Concordia University, Nebraska
Institutional Report – 2013
Onsite Visit – April 14-16, 2013

Explanation of Attachments: Attachments are coded to the section of the report. 1.3.a would indicate that the exhibit is in Standard 1, element 3, and is exhibit a. "I" indicates an exhibit in the Introduction. The entire report is also available at http://wp.cune.edu/accreditation.

Standard 2 – Assessment System

In 2009 the unit developed a Teacher Education Data (TED) system that is used to collect data on initial candidates in the teacher education program. All data collected is coded to the Conceptual Framework which is aligned with InTASC standards and Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) standards. Data is collected at multiple points during the candidate's program. Data is collected from instructors, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and the candidate. Each year a summary of data collected is shared with unit faculty members, institution administration, and constituents. Over 400 individual pieces of information are collected on each candidate during his/her time in the program. 2.1.a-b Conceptual Frameworks UG and GR, 2.1.c-e Teacher Education Data (3 documents)

The Conceptual Framework for the advanced level is also aligned to the InTASC standards, Nebraska Department of Education standards and professional standards for the field - Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) for administrators, National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) for early childhood candidates, and International Reading Association (IRA) for literacy candidates.

Instructors are asked to evaluate the program on an annual basis. Information for the initial programs is shared with the faculty. Information for the advanced programs is shared at the summer adjunct seminar and also with advanced level program directors. 2.1 f Graduate Instructor Comments, 2.1.g Grad Adjunct Seminar (video)

When data is analyzed, the unit checks for consistency over time and inter-rater reliability among evaluators. With candidates receiving evaluations from multiple instructors, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors the unit believes that bias is eliminated and that fairness and accuracy are insured.

Data collection for initial candidates begins with the first course in the education program and continues through field experiences, additional coursework, student teaching, and post-

graduation evaluation. Instructor evaluations of candidates are done in five different core courses in the program. Four candidate self-evaluations are completed - at admission, prior to student teaching, prior to graduation, and during the candidate's first year teaching. The cooperating teacher and university supervisor complete an evaluation during each of the candidate's two student teaching placements. The capstone experience and teacher work sample are evaluated. The candidate/graduate's administrator completes an evaluation during the first year of teaching. 2.1.h TED Data Collection

The Teacher Education Data system provides information on individual candidates that is available to unit faculty members through the campus Banner access system. The data for individual candidates can be accessed by faculty members. Aggregated and disaggregated data can be requested from the computer services department. Data can be disaggregated by program and delivery method. The annual faculty retreat includes time to review the data for programs and cohorts of candidates. A faculty member has been designated as the coordinator of TED data. Because the system was recently put in to place, no significant changes have been made to it. The collection of data has been systematized with minor changes in how it is entered into the system. 2.1.i TED Executive Summary, 2.1.j TED Analysis

A TED data summary for an individual candidate includes averages for each of the 15 teacher performance areas of the Conceptual Framework and the number of data entries for that area. This has allowed us over time to see which areas of the Conceptual Framework are being evaluated and which ones need additional input. Many of the areas are connected to the capstone experience, the teacher work sample, and the two student teaching experiences, especially those designated as teaching skills. 2.1.k TED Data - Student Report

Information on unit operations and program effectiveness is gathered during exit interviews in initial programs and as part of instructor questionnaires and graduate evaluations in advanced programs. Questions address the practicum experience as well as strengths and concerns with the program. 2.1.f Graduate Instructor Comments, 2.1.l Graduate Evaluation Survey

The unit considers a complaint to be "formal" when one of three things happens: a candidate submits that complaint in writing to the unit, a parent schedules a meeting with an administrator to lodge a concern involving his/her candidate/child, or a teacher or administrator from one of our practicum sites contacts the unit concerning a candidate. Concerns and formal complaints are addressed first by the instructor and/or program director. 2.1.m Formal Complaints

Candidate proficiency and professional growth is addressed at the initial level when the instructor or program director makes note of a concern in the TED system. This note only indicates that a concern was raised. Additional information is kept in a confidential candidate

file. This system can also be used to record unit faculty member concerns about candidates thus providing a "paper trail" on the candidate. A process has been developed, Using Assessment Data for Student Intervention, that indicates data entry points, minimum evaluation scores, and the sequence of meetings to address candidate improvement in the specific areas identified. 2.1.n Using Assessment Data for Candidate Intervention

Initial contact involves the candidate and instructor or program director. If a resolution is not reached then the Dean becomes involved. That can be followed by an appeal to the Provost and eventually, if needed, to the President. If students wish to appeal being denied admission or being removed from any program, a written appeal may be addressed to the Commissioned Ministers Appeal Committee through the Undergraduate Council. 2.1.o Candidate Appeals Options

Advanced candidates all complete a portfolio which is connected to state and national standards in the profession. The portfolio is a requirement for program completion and is intended to demonstrate the candidate's learning and proficiency in their area of endorsement. Portfolios were informally read from 2010-2012. In the summer of 2012 a formal reading process was introduced. Eight instructors from the program were chosen to be readers for the literacy and educational administration portfolios. Early childhood portfolios were also evaluated in a separate meeting. 2.1.p-w Advanced Program Evaluations

2.2.a Standard on which the Unit is moving toward Target

The Teacher Education Data system (TED) was developed by the unit and information is regularly shared with the Education Governance Committee on results and analysis. During the last academic year the unit has begun to see the benefits and weaknesses of the system. The most useful function is that TED allows individual candidate information to be accessed in order to work with them on a qualitative basis of their individual evaluation report. The major weakness which we have noted is an imbalance in the granularity of the characteristics measured. Also candidates are placed in a cohort based on their starting semester so there are inherent challenges with transfer students. There is no way to account for the variety of ways in which candidates can move through the program. 2.2.a.a TED Data Summary

We have noticed trends in the aggregate data that we believe will reveal useful information. As this data is connected to the curriculum mapping currently in progress we believe that we will be able to determine if the observed trends represent real differences which can be impacted by curriculum and instruction. This will be an ongoing focus of the unit and the Education Governance Committee. 2.2.a.b College of Ed Curriculum Mapping

Individual candidate performance can be evaluated at any point in time. Strengths and areas for improvement can be easily identified using a comparative score analysis. While individual faculty members cannot generate aggregate or disaggregate reports the staff in computing services is very responsive and will generate reports within 24 hours upon request. Individual candidate performance is evaluated by the candidate, instructors, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. Nearly 400 individual pieces of data are entered over the course of candidate's program. 2.2.a.c Teacher Education Data - Mapping, 2.2.a.d TED Mapping (2), 2.2.a.e TED Mapping (3), 2.2.a.f Teacher Education Data Collection Cycle

The teacher work sample was first implemented in 2003 and is executed during Student Teaching I. The Capstone experience was implemented in 2010 and is typically executed one year prior to student teaching. The Capstone experience, associated with Literacy Instruction, Assessment, and Intervention (Educ 461-elementary and early childhood) and Content Area Literacy (Educ 470-middle level and secondary), introduces candidates to the Understanding by Design planning paradigm and equips them for success in planning units in this way. Once students completed the Capstone experience and the coursework in Educ 461 or Educ 470, the teacher work sample during Student Teaching I seemed like a step backwards in unit planning expectations. It lacked the overarching planning and assessment expectations that the Understanding by Design (UbD) model highlights in order to achieve conceptual understanding for students. In response to the need for consistency of assessment procedures, the teacher work sample changes in the format and expectations which will be implemented beginning in the fall of 2012 reflect the UbD model and require candidates to complete pre/post assessment analysis to determine student learning growth. The combination of these two components in the new teacher work sample increases the expectations for our student teachers and requires them to reflect heavily on the teaching/learning process. We feel that the teacher work sample changes demonstrate consistency in expectations and planning paradigms within the education program, creating a more fluid experience for our students. 2.2.a.g TWS Scores 09-12, 2.2.a.h TWS Scoring Rubric, 2.2.a.i Candidate KSD - Capstone Data, 2.2.a.j Capstone Information (5 docs), 2.2.a.k TWS Changes and Rationale

Data on program completers is requested of the candidates and their administrators in their first teaching position. Response has not been at a level that would provide for confident decision-making based on those responses. 2.2.a.l Administrator Evals

While moving toward target in Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation – is focused more clearly on the initial level programs, there are small steps being made in advanced level programs. The curriculum mapping project at both levels will assist the unit in looking holistically at advanced level programs and align them more closely with state and

national standards. The practicality of including advanced level candidates in the TED system will be explored. 2.2.a.l.2 Ed Admin Curriculum Mapping (in progress)

At the advanced level a study has been conducted on candidate persistent to graduation. The study was conducted in the summer of 2012.   Data was disaggregated by program, by cohorts within each program, by delivery method, by type of admission (fully admitted, provisionally admitted, or expedited admission), and by recruiter. We recruit within our own institutional staff and also have contracted with a professional recruiting service since 2009. The first analysis of data raised issues for further study in the areas of transition from admission in the graduate college to registering for the first class, consistency of our data compared to other institutions, determination of best practices and transfer of those into other programs, differentiation of the types of candidates interested in different programs and the effects of that on persistence, and how the data from this study can serve as benchmarks for future goals and decision-making. 2.2.a.m Graduate Persistence Report