

Concordia University, Nebraska
NCATE Offsite Report – IR Addendum Response from the Institution

Revision – 03.14.13

Concerns articulated in the Offsite Report

Coding – 1.4 (1) indicates Standard 1, section 4, concern 1 of the report. “R” indicates the committee rationale for the concern. Page # refers to the page in the Offsite Report.

Concern articulated	Page #	Response	Data available
1.4 (1) The unit does not have evidence to ensure that candidates in all initial and advanced programs can demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. R- There is limited evidence related to knowledge, dispositions, and skills in the exhibits to verify how initial and advanced programs collect data on candidates in field experiences and other professional settings.	p. 7	<p>The knowledge, skills, and dispositions for initial and advanced candidates are articulated in the standards outlined in Nebraska Department of Education Rule 24 for the endorsements that Concordia offers. Reports on the endorsements can be found on the accreditation website (https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/) under Rule 24. Exhibits are included in each of the endorsement areas that were reviewed by the Nebraska Department of Education in July 2013.</p> <p>Data is collected from initial and advanced candidates on a regular basis as they move through their chosen program. At the initial level data is collected during all field experiences, at official admission to the teacher education program, prior to the professional student teaching semester, and prior to graduation.</p> <p>The Education Graduate Program Directors met on March 7, 2013 and discussed the implementation of checkpoints (to be three) for the self-evaluation of all graduate candidates in relation to the conceptual framework. The intent is to strategically place the evaluations at the beginning of the programs, the ending of the programs, and a midpoint in the programs. As most programs are two years in length, this system should assess candidates’ growth</p>	<p>Reports on the endorsements can be found on the accreditation website (https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/) under Rule 24.</p> <p>Evaluation forms for student teaching are located at www.cune.edu/st.</p> <p>The Instructor Evaluation of Student is used in Educ 101, Educ 201, and EDPS 210 - 1.4 (1) INSTEOS form</p> <p>The Long Form is used in the ECE Practicum and the Capstone Experience - 1.4 (1) TA CommEval B-Long</p> <p>Copies of additional evaluation forms will be available at the onsite visit.</p>

		over the two years. Implementation to take place in Fall of 2013.	1.4 (1) EDUC 425A Student Philosophy of Teaching ELLs 1.4 (1) EDUC 425A Students Perceived Changes in Skills Knowledge and Disposition
1.4 (2) The unit does not have evidence to ensure candidates in all initial and advanced programs know content and pedagogical content knowledge related to their professional standards. R- The unit primarily uses INTASC standards for all programs. No delineation of what content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge relevant to each program is defined or collected. Summative reports of Praxis I and II annual scores were not evident for all programs.	p. 7	<p>The professional standards of all endorsements are included in the Nebraska Department of Education Rule 24 standards and matrices which can be found on the accreditation website (https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/) under Rule 24.</p> <p>The Praxis I: PPST is required for admission into the teacher education program.</p> <p>The Nebraska Department of Education does not require a Praxis II license exam for certification, but for elementary and early childhood candidates does indicate on their teaching certificate that they are “highly qualified” if the candidate has received a passing score on the Elementary Education Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment test (EECIA).</p> <p>The institution doesn’t individually require the completion of a Praxis II content or pedagogy exam for middle level or secondary education candidates.</p> <p>Content proficiency is determined based on GPA and also by departments on unique assessments outlined in the Rule 24 folios found on the accreditation website under Rule 24.</p>	<p>Nebraska Department of Education Rule 24 standards and matrices can be found on the accreditation website (https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/) under Rule 24.</p> <p>Praxis I: PPST scores for program completers over the past five years are included in this document: 1.4 (2) Praxis I</p> <p>Praxis II: EECIA scores for program completers over the past five years are included in this document: 1.4 (2) Praxis II EECIA</p> <p>A document comparing the GPAs of teacher education program completers in secondary education endorsements with those of candidates completing an associated Bachelor of Arts program at the institution are included in this document: 1.4 (2) TE BA GPA Comparisons</p>

1.4 (3) The unit has not identified where dispositions are assessed for advanced candidates. R- No evidence could be found to support assessing advanced candidates' dispositions.	p. 8	<p>The four disposition statements that are part of our Conceptual Framework at the advanced level are:</p> <p>T-D1: Passion for Teaching The graduate candidate demonstrates a passion for teaching and motivation to spread the Gospel and/or strengthen the child's value system as evidenced in preparation and performance in his/her classroom.</p> <p>T-D2: Personal Characteristics The graduate candidate displays positive personal characteristics such as respect for others, dependability, punctuality, perseverance, appropriate sense of humor, social awareness, organization, management of paperwork, personal appearance and hygiene, and energy and health.</p> <p>LD-D1: Character / Faith Development The graduate candidate models a value system which emphasizes moral and ethical character; the Lutheran school teacher integrates faith and learning while modeling Christian mission and service according to the doctrines and teachings of the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod.</p> <p>LR-D1: Lifelong Learning – InTASC 9 Reflection and Continuous Growth The graduate candidate can articulate the value of lifelong learning and has implemented a professional development plan.</p> <p>Candidate performance in the disposition areas is most evident in their admissions essay and in their portfolio artifacts especially as it relates in InTASC Standard 9.</p>	<p>ESL/ELL advanced candidates 1.4 (3) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy Sample 1</p> <p>1.4 (3) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy Sample 2</p> <p>Education Administration candidates 1.4 (3) Ed Admin 1</p> <p>1.4 (3) Ed Admin 2</p> <p>Literacy candidates 1.4 (3) Literacy 1</p> <p>1.4 (3) Literacy 2</p>
1.4 (4) The unit does not seem to have instructional technology performances. R- Limited evidence reflects initial or advanced	p. 8	<p>Technology skills were included in coursework for teacher education candidates. Candidates prepared a powerpoint presentation for Teaching as a Profession and also in Introduction to Education. In 2009-2010 the unit assessed technology instruction and use by faculty and candidates. This was followed by a technology assessment in 2010-2011. The results are</p>	<p>Technology Assessment 0910 1.4 (4) Technology Assessment 0910</p> <p>Technology Assessment 1011 1.4 (4) Technology Assessment 1011</p>

candidates' use and reflection on the use of technology.		<p>included in the attached documents.</p> <p>The need to articulate what technology performances were required resulted in the addition of Instructional Technology - Educ 346 as a pilot course in the spring 2012 and its inclusion as a requirement for candidates beginning in fall 2012.</p> <p>Instructors in advanced programs and courses were surveyed on their use of technology in the classroom and also the requirements of candidates to use technology. Results are included.</p>	<p>Instructional Technology – Educ 346 syllabus</p> <p>1.4 (4) Syllabus - Educ 346 Instructional Technology</p>
1.4 (5) The unit has not disaggregated data for initial and advanced programs in early childhood. R- All data for early childhood are aggregated by endorsement area.	p. 8	<p>The advanced level Early Childhood program includes candidates who are adding the endorsement to their teaching certificate and those who are pursuing the Master's degree with an emphasis on early childhood education and already have the endorsement. The data was not disaggregated for those who are seeking the endorsement.</p> <p>Data for initial level program completers in early childhood is not coded individually to allow for disaggregation. A data set was disaggregated manually with information from the 2012 program completers with scores on their conceptual framework composite results.</p>	<p>1.4 (5) ECE Program Assessment 2011-12</p> <p>1.4 (5) ECE UG TED data summary</p>
1.4 (6) The unit does not disaggregate data for the advanced programs by delivery (sites or online). R- Most data are aggregated by each advanced program.	p. 8	<p>Disaggregated data for the graduate entrance essay and the portfolio evaluations (completed summer of 2012) are included in the documentation.</p>	<p>Entrance Essays: 1.4 (6) Graduate Entrance Essay Scores by Program 2012</p> <p>Ed Admin Portfolio Review 1.4 (6) Ed Admin Summary June 2012</p> <p>Literacy Portfolio Review 1.4 (6) Literacy Summary June 2012</p>

<p>2.4 (1) The unit does not regularly and systematically collect and use advanced candidate performance data to make changes and improvements in its programs and unit operations. R- The data are not consistently collected and aggregated, making it difficult to systematically analyze and evaluate performance data.</p>	<p>p. 10</p>	<p>Literacy – In February 2012 a proposal was made and accepted for the inclusion of two more courses in the program. This change was made as a result of feedback from instructors and from advanced level candidates in the program. The document is included.</p> <p>In spring 2011 the research course required of all advanced candidates was modified. The documentation of this change is included. Dr. Tonjes and Dr. Elwell were instructors of the course. Dr. Smallfoot was the Ed Admin program director.</p>	<p>2.4 (1) Literacy Proposal - Feb 2012</p> <p>2.4 (1) Rationale for development of Educ 594</p>
<p>2.4 (2) The unit lacks a system that includes a comprehensive set of evaluation procedures for monitoring candidate performance at the initial and advanced levels. R- The unit has redesigned the assessment system and assessment instruments. It has based assessment instruments on the conceptual framework, has developed an effective electronic data collection system to</p>	<p>p. 11</p>	<p>The Teacher Education Data system was developed by the unit and the computing services department of the institution. The purpose was to provide a systematic way to collect data relevant to the fifteen teacher performance areas of the Conceptual Framework. All initial candidate evaluations completed by cooperating teachers, instructors, university supervisors, and the candidates are coded to the Conceptual Framework. An executive summary is included.</p> <p>Data is accessed by the Dean prior to a candidate's admission interview. The data is also reviewed and analyzed at an annual retreat after the conclusion of the academic year. Reports can be generated for aggregated and disaggregated data analysis.</p> <p>A systematic procedure for collection of data on advanced</p>	<p>2.4 (2) TED Data Summary 201220</p> <p>2.4 (2) TED Collection Cycle</p> <p>2.4 (2) TED - Mapping (to adequately view this you will have to expand the view to 400%)</p>

store and analyze the data, and seems to have trained faculty in how to use the assessment tools and the electronic assessment system. Efforts are being made to monitor and advise candidates and to make changes in programs and the unit.		candidates has not been fully developed.	
2.4 (3) The unit has not provided evidence that the assessment systems design and evaluation has had any P-12 involvement. R- The unit has not demonstrated involvement of its professional community in regularly evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system.	p. 11	<p>The TED assessment system was shared with the area school administrators at the annual Administrators Luncheon. Input was not specifically sought at that time but was considered if shared.</p> <p>The Education Governance Committee was reinstituted in fall 2012 after a 2-year period of inactivity. Composed of faculty, students, and representatives of partner schools, the committee reviews teacher education programs, policies, and procedures. Kevin Kromminga, secondary education director, chairs the committee. Other members include Beth Pester (middle level director), Sr. Mary-Catherine (principal of St. Vincent DePaul School), Kirk Gottschalk (Seward Middle School principal), Amanda Abbott (middle level candidate) and David Lindeman (elementary candidate). Dr. Ron Bork, dean, is an ex officio member.</p> <p>The Graduate Council is an elected body that consists of graduate faculty in Education and in Arts and Sciences. Members include Jim Bockelman (Arts and Sciences-Art), Molly Fitzke (Graduate-Nursing), Paul Holtorf (Arts and Sciences-Theology), Kristy Jurchen (Arts and Sciences-Science), and Annette Oliver (Education-ECE). Ex Officio members include the Deans of the Graduate College, College of Education, and College of Arts and Sciences as well as</p>	<p>2.4 (3) Administrators' Luncheon 2011</p> <p>2.4 (3) Administrators' Luncheon 2012</p> <p>2.4 (3) Administrators' Luncheon Program 2012</p> <p>2.4 (3) ED Governance Meeting 1-30-2013</p> <p>2.4 (3) ED Governance Meeting Minutes 1-30-2013</p>

		<p>the Provost.</p> <p>Other involvement of professionals outside the unit and institution include practicum mentors in schools throughout the area working with advanced candidates, use of adjuncts to read and evaluate portfolios, and the use of adjuncts from neighboring districts as instructors in the advanced programs.</p>	
3.4 NO CONCERNS			
<p>4.4 (1) Opportunities for candidates at the advance level to interact with diverse P-12 students. R- From the information presented in the IR, it appears that some advanced candidates will have limited opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students. Further evidence needs to be examined to determine the unit's expectations for these candidates to experience working with diverse students outside of their regular classroom.</p>	p. 18	<p>Advanced candidates are generally practicing educators and will have very limited opportunity to observe and interact with other P-12 students beyond their own classroom. Teachers' Union contracts limit professional and personal days. Advanced candidates are hesitant to use vacation days for field experiences and generally don't have enough days to complete any extensive field experience requirements.</p> <p>Data on the diversity of the 7 largest districts from which candidates come – Omaha Public (132 candidates), Lincoln Public (20), Millard Public (13), Elkhorn Public (11), Papillion-La Vista Public (8), Grand Island Public (7), and North Platte Public (4) – is included in the documents.</p>	<p>4.4 (1) Diversity Data from ELL Practicum Sites</p> <p>4.4 (1) Faculty Student Diversity - Advanced Locations</p>

5.4 NO CONCERNS			
6.4 (1) Load credit hours for most education faculty exceed 24 hours for the academic year. R- Only two of the eleven full-time education faculty had 24 hours or less for the 2011-12 academic year.	p. 25	<p>Concordia University does not include administrative load weight or independent study load weight in the calculations used to determine teaching load weight for a semester and academic year. In consideration of this, the institution also recognizes that continually going over the 24-hour limit with all responsibilities is not conducive to effectively carrying out the assigned duties of the faculty member/administrator. Administrative load weights are determined by the institution and have varied over the years depending on duties assigned. A clarification document is included.</p> <p>Not all College of Education faculty members instruct in teacher education courses. Dr. Mark Blanke and Professor Tim Rippstein fall in this category and should not have been listed on the original load weight document.</p> <p>A survey was done by Nebraska Department of Education to determine state-wide inclusion of duties in determining load weight. That document is attached.</p>	<p>6.4 (1) Clarification of Load Weight for Faculty</p> <p>6.4 (1) Load Survey - NDE</p>

Evidence to verify ... requested by Offsite Team

Coding indicates the section and item number in that section along with the request, unit response, and evidence to support the response.

Section	Request	Response	Evidence
1.5 (1)	Program Improvement Plans: Initial	<p>The two literacy classes – Educ 461 and Educ 470 – include a capstone experience which was revised. Information is included in the attachment. This revision was made with input from the instructor and members of the unit.</p> <p>A Christian Teacher Diploma option was added for candidates wishing</p>	<p>1.5 (1) Capstone Experience</p> <p>1.5 (1) Christian Teacher Diploma</p>

		<p>to teach in a Christian school (non-LCMS).</p> <p>A new department was added to the College of Education at the request of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. Information on the scope of the department is included in the attachment.</p> <p>Technology use by instructors and candidates was the focus of our assessment efforts in 09-10 and 10-11. Information on the assessment is included in the two documents. We used a survey method to gather information from candidates, people in the field, and instructors in the unit. This data resulted in adding Instructional Technology – Educ 346 – to our initial program.</p>	<p>1.5 (1) Department of Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages</p> <p>1.5 (1) Technology Assessment 0910</p> <p>1.5 (1) Technology Assessment 1011</p> <p>1.5 (1) Educ 346 Instructional Technology</p>
1.5 (1)	Program Improvement Plans: Advanced	<p>Literacy – In February 2012 a proposal was made and accepted for the inclusion of two more courses in the program. This change was made as a result of feedback from instructors and from advanced level candidates in the program. The document is included.</p> <p>In spring 2011 the research course required of all advanced candidates was modified. The documentation of this change is included. Dr. Tonjes and Dr. Elwell were instructors of the course. Dr. Smallfoot was the Ed Admin program director.</p>	<p>1.5 (1) Literacy Proposal</p> <p>1.5 (1) Rationale for development of Educ 594</p>
1.5 (1)	Ed Admin rubric: Advanced	<p>This comment comes from Dr. Bob Smallfoot, Ed. Admin. Program director: “For Ed Admin I am starting at the beginning by determining that the curriculum map is correct. Then I will work with the faculty to insure that our courses consistently cover the same material and expect the same standards of student performance based on the curriculum map and course goals and objectives. Once we agree on student work that addresses course goals and objectives we can determine the appropriate artifacts for program assessment. Then, we will develop the rubric to assess the program. This should prevent</p>	

		the problem that we had in summer of 2012 when we had portfolios and rubrics mismatched. As of February 22, 2013 the curriculum map has been drafted and is being distributed to faculty via a Blackboard virtual Faculty Workroom. Faculty feedback and agreement upon the curriculum map/course goals and objectives is expected by mid-March. We hope to have agreement on student assignment and course artifacts by early April.”	
1.5 (1)	Literacy rubric: Advanced	<p>The instructor of the practicum class, where the literacy rubric is used for the Literacy Portfolio and the program director are reviewing the rubric and supporting documents (Rule 24, Vita requirements, and class expectations).</p> <p>This is an area for continued improvement.</p>	
1.5 (2)	Courses in the disciplines aligned with content knowledge standards – initial and advanced	<p>Coursework in all of the endorsement disciplines is aligned with professional standards. These standards are included in the Rule 24 matrices that are part of our Nebraska Department of Education program review at the state level. Access to the matrices for each program is available on our accreditation website.</p> <p>Advanced - Rule 24 outlines the standards required for all of the endorsements offered by an institution of higher education in the state of Nebraska. The standards in Rule 24 align with national professional standards in the subject and administrative areas.</p>	Information on the endorsement matrices is available at: https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/ under Rule 24.
	Data to support candidates meeting criteria at various transition points	There are four points for entry and continuation in the initial program – admission to teacher education, admission to student teaching, completion of student teaching, and application for graduation. At each point the candidate’s qualification to meet the requirements is checked by the appropriate officials – Dean, advisor, Registrar, director of field experiences, etc. – verify the candidate’s status to begin, continue, or complete the program.	1.5 (2) Admission to Teacher Education Form 1.5 (2) Checkpoint #2 1.5 (2) Application for Admission to Student Teaching

			1.5 (2) Graduation Application
	Program portfolios	<p>In the fall of 2012 the unit moved to an electronic portfolio format. Program directors review the portfolios at two points in the candidate's program – admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching. Portfolios can also be reviewed prior to graduation. The candidate provides the portfolio link to prospective school district employers for their review.</p> <p>The portfolios are at various stages of development since the process was just started in fall 2012 and graduating seniors were given the option of continuing with their binder portfolio or moving to the electronic portfolio. A sample of program portfolios is included.</p>	<p>To access candidate portfolios use the following link with the candidate's name (first and last without any other punctuation)</p> <p>http://wp.cune.org/katelynsievert Katelyn Sievert - elementary Rachael Oetting – elementary Connie Ketner – middle level Sarah Sprague – middle level Kathleen Bergt – secondary Austin Albers – secondary Erin Walth – special education Malissa Carey – special education Kassandra Lower – early childhood Kelsey Martinez – early childhood</p>
1.5 (2) Advanced	Professional Standards alignment	Rule 24 outlines the standards required for all of the endorsements offered by an institution of higher education in the state of Nebraska. The standards in Rule 24 align with national professional standards in the subject and administrative areas.	<p>Reports on the endorsements can be found on the accreditation website (https://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/) under Rule 24.</p> <p>1.5 (2) C and I Courses and the INTASC Standards</p>
	Advanced programs – expert in their field	NCATE Standard 5 on Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development indicates that professional faculty members have an earned doctorate or exceptional expertise in the field in which they teach. All of the full-time and adjunct instructors in the advanced programs meet this qualification.	1.5 (2) Faculty Qualifications Table

	<p>Practicum feedback for advanced candidates</p>	<p>Practicum mentors complete an Ed Admin Mentor Appraisal form for their mentee. This data is collected and analyzed by the program director. Currently item averages are calculated for each cohort. Comparisons are made between individual candidate scores and cohort averages for each item. Comparisons of cohort averages are made amongst the various cohorts over time. Ed Admin mentor appraisal results are included in the document.</p> <p>Two examples of the ESL Practicum candidate mentor form are included.</p> <p>Candidates evaluate each course and instructor at the end of the course. Evaluations are completed electronically and are available to the instructor, the program director, and the dean. The site is password protected. A demonstration can be given during the site visit.</p>	<p>1.5 (2) ADM Mentor Appraisal Results</p> <p>1.5 (2) ESL Practicum Candidate Completed Mentor Form 1</p> <p>1.5 (2) ESL Practicum Candidate Completed Mentor Form 2</p>
	<p>Advanced candidate use of data and research</p>	<p>Two examples from the ESL program are included along with the syllabi for the research component in Educ 594 and in the practicum courses.</p> <p>A link is also included to selected Curriculum and Instruction portfolios.</p>	<p>1.5 (2) Academic Research Article Review and Application 1</p> <p>1.5 (2) Academic Research Article Review and Application 2</p> <p>1.5 (2) CI Portfolio sites</p> <p>1.5 (2) Syllabus - Ed 594</p> <p>1.5 (2) Educ 581-582 syllabus</p> <p>1.5 (2) EDUC 590 Practicum Syllabus</p> <p>1.5 (2) Ed 568 Practicum syllabus</p>

1.5 (2) Advanced	Advanced candidate support of student learning	Each program includes a practicum that focuses on the implementation of learning into the practical classroom or school setting. Practicum logs are kept by candidates to document their experiences. Practicum instructors review the logs as part of the teaching/ learning process.	1.5 (2) ELL Practicum Portfolio1 1.5 (2) ELL Capstone Portfolio
	Program portfolios	Links to example portfolios are included.	1.5 (2) CI Portfolio sites 1.5 (2) Grad Portfolio ADM-OESep09A-Student #1 1.5 (2) Grad Portfolio ADM-OESep09B-Student #3 1.5 (2) Grad Portfolio LMR-FBSep09-Student #1 1.5 (2) Grad Portfolio LMR-OLFeb10-Student #1
1.5 (3)	<p>Dispositions – how do we assess fairness and the belief that all students can learn</p> <p>Initial program candidates' dispositions prior to ST</p>	<p>Assessing the belief that all students can learn probably falls best under Student Development (T-K1) and Diverse Learners (LD-S2).</p> <p>We have four dispositions in our Conceptual Framework – Passion for Teaching (T-D1), Personal Characteristics (T-D2), Character/Faith Development (LD-D1), and Lifelong Learning (LR-D1). The last one is linked to an InTASC Standard (9-Reflection and Continuous Growth).</p>	<p>Information on T-K1, LD-S2, T-D1, T-D2, LD-D1, and LR-D1 is included in the narrative and charts in our spring 2012 Teacher Education Data summary document.</p> <p>1.5 (3) TED Data Summary 201220</p> <p>Data in the following chart summarizes performance by candidates in elementary, middle level, secondary, and music education disaggregated also by Lutheran (L) or public (P) education candidates.</p>

			1.5 (3) TED Cohort Analysis This chart includes cohort information disaggregated by year and by major 1.5 (3) TED Data Chart
	Dispositions – how do we assess fairness and the belief that all students can learn? Advanced candidates' disposition assessment What data indicate their proficiency?	Educational Philosophy statements are part of coursework in Contemporary Thought in Education – Educ 501 and are expanded on within individual programs. Examples of philosophies are included. The Education Graduate Program Directors met on March 7, 2013 and discussed the implementation of checkpoints (to be three) for the self-evaluation of all graduate candidates in relation to the conceptual framework. The intent is to strategically place the evaluations at the beginning of the programs, the ending of the programs, and a midpoint in the programs. As most programs are two years in length, this system should assess candidates' growth over the two years. Implementation to take place in Fall of 2013.	1.5 (3) Developing Your Education Philosophy Statement 1.5 (3) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy 1 1.5 (3) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy 2 1.5 (3) Philosophy of Teaching ELLs
1.5 (4)	Instructional technology – teaching, assessing, and reflecting on candidate use Initial level	Technology use by instructors and candidates was the focus of our assessment efforts in 09-10 and 10-11. Information on the assessment is included in the two documents. We used a survey method to gather information from candidates, people in the field, and instructors in the unit. This data resulted in adding Instructional Technology – Educ 346 – to our initial program. The link includes candidate work from Educ 346 for the fall semester of 2012.	https://sites.google.com/site/spr2012educ346/home 1.5 (4) Student Blog Post on Use of Technology with ELLs
	Instructional technology – teaching, assessing,	Special Education - The classes, to date, have used webinars, researched reviews, attended conferences (Midwest Law Conference and Midwest Behavior Disorders Symposium and Nebraska Autism	1.5 (4) Graduate Program Technology Use

	and reflecting on candidate use Advanced level	<p>Conference), written briefs on law cases, used INCLUDE - a web-based system to include students in general education, and used the SRS system (State of Nebraska computerized IEP system).</p> <p>The attached chart has technology use at the advanced level by course.</p> <p>Other evidences of the use of technology by instructors and candidates are also included.</p>	<p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=zdqEjcXjmXE</p> <p>CUNE Instructional Technology & E-Learning Facebook site</p> <p>1.5 (4) ENG 530 evidences for technology</p> <p>1.5 (4) The Big Deal ebook Rubric</p> <p>1.5 (4) Use and Evaluation of Technology Big Deal eBook Review 1</p> <p>1.5 (4) Use and Evaluation of Technology Big Deal eBook Review 2</p>
1.5 (5)	Disaggregated data for TWS by discipline and program	Data for the Teacher Work Sample was not disaggregated by discipline prior to the fall of 2012. During summer of 2012 the TWS was revised and at that point data was disaggregated. Prior data was only disaggregated by elementary (elementary and early childhood) or secondary (secondary and middle level).	<p>1.5 (5) TWS disaggregated by endorsement</p> <p>1.5 (5) TWSScores 09-12</p>
	Capstone Experience Feedback	The capstone experience has been formalized in the past academic year and now includes a greater distinction in the data that is being collected. Data was also disaggregated by content area and endorsement in fall 2012 (Capstone Data).	<p>1.5 (5) Capstone Narrative</p> <p>1.5 (5) Capstone Data</p> <p>1.5 (5) UG Foundational knowledge quiz 461</p> <p>1.5 (5) UG Foundational knowledge quiz 470</p>

1.5 (6)	Employer and graduate survey results	<p>The Dean keeps in contact with new teachers over a 1-3 year period via e-mail. During second semester of the candidates first year of teaching a request is sent to complete the Conceptual Framework evaluation both by the new teacher and by his/her administrator. This has resulted in low response rates over the years even after second and third reminder requests.</p> <p>This past spring a request was made on our facebook page for similar data again with limited response.</p> <p>The accompanying chart indicates the candidate (teacher) and administrator scores for the evaluations that were returned over the past three years.</p>	1.5 (6) Administrator Evals 09-11
2.5 (1)	Inter-rater reliability: Initial	Unit faculty members discuss the evaluation forms and come to consensus on the descriptors used in the evaluations. No formal study has been done on inter-rater reliability at the initial level.	
	Inter-rater reliability: Advanced	<p>The portfolio review process was formalized in the summer of 2012 and included adjuncts from the literacy and ed admin programs as readers. Dr. Bob Smallfoot read a number of the portfolios in addition to having the adjuncts read them. A one-hour orientation was conducted by Barb Perlewitz, C&I director, prior to the reading. No formal analysis or correlation was done to determine inter-rater reliability, however scores across the portfolios appeared to be consistent.</p> <p>This was the first time that the reading was done by a group.</p>	
2.5 (2)	How do we eliminate bias and insure accuracy and fairness?	Unit faculty members discuss the evaluation forms and come to consensus on the descriptors used in the evaluations. No formal study has been done on inter-rater reliability at the initial level.	

	How do we eliminate bias and insure accuracy and fairness?	<p>From Barb Perlewitz, C&I director ... "So far, I have been the only one reviewing C&I Portfolios. Students are required to submit a self-evaluation of their Portfolio when they submit it, and I use the same evaluation form for my evaluation (see attached). I tabulate the results so candidates can see how what they posted and I posted are the same or differ with an explanation of my results."</p> <p>Candidates are also given a set of guidelines when they begin building their portfolio with examples of what should be included for each standard (see attachment)</p> <p>During the portfolio reading/review session names were removed from Portfolios before given to the readers. Also, readers were not assigned students that were in cohorts taught by the reader(s).</p>	<p>2.5 (2) Portfolio Artifact Self-Assessment Form</p> <p>2.5 (2) Portfolio Artifacts Suggestions</p>
2.5 (3)	How is data shared with faculty, candidates, and stakeholders? Process and frequency	<p>The unit faculty members discuss data in May each year analyzing the information from the TED system.</p> <p>The TED data can also be accessed on an individual candidate by unit faculty members. A demonstration of that will be available at the visit. The data is password protected.</p> <p>TED data is also shared with the Education Governance Unit on a regular annual basis.</p> <p>At the advanced level we have an annual summer adjunct workshop to share data, provide professional development in technology, and to meet as program adjuncts to discuss common concerns.</p>	<p>2.5 (3) TED Data Summary</p> <p>2.5 (3) ED Governance Meeting 1-30-2013</p> <p>2.5 (3) ED Governance Meeting Minutes 1-30-2013</p>
2.5 (4)	How is the assessment system evaluated by the professional community?	<p>The Teacher Education Data System was shared with the local administrators at the fall meetings. It was also a topic of discussion with the Education Governance Unit.</p>	<p>2.5 (4) ED Governance Meeting 1-30-2013</p> <p>2.5 (4) ED Governance Meeting Minutes 1-30-2013</p>

2.5 (5)	Comprehensiveness of assessments as it relates to an integrated set of evaluation measures	Data is collected at multiple locations and from multiple sources for initial candidates. The data collection cycle is explained in the document. Sample forms are included as documents. Other forms can be accessed on our student teaching website.	2.5 (5) TED Collection Cycle 2.5 (5) INSTEOS form 2.5 (5) TA CommEval A-Short 2.5 (5) TA CommEval B-Long 2.5 (5) CF Evaluation Form Evaluation forms for student teaching are located at www.cune.edu/st .
	Comprehensiveness of assessments as it relates to an integrated set of evaluation measures	Candidates complete an entrance essay that is read and evaluated. They also develop a portfolio that is assessed at the end of their program. Assessment of the portfolios is based on guidelines and a rubric (attached)	2.5 (5) Admission Essay Rubric 2.5 (5) Graduate Entrance Essay Scores 2.5 (5) Ed Admin Portfolio Rubric 2.5 (5) Ed Admin Portfolio Assessment Guidelines 2.5 (5) Literacy Portfolio Rubric 2.5 (5) Literacy Portfolio Assessment Guidelines
2.5 (6)	Changes and improvements made as a result of analysis of data	Technology use by instructors and candidates was the focus of our assessment efforts in 09-10 and 10-11. Information on the assessment is included in the two documents. We used a survey method to gather information from candidates, people in the field,	2.5 (6) Technology Assessment 0910 2.5 (6) Technology Assessment 1011

		<p>and instructors in the unit. This data resulted in adding Instructional Technology – Educ 346 – to our initial program.</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample was revised in summer 2012 to more closely reflect the process being taught in the Literacy courses and used in the Capstone Experience. The rationale and the new rubric are included as documents.</p>	<p>2.5 (6) Educ 346 Instructional Technology</p> <p>2.5 (6) TWS Changes and Rationale</p> <p>2.5 (6) TWS Rubric</p>
	Changes and improvements made as a result of analysis of data	<p>Literacy – In February 2012 a proposal was made and accepted for the inclusion of two more courses in the program. This change was made as a result of feedback from instructors and from advanced level candidates in the program. The document is included.</p> <p>In spring 2011 the research course required of all advanced candidates was modified. The documentation of this change is included. Dr. Tonjes and Dr. Elwell were instructors of the course. Dr. Smallfoot was the Ed Admin program director.</p>	<p>2.5 (6) Literacy Proposal - Feb 2012</p> <p>2.5 (6) Rationale for development of Educ 594</p>
2.5 (7)	Formal complaints	A summary of action on concerns is included in the attached document. Additional information is available in the dean's office.	2.5 (7) Formal Actions on Complaints
2.5 (8)	FERPA	Entering candidates are asked to sign a FERPA (Buckley Amendment) document upon enrolling at the institution. That information is available to faculty members through the Banner system listed in the Student Information – General of the system. This information is password protected and can be demonstrated at the onsite visit.	
2.5 (9)	Granularity of the characteristics	Granularity of the characteristics is an indication of the relative importance of the data collected compared to the number of times that information is provided in the evaluations. A review of the two attached documents indicates that the collection of data is “out of balance”. A review of the evaluation forms will be completed in summer 2013 in order to align importance with data collection frequency.	<p>2.5 (9) Teacher Education Data - Mapping</p> <p>2.5 (9) Teacher Education Data (2) - Mapping</p>

2.5 (10)	Improvements based on data	The same as 2.5 (6) above	
2.5 (11)	UbD model	A description of our Capstone Experience is included along with a link to the general description of the Understanding by Design philosophy which is available at: http://www.authenticeducation.org/ubd/ubd.lasso	2.5 (11) Understanding by Design UbD
2.5 (12)	Growth in dispositions over three years	<p>The four disposition statements that are part of our Conceptual Framework at the advanced level are: T-D1: Passion for Teaching T-D2: Personal Characteristics LD-D1: Character / Faith Development LR-D1: Lifelong Learning – InTASC 9 Reflection and Continuous Growth</p> <p>The Growth over Time chart shows growth in all 15 areas of the Conceptual Framework from admission to the program through graduation. Data was gathered from a cohort that graduated in 2012.</p> <p>At the advanced level candidate performance in the disposition areas is most evident in their admissions essay and in their portfolio artifacts especially as it relates in InTASC Standard 9.</p>	2.5 (12) Growth over Time - CF 2.5 (12) Graduate Professional Vita 2.5 (12) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy 1 2.5 (12) ESL Practicum ELL Teaching Philosophy 2 2.5 (12) Ed Admin 1 2.5 (12) Ed Admin 2 2.5 (12) Literacy 1 2.5 (12) Literacy 2
3.5 (1)	Collaboration with school partners in field experiences: Initial	<p>Administrator luncheon, contacts with administrators for placement, and field experience orientations done by school administrators are important ways in which we involve our local partners. Attendees at the last two administrator luncheons are included in the documents.</p> <p>Ongoing conversations with cooperating teachers and supervisors and evaluations of ST done by the candidates assist the unit in providing quality clinical experiences.</p>	3.5 (1) Administrators' Luncheon 2011 3.5 (1) Administrators' Luncheon 2012 3.5 (1) Heartland Summit Participants

		Concordia hosted the Heartland Summit, a gathering of over 60 secondary education administrators and education professionals from throughout the Midwest.	
	Collaboration with school partners in field experiences: Advanced	In the Literacy program the practicum instructor is the mentor and works with candidates in the school placement activities. In the Educational Administration program the mentor is an administrator in the building.	
3.5 (2)	Use of data to evaluate field experiences and clinical placements: Initial	Exit interviews at the initial level are conducted by the program directors. Further information on those interviews can be gathered during the onsite interview with program directors.	
	Use of data to evaluate field experiences and clinical placements: Advanced	Practicum mentors complete an Ed Admin Mentor Appraisal form for their mentee. This data is collected and analyzed by the program director. Currently item averages are calculated for each cohort. Comparisons are made between individual candidate scores and cohort averages for each item. Comparisons of cohort averages are made amongst the various cohorts over time. Ed Admin mentor appraisal results are included in the document. C&I completes a 100 hour practicum in the field mentor feedback is part of the overall candidate and program evaluation.	3.5 (2) Your Mentor and You 3.5 (2) Mentor Vita Form 3.5 (2) Mentor Appraisal Form-Ed Admin 3.5 (2) ADM Mentor Appraisal Results 3.5 (2) Mentor Feedback Form1 3.5 (2) Mentor Feedback Form 2
3.5 (3)	Preparation of school faculty for	A Handbook for Cooperating Teachers and Supervisors is available online at the student teaching website.	3.5 (3) Coop-Univ-Supv-Manual

	their role as mentors and supervisors of candidates	The unit also has a handbook for adjunct instructors that provides pertinent information for them.	3.5 (3) Adjunct Handbook
3.5 (4)	Process to track required and appropriate learning experiences	Field Experiences are recorded by the Field Experiences office. Information can be obtained by instructors, program directors, and by the candidate upon request of the Field Experience administrative assistant. This information becomes part of the candidate electronic portfolio.	3.5 (4) Field Exp Stats 2009-2010 3.5 (4) Field Exp Stats 2010-2011 3.5 (4) Field Exp Stats 2011-2012
3.5 (5)	Feedback to candidates from coops and supervisors	Initial candidates have weekly meetings during their first student teaching (clinical) placement and also complete Weekly Activity Reports (WARs) that include teaching activities, positive and negative experiences and a place for comments. The WARs are continued during the second student teaching placement and are read by the university supervisor and the program direct.	The form for Weekly Activity Reports is located in the student teacher section at www.cune.edu/st .
	Use of data to improve field experiences	See 3.5 (2) above	
3.5 (6)	Procedures for supervision, observation, and follow-up with out-of-state candidates: Initial	At the initial level all candidates are placed in schools that meet the Nebraska Department of Education requirements – conducted in schools accredited by NDE or in out-of-state schools accredited by another state agency in a similar manner, in accredited English-speaking schools in other nations or in non-public schools that are accredited by a recognized state or national process. Supervisors for all student teacher candidates are selected from qualified candidates and are employed by the university. Their responsibilities are outlined in the Cooperating and Supervisors Handbook found online.	The Cooperating Teacher and Supervisor's Handbook is located in the university supervisor section at www.cune.edu/st . 3.5 (6) Assignment Schedule - 2nd Quarter 2012-13 3.5 (6) Assignment Schedule - 3rd Quarter - 2012-13 3.5 (6) Assignment Schedule - 4th Quarter 2012-13

	Procedures for supervision, observation, and follow-up with out-of-state candidates: Advanced	The Practicum instructor receives information and feedback from the candidates. Each practicum experience is documented on a Practicum Experience form. Practicum Mentors sign off on each experience and complete the Mentor Appraisal form at the end of the Practicum.	3.5 (6) ADM Mentor Appraisal Results
4.5 (1)	Individual tracking of candidates in field experiences – diversity placements	<p>Field Experiences are recorded by the Field Experiences office. Information can be obtained by instructors, program directors, and by the candidate upon request of the Field Experience administrative assistant. This information becomes part of the candidate electronic portfolio.</p> <p>All initial candidates are placed in a diversity experience. Most of these are at People's City Mission in Lincoln where they tutor students after school or work with the Camp Edify program in the evening. The 2011-2012 statistics chart specifically lists People's City Mission as a field experience site.</p>	4.5 (1) Field Exp Stats 2011-2012
4.5 (2)	Diversity data for advanced candidates – LD-S2	Advanced level candidates are not racially or ethnically diverse. Recruitment of candidates in diverse school districts continues on a regular basis. Advanced candidates complete their field experiences and practicums in their own buildings. Diversity information on candidates and districts is included in the attached documents.	4.5 (2) Diversity Data for ELL Practicum Placements 4.5 (2) Faculty Student Diversity - Advanced Locations 4.5 (2) Candidate Diversity
4.5 (3)	Review rubrics in determining the scoring for LD-S2	Evaluations of and by candidates on the 15 teacher performance areas of the Conceptual Framework are completed on a 5-point likert scale including proficient, expanding, basic, developing, and novice.	
4.5 (4)	Electronic portfolios for initial candidates	In the fall of 2012 the unit moved to an electronic portfolio format. Program directors review the portfolios at two points in the	To access candidate portfolios use the following link with the

		<p>candidate's program – admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching. Portfolios can also be reviewed prior to graduation. The candidate provides the portfolio link to prospective school district employers for their review.</p> <p>The portfolios are at various stages of development since the process was just started in fall 2012 and graduating seniors were given the option of continuing with their binder portfolio or moving to the electronic portfolio. A sample of program portfolios is included.</p>	<p>candidate's name (first and last without any other punctuation)</p> <p>http://wp.cune.org/katelynsievert Katelyn Sievert - elementary Rachael Oetting – elementary Connie Ketner – middle level Sarah Sprague – middle level Kathleen Bergt – secondary Austin Albers – secondary Erin Walth – special education Malissa Carey – special education Kassandra Lower – early childhood Kelsey Martinez – early childhood</p>
4.5 (5)	Interviews with candidates on diverse interactions	These interviews will be conducted during the onsite visit.	
4.5 (6)	Diversity of candidates in the program	Data on candidate population at the initial and advanced level is included in the document including initial level entering classes for the past two years and the campus population. Data on the advanced (GR) programs is included at the end of the document.	4.5 (6) Diversity Information - CU Candidate Population
4.5 (7)	Diversity of adjunct faculty	<p>There is limited diversity among the advanced level instructors, however they do teach courses in most programs affording candidates the opportunity to interact with diverse faculty.</p> <p>We found 7 ethnically/racially diverse instructors who taught 17 courses for us over the last three years. They taught courses in the core, ed admin, literacy, ESL, and C&I (not ECE unless they were in a core subject)</p>	4.5 (7) Ethnically Diverse Instructors - Advanced Programs
4.5 (8)	How the unit	The unit views diversity broadly including ethnic/cultural diversity,	4.5 (8) Faculty Student Diversity -

	assures that all candidates at the advanced level have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students	<p>socio-economic status (based on free/reduced price lunch), English Language Learner population, and special education needs. The charts included indicate the percentages of students in each of those categories. These seven districts are those with the largest candidate population in our advanced programs.</p> <p>Advanced candidates complete their field experiences and their practicum in their own school building.</p>	Advanced Locations 4.5 (8) Diversity - School Districts - Advanced Candidates
5.5 (1)	Interviews on quality of faculty, teaching methods, use of technology, attention to diversity	These interviews will be conducted during the onsite visit.	
	Interviews on quality of faculty, teaching methods, use of technology, attention to diversity	This will be part of the interviews on Sunday afternoon and Monday afternoon.	
5.5 (2)	Interview faculty about professional development, technology, diversity, support for teaching, impact their students have on P-12 learning	<p>These interviews will be conducted during the onsite visit.</p> <p>Jennifer Lotz and Anna Boriack are examples of two adjuncts who have taken advantage of the opportunity to do coursework at Concordia University at a reduced rate.</p>	
5.5 (3)	Artifacts used in faculty evaluation	Unit faculty members complete the Pillars form indicating activities in which they have been involved in the areas of outreach, in-reach,	5.5 (3) Faculty Pillars

		academics, and scholarship. This document becomes a point of discussion as the department chair or Dean meets with the faculty member.	
5.5 (4)	Unit faculty classroom visits and P-12 visits	Visits will be arranged for Monday morning of the onsite visit.	
6.5 (1)	<p>How has Education Governance changed?</p> <p>What is the broader representation of constituent groups mentioned in the IR</p>	<p>The Education Governance Committee was reinstituted in fall 2012 after a 2-year period of inactivity. Composed of faculty, students, and representatives of partner schools, the committee reviews teacher education programs, policies, and procedures. Kevin Kromminga, secondary education director, chairs the committee. Other members include Beth Pester (middle level director), Sr. Mary-Catherine (principal of St. Vincent DePaul School), Kirk Gottschalk (Seward Middle School principal), Amanda Abbott (middle level candidate) and David Lindeman (elementary candidate). Dr. Ron Bork, dean, is an ex officio member.</p> <p>Formal and informal partnerships have been developed schools in the area, across the United States and internationally. These are most evident in the placement of student teachers.</p> <p>At the advanced level a significant partnership has been developed with the Omaha Public Schools for the ESL/ELL endorsement program and for the Para-Educator to Teacher program. All of these programs are beneficial to the unit and to the partner. All include significant input from the partner school/district.</p>	<p>6.5 (1) OPS Para Educator Proposal</p>
6.5 (2)	Budget comparisons with other departments	The information on budgets was provided by Tammy Wissing, Accounting, Finance and Operations, Controller.	<p>6.5 (2) CU Education Budget Summary 09-12</p> <p>6.5 (2) CU Budget Comparisons by Department</p>

6.5 (3)	Impact of 6.4% of the budget being spent for 40% of the student body	The information on budget comparisons with other departments will hopefully answer the question. Candidates receive all of their content instruction from members of the other departments so the cost for the total educational program of candidates is not just allocated to the education department.	
6.5 (4)	Collaboration between College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences	The Deans of Education, Arts and Sciences, and Graduate College meet regularly with the Provost as the Academic Leadership Team (ALT). Common concerns are shared and discussed, future plans are discussed, and consensus is reached. The cooperation between colleges, departments, and faculty members is evident in the joint work that is done to prepare young people for the teaching profession.	
6.5 (5)	Education faculty load	The document included here lists the load weight for all faculty at the institution for fall 2012. This is typical load weight for a semester. The highlighted faculty members are in the College of Education, but not all of them are instructors in the teacher education program.	6.5 (5) CU Faculty Loadweight Fall 12
6.5 (6)	Impact of faculty load on candidates	Information will be gathered in interviews	
6.5 (7)	Evidence of technology training for faculty	<p>Angie Wassenmiller serves as our e-Learning and Instructional Technology director. The document outlines some of the recent opportunities for faculty technology training.</p> <p>Online course instructors are required to complete the Quality Matters (QM) training to provide consistency in the development and presentation of online coursework.</p>	6.5 (7) Technology Training
6.5 (8)	Education faculty and professional development funds	Only 4 unit teacher education faculty members were eligible for professional development funds. Faculty members without an earned doctorate are eligible to receive tuition grants for advanced	6.5 (8) Professional Development Funds

		study. Funds are available for all faculty to attend professional conferences in their discipline or area of leadership.	
6.5 (9)	Are resources for distance learning programs sufficient to provide reliability, speed, and confidentiality of connection	<p>This summary was provided by Dr. Kent Einspahr, Co-Dean of Information Technology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are using the current version of Blackboard as our Learning Management System. - The operation of the Blackboard LMS is monitored 24/7. - We have a 400 Mbit internet connection. - A helpdesk system for reporting problems is also monitored. - Both IT staff and instructional technology staff handle questions and problems from students or instructors and monitor the helpdesk. - The instructional technology department offers training and support. - The IT support staff are experienced teachers who use Bb for their own courses. - We have a robust process in place to distribute passwords to the correct person and to handle resets securely. - The Blackboard system 	
6.5 (10)	The link to the education budget was not working 6.3.f.3	The link has been fixed. It can also be accessed at this link.	6.5 (10) Budget - Education Dept.