal decisions for placement such as placing a candidate with a mentor that is strong in a certain area where the candidate has shown a weakness are sometimes made based on these evaluations, however these are not documented.

6. More information is needed related to collaboration between the unit and P-12 schools (other than placement decisions).

Response to 6

Collaboration with Baldwin Elementary for WTEP Reading Project

The WTEP is working with this partner school in the Paragould School District to improve the reading skills of students in grades 2-4. Twenty teacher candidates from WBC will be on the Baldwin Campus in October, 2013 in ten 2nd – 4th grade classrooms. The project was planned in conjunction with Principal Caroline Schenk and involves WTEP candidates teaching a whole group through a read aloud and extension activity that supports the candidate’s degree area and discipline. The classroom teachers at Baldwin will complete a post-lesson conference with the candidates to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and extension activity. Please see more in-depth details in the “Plans and Timelines” section of this Standard 3 Addendum. Additional evidence to support this collaboration are the e-mails between Dr. Brad Baine, instructor for the WTEP Study of the School course and Principal Schenk to further plan this
project after two face-to-face meetings had already occurred. These emails can be seen in the Electronic Exhibit Room via the Addendum link.

**Collaboration with Special Education in Partner Schools**

**Spring 11**

The WTEP faculty member that teaches the Adaptive Physical Education course collaborated with Special Education Director Colleen Sears in the Hoxie School District to allow teacher candidates to work with ELN students in a classroom setting. Teacher candidates worked with Hoxie students to implement strategies that had been modeled in the Adaptive Physical Education course.

**Spring 12**

WTEP faculty collaborated with Lawrence County Cooperative School for Exceptional Children located in Portia, Arkansas. This collaboration led to ELN students from the school being transported to the unit campus to participate in physical education activities. The teacher candidates set up activity stations in a circuit. ELN students participated by traveling to each station to complete the activities that WTEP candidates designed to meet the Arkansas Physical Education Frameworks.

**Spring 13**

Teacher candidates enrolled in the Adaptive Physical Education course completed classroom activities with ELN students in the Greene County Tech School District. The WTEP faculty member collaborated with Special Education teacher Kim Hollister at GCT.

**Collaboration with Area School Superintendents**

In the 2011-2012 school year, a WTEP faculty member spoke to area superintendents at the NEA Education Cooperative. He discussed the methods the WTEP is using to prepare teacher candidates for the 21st Century classroom including how the education technology program at WBC has advanced. There was a dialogue among superintendents and faculty about strategies for school improvement.

**Collaboration with the Bank of Pocahontas and Alma Spikes Elementary**

The faculty member that teaches ED 3243 Language Arts & Literature: P-4 collaborates with the Bank of Pocahontas and Alma Spikes Elementary School to teach economics to area second grade students through a program entitled “Teach Children to Save”. WBC students enrolled in
the aforementioned course use children’s literature and play money in a hands-on economics lesson that is designed to teach second graders to be “smart savers”. In addition to the lesson, each child receives a piggy bank with $1.00 in it from the Bank of Pocahontas. This collaboration allows our students a chance to design a lesson based on Arkansas Frameworks, implement the lesson in a school setting, and then reflect on student achievement and their own teaching practice.

**Grant Writing to Benefit Partner Schools**

Several faculty members have been involved in writing grants to benefit our partner schools and their teachers. The Northeast Arkansas Region Mathematics Partnership (4th - 8th grades) was formed by the NEARK Cooperative in October, 2006. WBC was part of this partnership to provide professional development to the teachers of NE Arkansas. A Math Science Partnership (MSP) grant focusing primarily on Geometry and Numbers and Operations was received to conduct ten-day summer institutes for thirty 4th - 8th grade math teachers in 2007-2009. Onsite visits were made twice a year in the classrooms of each participant by the training consultants.

The NEARK Region Mathematics Partnership received another MSP grant focusing on integrating science and mathematics in the high school. This was allocated to conduct ten-day summer institutes for thirty-two 9th -12th grade math and science teachers in 2008-2010. Onsite visits were made to the classrooms to observe or collaboratively conduct integrated lessons in math and science. The Partnership received an Enhancing Education Through Technology grant in 2007-2009 to begin an interactive technology imitative to train teachers and engage high school geometry students in innovative teacher-developed lessons utilizing the Interwrite pad technology. Through a partnership with WBC mathematics faculty and middle level education students, these Interwrite lessons were vertically aligned with the state SLE’s for mathematics.

A partnership was formed by Jonesboro Public Schools and WBC in 2007 to increase the content knowledge of math and math pedagogy for K-2nd grade teachers. Math content was delivered over the course of a three-year MSP grant in a series of three-hour monthly evening seminars for the nine month school calendar and a one week workshop in the summers. Onsite visits were made to each classroom twice a year.

Further evidence of collaboration can be seen in the Electronic Exhibit Room in the Standard 3.3.a exhibits.
Standard 4: Diversity

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement

2. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.

Rationale: There is no candidate diversity within the unit.

Response: The unit currently has two students of ethnic diversity. One student, a female Hispanic/Latino, and another student, a male African American, interviewed and were accepted into the Williams Teacher Education Program last spring 2013. These two students are also in leadership positions in our student-led Williams Educators Organization.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Evidence of a diversity plan that is implemented by the college, with implications for unit faculty and enrollment. Since the IR indicates under Standard 5 that several new unit faculty hires have occurred since the last NCATE visit, an explanation would be helpful as to how diversity initiatives were implemented in those hiring processes.

Response: Dr. Ken Startup, Vice President of Academic Affairs, will be available to speak to this issue with the BOE during the onsite visit.

2. Examples and evidence of the activities of the Minority Affairs Committee

Response: A word of clarification is in order regarding the Minority Affairs Committee (referenced in the original institutional report). That committee was, in fact, decommissioned in 2010. The administration determined to make this change in view of the reality that the committee’s functions were redundant. In fact, important diversity activities (e.g., Black History Month) and culturally-linked awareness-raising events (e.g., “world hunger nights”) and student/faculty involvement in intense cross-cultural engagement and contact (e.g., mission and ministry trips to inner city Memphis and New Orleans and to Haiti and Thailand) were all being guided very effectively by other departments and offices (e.g., Campus Ministries, Student Affairs, the Business and the History departments). It may be significant to note that in its ongoing attempt to avoid undue redundancy and duplication (and the concomitant dilution of institutional physical and fiscal capital) the college has most recently (2013) eliminated four additional standing committees.

In connection with the issue of diversity at Williams, it does certainly merit notation that the college has (January 2013) employed a full-time Director of International Recruiting. This individual has been tasked with the responsibility of bringing 100 (additional) international students to the Williams campus (within three years). To state the obvious, if this goal is – even partially – achieved the diversity of the Williams student body will be exponentially expanded. Even fifty additional international students will make the college even more dramatically distinct (in terms of diversity) than it already is -- when compared to the institution’s host community.
3. **Examples and evidence of activities of Black History Month**

**Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the office of Student Affairs will provide examples and evidence of activities of Black History Month.

4. **Evidence of who has been included as recent WEO speakers**

**Response:** WEO is a student lead organization that focuses on service learning. However, WEO dedicates at least one meeting session per year for a guest speaker from the P-12 setting. During the 2011-12 school year, Ms. Ethel Tompkins, Lawrence County Library staff member, spoke to the WEO students about the “Hoxie 21”, which occurred in 1955, two years prior to the “Little Rock Nine”. The “Hoxie 21” was the desegregation of the Hoxie School District. Ms. Ethel Tompkins was the first African American to graduate from the Hoxie School District.

Currently, diversity is evident through our WEO officers, with a Hispanic President (who is also the recipient of our Minority Scholarship) and an African American Vice President.

5. **Explanation of system to assure all students have diverse field experience**

**Response:** The Education Coordinator contacts area P-12 schools via email, letters, and phone calls to request placement of teacher candidates for field experience. An attempt is made to place teacher candidates in diverse schools; however, due to the competition of a much larger institution located in the most diversely populated region of our area, the WTEP is often denied access to this diverse population of P-12 students. In the electronic exhibit room, examples of placement attempts in diversely populated schools can be found (exhibit 4.5.5 Field Experience Placement Attempts).

6. **Demographics of all institution faculty**

**Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the office of Academic Affairs will provide the requested demographic information.

7. **Demographics of entire student body**

**Response:** During the BOE onsite visit, the office of Admissions will provide the most recent requested demographic information. In addition, the student body demographics as of October 1, 2012 can be found in the electronic exhibits room of the IR Addendum (exhibit 4.5.7 Student Body Demographics).

8. **Demographics of individual P-12 schools in which candidates have field placements or other field experiences, e.g. Gould School. (The exhibit should include clinical sites that are not included in the list of 22 partner schools.)**

**Response:** An updated list will be provided at the BOE onsite visit.
The nine “additions” to the Professional Education faculty made since the 2005 NCATE visit are composed of four faculty replacements within the WTEP and five faculty additions to the WTEP. The four replacements are faculty members who were hired in 2005 or later who have replaced former faculty/WTEP members. The five additions are faculty hired in 2006 or later who have not replaced former faculty/WTEP members but have been added to their number. Three of these WTEP additions are attributable to the College’s growing Physical Education Department. There are currently five Physical Education faculty who are members of the WTEP as opposed to only two in 2005. The remaining two additions to the WTEP are from the English and Education Departments.
Institutional Report Addendum

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.3 Areas for Improvement

AFI 1. The unit does not allocate adequate resources to support the professional development of faculty.

Rationale: The unit has been unsuccessful in providing additional resources in this area.

Response: Each department receives $500 per year for each full time faculty member. Most departments employ the same strategy in managing these funds. If one member of the department does not attend a professional meeting, his/her funds may be transferred to another member. For example, when one of the English department faculty presented a paper in San Francisco, another faculty member allocated his own development funds, enabling the first faculty member to attend.

Williams Baptist College is in a transitional period under the guidance of the new President, Dr. Tom Jones. Dr. Jones has encouraged the implementation of new sports programs which will generate more revenue through increased enrollment. However, the effects of these changes will not be recognized immediately, allowing an indefinite agenda for requesting additional funds.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. Faculty loads for teaching on campus generally exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching.

Rationale: The university standard for faculty teaching load is 27-28 hours a year. This exceeds the NCATE-recommended 12 hours for undergraduate teaching loads.

Response: An elaboration of Williams Baptist College’s policy on faculty teaching loads is warranted. The following is excerpted from the Williams Baptist College Faculty Handbook.

“The official teaching load is twenty seven to twenty eight semester hours per academic year, excluding summer school. Exceptions may be made where contract hours, lab hours, etc., warrant special consideration. Three laboratory hours or hours of private instruction are equated to two hours of lecture. Occasional overloads in one semester may be offset by load reductions in the next. Reductions in the teaching load may be allowed for certain activities
which make demands beyond those expected of each faculty member. Released time may be expressed in terms of equated hours or of percentages.

Overload pay will be paid to full-time teaching faculty when the faculty member's instructional work load for the academic year exceeds twenty-seven semester hours or twenty-eight semester hours for some faculty teaching in the Department of Natural Science. The rate of overload pay for the forthcoming academic year will be determined by the President and communicated to the faculty following the April meeting of the Board of Trustees. The rate for overload pay will specify a rate per instructional hour. The salary for courses of less than or more than three hours will be prorated on the basis of the salary for three credit hours.”

Even though occasional teaching overloads occur, faculty members are compensated and efforts are made to reduce future course loads.

6.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the visit

Response: As requested, interviews will be arranged with faculty, candidates, and administrators during the onsite visit in October 2013.