

This IR Addendum is organized by the six NCATE standards and provides MSUM response to each area noted as concern in our Offsite Report as well as additional evidence. The report also includes hyperlinks to the [Teacher Education Accreditation/Self Study](#) page as well as other information found on the MSUM website.

Standard One

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The unit does not provide evidence concerning revisions to the advanced program in Curriculum and Instruction.

Rationale: Details of new assessments (assessment requirements, rubrics and data) are not available for review.

MSUM Response: “The Master of Science degree in Curriculum and Instruction provides candidates with both a theoretical base and opportunity for practical application within the areas of educational foundations, curriculum theory, instructional best practices, and educational research. The core required courses provide not only a theoretical base, but an opportunity to conduct action research in the classroom with the purpose of providing a solid research base that is appropriate for the P-12 teacher who seeks a means by which to increase student achievement. In addition to the core, students must select a 13-15 credit emphasis in one of the following areas: Teacher Leadership, Literacy, Special Education, TESL, Technology, or Kodaly.” (Graduate Studies Website)

A dedicated page to the [Curriculum and Instruction Program](#) has been created on our Accreditation/Self-Study website. On this page, key summative assessments aligned to standards, data, and rubrics are posted for the C & I Core along with each area of emphasis. Data on advanced candidate performance for the C & I degree program were presented in Exhibit 1.4.d. These data represent six key assessments identified for the C & I program in the Teacher Education Assessment System. [Program Requirements for the Master of Science Degree in Curriculum and Instruction](#) are published on the Graduate Studies website. Syllabi for all advanced coursework are published at this link [Advanced Program Syllabi](#). Dr. Mike Coquyt, Coordinator of the C & I Master’s Degree program and Dr. Boyd Bradbury, past coordinator, will be available during the onsite visit to provide additional information about the program.

2. The unit does not provide evidence regarding assessment of candidate dispositions. Rationale: Details of dispositions assessment are not presented for advanced programs (except for Special Education). Additionally, the dimensions for initial program dispositions are presented in Exhibit 1.4.e but the instrument seems to have different dimensions to those for which data are reported.

MSUM Response: Assessment of dispositions is conducted for all initial licensure candidates using common instrumentation. [Exhibit 1.4.e](#) of the IR Report included a

dispositions assessment instrument but the criterion in that instrument did not match the criterion for performance in the two data tables within the document (Spring and Fall 2012). When the cooperating teacher provides evaluation of dispositions he/she does this within DIARY (the teacher education data management system). Incorrect information was pulled from DIARY for communicating the instrument within the exhibit, however, the data communicated in Exhibit 1.4.e includes the correct criteria for evaluation of initial candidates.

In [Exhibit 1.4.d](#) Advanced Program Data, dispositions assessment data are reported for Special Education graduate licensure candidates. This evaluation represents assessment information while candidates are enrolled in graduate practicum. The dispositions assessment instrument was revised for special education advanced candidates Spring of 2014. The change occurred as only candidates who currently hold a MN teaching license are admitted into Special Education Graduate licensure programs. Almost all candidates hold special education teaching positions and are either adding an additional special education license and/or are working on a variance from the state. The variance is three-year conditional license issued by the MN Department of Education when a school district is unable to hire a licensed teacher for a position. Hundreds of variances are granted each year for special education in Minnesota. As we worked with candidates who were already holding teaching positions, we found the dispositions assessment used for initial licensure did not convey the depth of assessment of the InTASC dispositional standards that we considered important for advanced candidates. Fall 2013, special education faculty developed a revised instrument aligned to the InTASC standards and this dispositional assessment was administered Spring 2014. Pages 11-14 of the Advanced Degree Program Data presents the first data gathered with the new instrument.

Currently, we do not collect dispositions data for the C & I Master's Degree candidates or the TESL graduate licensure candidates. The C & I program does not include a field experience. These candidates have a MN teaching license and almost all currently hold a teaching position. Programmatic discussions are occurring about adding a field component to the C & I Master's Degree program and if developed, the dispositions assessment used for advanced special education candidates would be adapted and adopted as a Key Assessment.

The TESL graduate licensure program has a field experience (i.e., ED 694V Internship, 4 cr). This field component has not been offered since development of the advanced candidate dispositions assessment. The instrument has been reviewed with Dr. Linda Houts-Smith, TESL coordinator and the assessment will be in inserted into DIARY and used for assessment beginning the Spring Semester 2015.

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

- 1. Can the unit provide a clear list of the seven key assessments for initial licensure programs and six for advanced programs (IR p.5)? Exhibit A is somewhat*

confusing, as is the IR narrative from pages 5-8.

MSUM Response: [Exhibit 2.4.a.d](#) identifies the key assessments for initial and advanced programs. Page one of the exhibit communicates the mission for the teacher education assessment system as well as the process for administration. Pages 2-4 identify the key assessments for initial licensure programs. Pages 5-6 communicate the key assessments for advanced degree programs and pages 6-11 identify the key assessments for graduate licensure programs. Within each program, Key Assessments are aligned across phases of the assessment process.

2. *What information can the unit provide regarding revisions to the advanced program in Curriculum and Instruction in terms of candidate understanding of content, pedagogy and assessment of student learning? What assessments address which areas of weakness (i.e. AFIs)? Are data available to support removal of the AFIs?*

MSUM Response: In 2011 a follow-up visit was conducted to review the AFIs for the Curriculum and Instruction Master's Degree program and the evidence submitted supported approval. Since that visit, leadership for coordination of the C & I program as well as leadership for self-study and accreditation of MSUM teacher education programs have changed resulting in revisions to the assessment system with seven key assessments utilized for initial licensure programs and six for advanced programs. [IR Addendum, Exhibit I Assignments](#) identifies assessments utilized to assess candidate performance in a) understanding pedagogical content, b) understanding of theories related to pedagogy and learning, c) understanding of instructional strategies, d) understanding of technology to promote student learning, and e) understanding of assessing student learning and rubrics to evaluate these assignments are located in IR Addendum [Exhibit II C & I Rubrics](#). The [syllabi](#) for the C & I courses provide further detail of these curriculum components.

3. *Can the unit provide early data from new assignments (identified on page 10 of the IR) in other advanced level programs (Special Education, TESL)?*

MSUM Response: Data for advanced programs are reported in [Exhibit 1.4.d](#). The table reports data for both Special Education and TESL. Signature Assignments were added as a Key Assessment Fall 2013 when the Teacher Education Assessment System (TEAS) was developed.

4. *Can the unit provide missing Exhibits 1.4.f (dispositions data), 1.4.j (employer feedback) and 1.4.m (alignment of graduate assessments with NBPTS)? (Initial program dispositions data are reported in Exhibit 1.4.e but the components of the instrument are different to those for which data are reported (see above comment)).*

MSUM Response: Dispositions data are reported for initial licensure program in [Exhibit 1.4.e.f. Dispositions Assessment](#). Dispositions data are reported for Special

Education graduate licensure programs in [Exhibit 1.4.d Advanced Degree Data](#). Dispositions data have not been collected on candidates in the C & I Master's Degree Program or the TESL program (further explanation in Standard 1, AFI 2).

[Exhibit 1.4.j](#) is active and provides data on initial licensure candidates as rated by employers after their first year of teaching. Currently, we are not gathering follow-up data on advanced candidates but have drafted a plan to collect this Phase IV data.

Exhibit 1.4.m (missing in our initial report) has now been added and is noted as [IR Addendum Exhibit 1.4.m](#).

Explanation of dispositions assessment has been provided in Standard One, AFI 2 (please see above).

[IR Addendum Exhibit I Assignments](#) communicates assignments within the C & I program that align to the content area of: a) understanding pedagogical content, b) understanding of theories related to pedagogy and learning, c) understanding of instructional strategies, d) understanding of technology to promote student learning, and e) understanding of how to assess student learning as well as alignment to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

STANDARD TWO

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The unit does not provide clear evidence on how it uses the data generated from its assessment system to improve the performance of candidates, the unit and its program.

Rationale: It appears that the unit has made significant progress in refining the assessment system for both initial and advanced candidates. However, the unit presented limited documentation to show how it uses the data from assessments to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

MSUM Response: Leadership for MSUM self-study and accreditation for teacher education changed in Fall 2013. Previous to this, the assessment coordinator held "data days" to inform faculty and program coordinators of data leading to discussions for continual improvement. The current assessment coordinators, Dr. Sue Severson and Dr. Ximena Suarez-Sousa, have worked with the assessment committee to revise the assessment system as well as the process for reviewing data and developing continual improvement plans. The Teacher Education Assessment System (TEAS) is now used for gathering program data and a faculty fall retreat is held for teacher education faculty where data are disseminated, discussed and used for continual improvement. The [Teacher Education Fall Retreat](#), initiated Fall 2014, provides opportunity for faculty teaching in programs within STL to collaborate with Secondary/K-12 faculty who reside in other colleges.

In June of 2014, all MSUM teacher education licensure programs were due for renewal with the MN Board of Teaching. The MN Board of Teaching has just initiated a new renewal process, Program Effectiveness Reports for Continuing Approval (PERCA) that requires each approved licensure program to review data with content area advisory groups and develop two-year programmatic goals. Membership for each of these advisory boards is identified in [IR Addendum Exhibit III Licensure Advisory Boards](#). The two-year goals set by each licensure program as reported in the PERCA process are reported in [IR Addendum Exhibit IV Program Goals](#).

Additionally, during the MSUM Professional Development Day, time was designated for teacher education faculty to meet. The majority of time at the [Professional Development Day, Teacher Education Session](#) was dedicated to review of the new CAEP standards as Dr. Severson and Dr. Suarez-Sousa had recently attended the CAEP Conference in Washington, DC. Discussion focused on types of modifications that will need to occur to the Teacher Education Assessment System to align to the CAEP standards.

The College of Education and Human Services has dedicated resources and time to self-study. Recent discussion has occurred around the new regulations proposed for teacher preparation by the US Department of Education. We realize the connection between these proposed regulations and CAEP requirements and are invested in assuring evaluation of our program is in alignment.

During our next Fall Teacher Education Retreat we will again distribute performance data to each teacher education program, allow time for review, provide opportunity to develop progress reports on previous goals and establish new goals for continuing improvement.

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

1. *Does the ACT/SAT score replace the MTLE Basic Skills Tests? If so what are the required scores? (CAEP recommendations for future years are clear, but not anything that would be Minnesota Code.)*

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit V MN Board of Teaching Memo](#) communicates the guidelines for implementation of utilizing ACT/SAT in the teacher preparation process in Minnesota.

The Selective Admittance and Retention into Teacher Education (SARTE) process has been adjusted to accommodate ACT/SAT as an alternative assessment for the Basic Skills MN Teacher Licensing Exam (MTLE) but the documents have not yet been loaded to the SARTE website. The revised SARTE process will be available during the onsite review.

2. *Can the unit provide samples of unit assessments, including signature assignments*

in both Initial and Advanced programs, both Initial and Advanced Cooperating Teacher Disposition Assessments, Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation, edTPA, Supervisor Survey and Transition to Teaching Survey, and Faculty Assessments as evaluated by Candidates?

MSUM Response: Work samples for signature assignments and other assignments aligned to MN Board of Teaching Standards are available at [Work Samples](#) (username: cehsaccred; password: Moorhead14). As work samples are still being gathered, additional examples of candidate performance will be available during the onsite visit.

Examples of completed dispositions assessments and cooperating teacher final evaluations will be made available during the onsite visit by the team who reviews DIARY, the data management system utilized by teacher education programs at MSUM.

Completed [Transition to Teaching Surveys](#) (candidate responses after first year of teaching) and [Supervisor Surveys](#) (principal ratings of first year teachers) are linked.

A web developer from IT services is working on determining a way for sample edTPAs to be loaded to our Accreditation/Self-Study website.

3. *Was the fall of 2013 the initiation of the unit's new assessment system? Is there more than one year of data available from signature assessments?*

MSUM Response: With changes to assessment coordination in August 2013, the Teacher Education Assessment System was revised and the Signature Assignments were added as key assessments. Data were initially gathered on these assessments Fall 2014. Additional data for [Spring 2014](#) are now available. We are in the process of gathering Fall 2014 data and have revised the process to allow instructors to enter scores directly into DIARY.

4. *What evidence can the unit provide regarding involvement of P-12 educators in the evaluation and refinement of the assessment system?*

MSUM Response: Prior to Spring 2014 the assessment committee was a committee of the School of Teaching and Learning and therefore Secondary/K-12 teacher education faculty were not involved as these programs are housed in colleges outside the College of Education and Human Services. During Fall Semester 2013, the Teacher Education Assessment Committee was proposed as a University Committee so that faculty outside of STL could be included. The committee structure was approved by the university and invitation was extended for membership by the President of the Interfaculty Organization (IFO). The focus of the committee has been on the Teacher Education Assessment System as well as planning for faculty review of data and development of continual improvement plans (i.e., Fall Faculty

Retreat, Teacher Education session at University Professional Development Day). Planning to add advisory members from the P-12 system is occurring. Membership of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee is noted as [IR Addendum Exhibit X Assessment Committee](#).

Data gathered from the Teacher Education Assessment System have been shared with P-12 partners in two ways. First, prior to submission of licensure programs to the MN Board of Teaching for program renewal, each licensure program met with their advisory board that included P-12 partners and reviewed data to develop program goals. Membership of these advisory boards by program are reported in [IR Addendum Exhibit III Licensure Advisory Boards](#).

Secondly, the Dean's Advisory Committee meets quarterly to seek input from P-12 partners regarding educational issues faced by the P-12 system as well as advisement for MSUM programming. [Agendas and meeting minutes](#) demonstrate topics of discussion along with advisory from P-12 partners.

5. *Were all programs renewed in the September Board of Teaching meeting?*

MSUM Response: The PERCA reports for program renewal were submitted to meet the MN BOT May 4, 2014 deadline. However, the new EPPAS data management system implemented by the BOT during Spring of 2013 slowed down the process for BOT review and approval of programs as first the programs had to be entered into the EPPAS system, then institutions were required to wait for BOT review and approval before submitting the program renewal report. As 14 institutions were entering programs into the EPPAS system at one time, BOT staff had difficulty keeping up with the reviews. Therefore, some of MSUM licensure programs received full approval while other approvals were extended until January, 2015. [Memos](#) from the BOT communicate the status of full approval vs extension.

However, on January 6th JoAnn VanAernum, state consultant sent an e-mail indicating:

All the programs are fully approved, as listed in EPPAS....so no worries.

*JoAnn Van Aernum
Teacher Education Specialist
Minnesota Department of Education
Minnesota Board of Teaching
651-582-8866*

6. *Are there agendas or other records of meetings available in which faculty reviewed the candidate assessment data and made decisions based on that review?*

MSUM Response: Meeting minutes show that data have been reviewed with the [Dean's Advisory Council](#). Teacher education faculty members are also members of

the council.

Prior to renewal of licensure programs with the MN Board of Teaching licensure, program coordinators were required to meet with content area advisory boards to answer two program renewal questions that are included in the Program Effectiveness Reports for Continuing Approval (PERCA).

These two questions were:

Identify the constituent groups, including representatives from partner schools, practicing public school teachers licensed in the content area, faculty with content expertise, and unit faculty, that collaborate with the unit faculty in the regular and systematic evaluation of this program. Provide a description of their role. (max 8000 chars.)

Describe how the program has used data reported above in items 1-4 to further develop continuous improvement plans and to set goals for the next two years. (max 8000 chars.)

Unfortunately, meeting minutes were not gathered from these advisory meetings. However, PERCA reports, where these questions were answered, were submitted to the MN Board of Teaching and as noted in question 5 above, all programs have now been renewed.

STANDARD THREE

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern are identified for this standard.

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

1. *In Exhibit 3.4.b under ELED Inclusive with SPED there is “ ? Weeks in special education placement” in the clinical practice column. Should there be a number identified for placement?*

MSUM Response: [New Exhibit 3.4.b](#) has been corrected.

2. *What disaggregated data can the unit provide in the chart in Exhibit 3.4.g. on candidates' performance at midterm and final on the cooperating teacher evaluation form? (The chart only gives the InTASC standard/attribute for Spring 2013.) What information can the unit provide to distinguish between entering program data and exiting program data?*

MSUM Response: A new exhibit has been loaded into the AIMS site and is titled [NEW Exhibit 3.4.g](#). This exhibit is an excel document and disaggregated data can be found by linking to the tabs at the bottom of the document. We are unsure what is meant by “what information can the unit provide to distinguish between entering

program data and exiting program data” but will try to provide further information during the onsite review.

3. *What information can the unit provide to clarify its description of field experiences for advanced programs (IR, page 26 under “Graduate Licensure Programs”)? (The description would align better with clinical practice and not field experiences.)*

MSUM Response: A summary of field experiences/practicum for advanced programs is provided in [IR Addendum Exhibit VI, Advanced Field Experiences](#).

4. What clarification can the unit provide concerning field experiences and clinical practice for each program? (See Exhibit 3.4.b., which does not clearly display field experiences and clinical practice for each of the 23 initial and 3 advanced programs.) Can the unit provide a chart clarifying clinical and field experiences for different programs?

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit VI, Elementary Education Field Experiences](#) details the embedded field experiences that are required of the elementary education initial licensure candidates. [IR Addendum Exhibit VI, Special Education Field Experiences](#) details the embedded field experiences within the Special Education program as well as the field components of the Twin Cities Special Education program.

5. *What information can the unit provide to clarify how many schools the unit actually has a partnership with in each district with which it collaborates?*

MSUM Response: The unit has formal contracts with each school district that is used for field experiences and clinical experience. These contracts are renewed every 3 years.

School partners where we place embedded field experience candidates, receive an in-person visit from either the Director or Assistant Director of Field Experiences. At that visit, the program is explained and a written description of the program is given to the principal of the school. We verbally agree upon the program requirements as outlined in the written description. We currently have agreements with 2 schools in the Moorhead district, 2 schools in the West Fargo district, and 8 schools in the Fargo district.

6. *Can the unit provide plans and timelines for its efforts in moving toward Target on this standard?*

MSUM Response: At this time our focus has been on preparing for our accreditation visit with future planning to focus on understanding and responding to the CAEP standards. Dr. Severson and Dr. Suarez-Sousa attended the CAEP Conference in Washington DC and have provided overview of the CAEP standards to faculty at the

Teacher Education Session at the MSUM Professional Development Day.

7. *How is technology used to support clinical practice and field experiences?*

MSUM Response: Each university supervisor is provided with a laptop computer for observations and for filling out evaluations. We have recently ordered an Apple Ipad Air 2 for each field experience and clinical supervisor. The iPad Air has a video recording feature and several different ways supervisors can give feedback and communicate with teacher candidates.

DIARY is used to store data for each teacher candidate, which is easily accessible to candidates and supervisors. In addition, all information about field experiences and clinical experience is available on our website.

STANDARD FOUR

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. *Some assessments indicate that initial candidates are not proficient in addressing diversity in the classroom.*

Rationale: Some data instruments reveal conflicting results. For example, results from data collected at the end of their first year of teaching from postgraduate candidates and their principals vary widely in how they perceived first-year teacher competency in addressing diversity. Also, the edTPA data reveal that overall mean scores on performance categories related to diversity are below the proficiency level, even though these same candidate competencies were internally scored as proficient.

MSUM Response: In MN the edTPA is a program requirement for all initial licensure candidates but passing is not required for licensure. During pilot stages, which involved phasing in the edTPA as a program requirement, only in-house scoring was required. Now all teacher candidates complete an edTPA during student teaching and all are Pearson scored. While in-house scoring still occurs to assure connection to student performance, data from Pearson scored edTPAs are used for program evaluation as scorers have been trained and calibrated.

(It should be noted that data were missing for some years, and instruments did not necessarily correlate question-for-question.) The unit acknowledges that it needs to address curriculum to improve candidate competency.

MSUM Response: Program faculty have been reviewing the data collected from various sources and having discussions about lower areas of performance as well as discrepancies in data. We are aware that employers of our graduates, after their first year of teaching, rate the following areas as below the mean:

17. The teacher uses assessment data to diagnose gaps in students' knowledge and skills.
21. The teacher asks her/his students to self-assess their own learning.

22. The teacher creates learning opportunities that require students to analyze evidence.
23. The teacher creates learning opportunities that require students to develop solutions to abstract problems.
24. The teacher creates learning opportunities that require students to create solutions to global problems.
25. The teacher creates learning opportunities that require students to work collaboratively with teams to solve complex problems.
26. The teacher creates learning opportunities that require students to develop competencies in information, media, and digital literacies.
27. The teacher differentiates instruction to meet the needs of all special education students.
29. The teacher designs instruction to support students who are English language learners.
30. The teacher designs instruction for students with mental health needs.
31. The teacher differentiates her/his instruction to meet the needs of gifted and talented students.
32. The teacher advocates for students from diverse backgrounds.
33. The teacher effectively teaches students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds.
34. The teacher effectively teaches students who have experienced trauma and/or displacement.
41. The teacher helps students from various cultures interact positively with one another.

The data from this survey (along with data from all other key assessments) were distributed to the teacher education faculty at the [Teacher Education Fall Retreat](#). Specific attention was directed toward data that focused on “understanding learning differences,” “differentiation of instruction,” and “cultural competence.” As part of the activities during the retreat, program coordinators met with program faculty to reflect on the data as well as respond to indicators on a [“Planning our Route”](#) document that included one-year goal setting based on data review.

Additionally, data were shared with the [Dean’s Advisory Committee](#) on 10/16/13 and 10/29/14 seeking input and advisement from local administrators. We recognize the discrepancy in candidate proficiency as evaluated by various key assessments and are in the process of studying the [validity of these assessments](#) as well as developing curriculum revisions to support candidate strengths and needs.

2. Students have limited or no opportunity to work with ethnically or racially diverse faculty.

Rationale: Given that 91% of unit faculty members are White and 89% of university faculty members are White, it is possible that many candidates could complete their entire program without being instructed by a non-White faculty member.

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit VII Courses Taught by Diverse Faculty](#) identifies the coursework that faculty with diverse backgrounds teach within the teacher education program.

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

1. *Can the unit provide more examples of candidate work at both the initial and advanced levels to demonstrate application of knowledge and skills related to addressing the needs of diverse student?*

MSUM Response: [Work samples](#) that represent varying levels of candidate work are provided on our Self-Study website. The work samples are located in the same table as the syllabi. At this time, the work samples are not sorted by topics addressed. These are password protected (username: cehsaccred; password: Moorhead14). Additional work samples will be available during the onsite review.

Are initial and advanced candidates in every program expected to demonstrate diversity competencies in coursework?

MSUM Response: AMCS 233 Education & Multicultural America is a required course taken by all teacher education licensure candidates and addresses most of the MN Board of Teaching Standards that emphasize on cultural diversity. The syllabus for this course is available on our Accreditation/Self-Study website. The [AMCS 233](#) syllabus, can be found by linking to any of the licensure areas on the syllabus page of the site.

Diversity competency outcomes are also targeted in other coursework and we are in the process of gathering information on these assignments. We plan to have further data and work samples of these assignments available at the onsite visit. Additionally, we plan to have data and work samples available from the AMCS 233 course during the onsite visit.

(Limited or no information was available on programs for other school personnel earning certificates in specific programs, such as Technology, etc.)

MSUM Response: There are no additional certificate programs available for “other school personnel.” However, there are [areas of emphasis](#) that candidates may pursue with Masters’ Degrees.

2. *Can the unit provide evidence that field placements at the initial and advanced levels are tracked to ensure experiences in diverse settings? How are field placements tracked to ensure that candidates at both levels participate in diverse settings? Who tracks these placements? Is it possible that some candidates would not be placed in at least one diverse setting?*

MSUM Response: Tracking is done through our DIARY system. Each placement coordinator checks DIARY to find where each teacher candidate has been placed

previously. Careful consideration is made to ensure that every candidate has a variety of diverse experiences.

It is unclear whether Curriculum and Instruction, Social Work, and School Counseling require field experiences or where and how they would occur.

MSUM Response: The C & I program does not include a field experience however 99% of candidates are practicing teachers within the P-12 system.

“The [School Counseling](#) emphasis prepares students for licensure or certification as a school counselor. Students complete coursework as well as one semester of practicum and two semesters of internship in elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. School counselors are no longer required to have a teaching license in order to become a school counselor in Minnesota or North Dakota.”

Social Work candidates complete a 12-credit [internship](#) that is a “required field experience under agency and departmental supervision. Opportunity to practice/integrate social work core competencies and practice behaviors (knowledge, value, and skills) obtained in class. Planning must occur one semester prior to internship. Students must have completed 90 hours of human service experience, have a minimum cumulative MSUM GPA of 2.5, and be concurrently enrolled in [SW 470](#). Student must also have completed all major restricted electives and other electives.”

Data are not disaggregated to distinguish between advanced and initial candidates' field experience/clinical practice placements and no determination about diversity of field experiences at the advanced level could be made.

MSUM Response: The school districts noted in [Exhibit 4.4.f](#) represent clinical practice placements for initial licensure programs. Almost all candidates pursuing advanced programming in *special education* (degree or licensure) are practicing teachers within school districts throughout Minnesota. Many of these candidates have a variance from the state and therefore hold the teaching position for which they are pursuing licensure. Well-developed syllabi (aligned to BOT standards) guide the candidate through the practicum experience including documentation of activities for hours identified as practicum, observations of teaching, completion of standards-based assignments and cooperating teacher evaluation of dispositions and performance. However, at this time, MSUM is not gathering data about the diversity of the schools that these teachers are currently employed. A process has been discussed to collect these data that we hope to implement Spring 2015. As most of the candidates are current teachers we will not be able to affect their placements, however, we could build experiences into the field experience/practicum requirements to enrich the opportunities candidates have to work with student diversity whether it be cultural or learning differences.

The C & I program does not include a field experience component in the curriculum.

3. Can the unit provide evidence that candidates at the initial and advanced levels have interaction with diverse faculty? What are the complete demographic data on unit faculty?

MSUM Response: [Exhibit 4.4.d](#) provides information on the demographics of unit faculty. The School of Teaching Learning is considered the “unit” that manages teacher education at MSUM. The teacher education licensure programs include restricted electives that are required by all teacher education candidates. These courses include MN Board of Teaching Standards but some are located outside of STL. A table, [IR Addendum Exhibit VII Courses Taught by Diverse Faculty](#) has been developed to communicate coursework candidates would experience with diverse faculty within and outside the unit. Exhibit 4.4.d includes a statement, * *The Federal Education Right & Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits the release of personally identifiable information. To be in compliance with FERPA, we cannot publish the summary of information based on fewer than five subjects within categories related to gender and ethnicity.* However, during our onsite review we will try to provide further information that is available to us based on requests.

Is it possible that candidates could matriculate through a program having no interaction with a faculty member who is unlike them in at least two areas of diversity?

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit VII Courses Taught by Diverse Faculty](#) represents the course experiences candidates have with diverse faculty while completing teacher education program requirements. Candidates also experience instructor diversity in completing the Liberal Arts & Sciences curriculum.

4. Can the unit provide evidence that candidates at the advanced levels have interaction with other candidates from diverse backgrounds? Is it possible that candidates could matriculate through a program having no interaction with another candidate who is unlike them in at least two areas of diversity? How does the online format address interactions with diverse colleagues?

MSUM Response: We have requested data on diversity of advanced candidates from MSUM Data Requisitions and will have it available during the onsite visit.

5. Can the unit provide evidence of progress in exploring ways to improve candidate performance related to meeting the needs of diverse students (as described on Page 31 of the Institutional Report)? What are some steps that have been taken relative to the plans described in the IR?

MSUM Response: During Fall semester of 2014 faculty teaching in the embedded two block of the Elementary Inclusive Education program revised STL 413 (Effective Teaching) to place increased emphasis on Differentiated Instruction to address diverse needs in the classroom. Anecdotal reports from faculty indicate that the

change in course content has been reflected in student's lesson planning. The STL 413 syllabus located in the [Elementary Inclusive program](#) reflects the changes made to address diversity in the classroom. (username: cehsaccred; password: Moorhead14)

During fall semester of 2014 the faculty member teaching STL 474: *Methods for Elementary Science and Environmental Education* and a special education faculty member co-taught a session of STL 474. This session focuses on how to address diverse learning needs when teaching science content. Both faculty members plan to continue co-teaching this session on an on-going basis each semester.

The Special Education Minor has been updated to respond to current practices in education. One course, SPED 404 has been added to the minor with updated and intensified content. The course name has been changed to Best Practices in Teaching I. A second course, SPED 413 has also received a name change, Best Practices in Teaching II. These two courses reflect a conscientious effort to offer all students who opt to take the courses relevant and practical information for teaching in diverse environments. As mentioned in the initial report, the SPED minor is pursued by over 80 students, with an increasing number of secondary/K-12 students recognizing the impact the minor can have on their preparation.

A small group of faculty is pursuing a University Faculty Development grant. The grant would establish a book study group focused on diversity. Recommendations from members of the Dean's Advisory Council will be considered when determining the book. Members of this group are also exploring attending a conference focused on diversity in higher education during the spring 2015 semester.

6. *Can the unit provide evidence of candidate proficiency at the advanced level in addressing diversity in the classroom and/or school? Is there a systematic collection of data on candidate proficiency and dispositions at advanced levels in all programs that is aligned to diversity goals in the unit conceptual framework.*

MSUM Response: [Exhibit 4.4.b](#) identifies Signature Assignments and data from Signature Assignments in initial and advanced programs that demonstrate candidate proficiency aligned to diversity. The remainder of the document identifies curriculum components from other coursework that also address diversity content. Unfortunately, at this time, data are not gathered on these assignments.

Can the unit provide additional standardized data relative to initial candidates' competency in addressing issues of diversity? What are the results of other instruments not presented in exhibits for Standards 4 or 1? What are the most current results?

A critical focus for curriculum has been enhancing programmatic aspects that support candidates' knowledge and skills in working with diversity in inclusive settings. Special Education state standards have been infused into the elementary program, a minor in special education has been developed, and a streamlined option

for Secondary/K-12 candidates to earn a mild disabilities special education license has been developed. General education and special education programmatic faculty have collaborated to develop this inclusive programming.

Keri DeSutter, a special education faculty member, has completed two studies that examine issues related to preparation of MSUM candidates to work with diverse students. Her study [*Exploring Teacher Candidate Perceptions of Abilities, Beliefs, and Preparation Related to Inclusive Education*](#) (2014) indicated that MSUM candidates experience a strong sense of their capabilities and feel confident about knowing when adjustments need to be made for students with disabilities (93.6% agreement). Findings also indicated that candidates hold strong beliefs related to positive aspects of inclusion with 100% candidates responded with some form of agreement to “inclusion helps students develop friendships.” Similarly, 98.4% of teacher candidates responded to the statement “Inclusion is a good idea.” In response to questions about preparation for inclusion, candidates agreed in some form that the program prepares them for inclusion, however the percentage of agreement was lower (75.8%).

In her study [*Uncovering Beginning Teachers’ Opinions of Preparation for Inclusive Education: A Mixed Methods Study*](#), DeSutter conducted quantitative analysis and found “that teacher preparation programs who implement standards with integrity have a higher likelihood of producing candidates who feel prepared to teach in inclusive classrooms.” Additionally, qualitative data provided more precise information regarding the types of experiences that beginning teachers would have liked that could be linked to these standards.

Candidate competency related to diversity is an area we have prioritized for curriculum review. Recent curriculum revisions supported by our Bush Foundation grant focused our attention on preparing candidates to work in inclusive classrooms. As we move forward with program evaluation and development we need to assure that we are comprehensive in our definition of inclusive learning environments.

STANDARD FIVE

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The unit does not provide evidence concerning best professional practice in teaching.

Rationale: It is unclear how peer, student and administrator evaluations are used to determine whether or not faculty members are engaging in best professional practice in teaching.

MSUM Response: The purpose, criteria, schedule and frequency of professional development plans (PDP), and progress reports (PDR) of faculty professional development and evaluation process are defined under [Article 22 of the IFO](#)

[Contract](#) (page 77). As specified in Section B of Article 22, the number one criterion for faculty evaluation is the demonstrated ability to teach effectively and/or perform effectively in other current assignments. The Contract further defines the teaching effectiveness criterion through its [Appendix G](#), (page 125) as follows:

Effective teaching begins with well-informed and intellectually engaged faculty who are current in their disciplines and their pedagogies and who understand relationships among disciplines. Because teaching embraces activities and responsibilities beyond classroom instruction, evaluation may address effectiveness in course development, interdisciplinary course or program development and delivery, curriculum design, instructional innovation, ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge, instructional advisement and other such related activities.

The faculty member's PDR should include evidence in support of the foregoing. **Faculty are encouraged to include student assessments as evidence of ability to teach effectively.** Evidence of teaching/performance effectiveness may include, but is not limited to:

- Developing and using quality syllabi
- Developing and updating course content
- Developing and updating curriculum
- Providing student assessments of teaching effectiveness**
- Providing peer evaluations and reviews of teaching effectiveness**
- Developing and using measures to evaluate student progress and learning outcomes
- Meeting relevant accreditation or other professional standards
- Incorporating multicultural perspectives in teaching methods
- Demonstrating the nature and quality of assignments
- Incorporating pedagogical approaches
- Providing course assistance to students
- Reviewing, revising and updating courses and teaching approaches
- Providing timely feedback to students
- Receiving and/or being nominated for teaching awards (IFO Contract, Appendix G, pp. 1-2)

As noted in bold above, the IFO contract lists students' course evaluations and peer evaluations as primary examples of evidence in demonstrating ability to teach effectively. Therefore, MSUM faculty members include students' numerical ratings of their teaching effectiveness and written feedback from their peers in their PDR's so that they are to be used as evidence to measure their teaching effectiveness by their peers and administrators.

2. The unit does not present evidence regarding best professional practice in scholarship.

Rationale: The standards of performance are unclear, making it difficult to determine if most professional education faculty are doing the kind of scholarly work in their specializations that is consistent with the unit's / institution's mission.

MSUM Response: As mentioned above, [IFO Contract](#) (page 77) specifies five criteria for faculty evaluation and the second criterion is scholarly or creative achievement or research. The IFO Contract defines scholarly or creative achievement or research as follows:

This category supports one's teaching and contributes to one's special field of knowledge. The advancement of knowledge and education calls for many kinds of scholarship/creative activity/research. Each may require a different approach. Evidence of success in meeting this criterion may include, but is not limited to:

- published works
- works in progress
- unpublished reports
- abstracts
- research briefs
- letters to the editor published in disciplinary and professional journals
- software and other technologically delivered academic products
- other scholarly works
- submitting and/or receiving patents
- delivering presentations at professional meetings
- applying for, writing, receiving and reporting on grants
- receiving and/or being nominated for scholarly awards
- presenting invited lectures
- participating in panels and symposia
- participating in policy analysis
- playing an editorial or advisory role for professional journals or publications
- participating on evaluation panels for research funding
- participating in exhibitions, juried shows, musical or theatrical performances
- consulting
- writing accreditation reports
- conducting research projects
- contributing to/assisting in the scholarly growth of students, peers and other scholars (IFO Contract, Appendix G, p. 2)

MSUM faculty members write their professional development goals under this criterion in their PDPs and report on their achievement in their PDRs for evaluation.

[IR Addendum Exhibit VIII.a Faculty Qualifications](#) and [IR Addendum Exhibit VIII.b Faculty Qualifications](#) present current data on scholarly work of teacher education

faculty. (username: cehsaccred; password: Moorhead14). VIII.a is a list of faculty who teach methods courses and VIII.b presents faculty teaching other education coursework.

3. The unit does not provide evidence concerning best professional practice in service.

Rationale: Faculty service data are not provided.

MSUM Response: As noted in [Article 22](#) (page 77), Service to the university and community is noted as an area for faculty evaluation. [IR Addendum Exhibit VIII a & b Faculty Qualifications](#) presents current data on service of teacher education faculty.

4. The unit does not provide clear information regarding use of faculty evaluations to drive specific professional development.

Rationale: The relationship between faculty evaluations and professional development is unclear based on the exhibits provided.

MSUM Response: The faculty evaluation process established by the [IFO Contract](#) utilizes PDP and PDR as the vehicle not only to evaluate faculty performance, but also to link the evaluation result to professional development. MSUM faculty members receive written feedback from their peers and administrators on their professional development plans and then their professional development report in the five criteria mentioned above. Faculty then incorporate/address the feedback they received on their PDR into their next PDP. In other words, a faculty member's PDR is evaluated against his/her PDP and his/her PDP is informed/driven by PDR evaluation results. For example, a faculty member was encouraged to focus on the most prominent feedback she received from her students rather than to try working on all the feedback she received at once in her efforts to improve her teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations. Also, she was encouraged to invite her peers to observe her teaching and to observe her peers teaching as another way to improve her teaching. All the feedback was incorporated into her next PDP.

5. The unit does not present clear evidence regarding professional development opportunities for new knowledge in areas like professional practice, performance assessment, technology, and emerging practices.

Rationale: It is unclear if the unit is providing these opportunities outside of a few related activities at the Faculty Development Center.

MSUM Response: The School of Teaching and Learning as the teacher education Unit sponsors a visiting scholar each year to support professional development activities to address programmatic needs identified through the review process. [IR Addendum Exhibit IX Summary of Professional Development Activities Offered by the Unit](#) provides information published about the STL faculty development

opportunities for faculty, students and P-12 partners.

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

1. *What data demonstrate best practices in teaching in areas such as reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and dispositions?*

MSUM Response: As previously mentioned, the PDP and PDR process requires faculty to reflect on their teaching and set goals for improvement.

2. *How do faculty members assess their own instructional effectiveness and candidate learning?*

MSUM Response: Article 22 (page 77) and Appendix G (page 125) of the [IFO Master Contract](#) identifies the five criterion for faculty evaluation and guidance regarding some of the types of evidence which may be considered appropriate for addressing each category, both for the department/unit in developing its goals and objectives and for the individual faculty member in preparing his/her Professional Development Plan (PDP) and Professional Development Report (PDR).

3. *Based on the mission of the unit/institution, are most professional education faculty members demonstrating scholarly work in their field of specialization?*

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit VIII a & b Faculty Qualifications](#) provides description of scholarly achievements of teacher education faculty. Additionally, within the AIMS site scholarly achievements are noted under Faculty Information.

Specifically, what are the unit's and/or institution's standards of performance and metrics?

MSUM Response: While there are no published metrics, Article 22 and Appendix G of the [IFO Master Contract](#) identify the criterion for evaluation as well as providing examples.

7. *What are the service activities of faculty members and does it include P-12 related service?*

MSUM Response: [IR Addendum Exhibit VIII a & b Faculty Qualifications](#) provides information about service activities including P-12 related experiences.

8. *Are faculty evaluations used to improve faculty members' teaching, scholarship, and service?*

MSUM Response: Article 22 and Appendix G of the [IFO Master Contract](#) illuminate how faculty evaluation is done through the PDP and PDR process, which includes the evaluation criteria on teaching (Criterion I), scholarship (Criterion II), and

service (Criterion V), is used to improve faculty members' performance on those three areas.

9. *What examples can the unit provide of faculty evaluations (redacted) to specifically demonstrate teaching, scholarship, and service?*

MSUM Response: The Dean of the College of Education and Human Services is conferring with the Inter Faculty Organization (IFO) to affirm that we are able to share faculty evaluations. Further information will be available during the onsite visit.

10. *What opportunities does the unit provide faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, especially related to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices?*

MSUM Response: Fall 2014 a [Teacher Education Faculty Retreat](#) to review programmatic data and discuss plans for continual improvement. Additionally a [Teacher Education Session](#) of the MSUM Professional Development Day also provided opportunity for faculty to collaborate on performance assessment. [Summary of Professional Development Activities Offered by the Unit](#) also provides information regarding professional development.

11. *Can you provide an updated Exhibit 5.4.b to help the team understand the qualifications of clinical faculty?*

MSUM Plan: A [New Exhibit 5.4.b](#) has been uploaded.

12. *What are the criteria for faculty continuation, tenure, and promotion? Are there specific rubrics and examples that demonstrate this process?*

MSUM Response: Criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are described in the [IFO Master Contract](#), Article 25, page 88. Additional can be obtained from Dr. Ok-Hee Lee, Interim Dean of the College of Education during the onsite visit.

STANDARD SIX

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. *The unit does not present clear evidence on the degree to which P-12 practitioners and other members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.*

Rationale: Little to no data are provided in the IR or exhibits to demonstrate how P-12 practitioners and other professional community members participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.

MSUM Response: Data gathered from the Teacher Education Assessment System have been shared with P-12 partners in two ways. First, prior to submission of licensure programs to the MN Board of Teaching for program renewal, each licensure program met with their advisory board that included P-12 partners and reviewed data to develop program goals. Membership of these advisory boards by program is reported in [IR Addendum Exhibit III Licensure Advisory Boards](#).

Secondly, the Dean's Advisory Committee meets quarterly to seek input from P-12 partners regarding educational issues faced by the P-12 system as well as advisement for MSUM programming. [Agendas and meeting minutes](#) identify topics and discussions that have occurred at these advisory meetings.

2. *The unit does not present clear evidence as to whether the CEHS budget is at least proportional to other units on the campus with clinical components.*

Rationale: No evidence is provided as to budget allocations for comparable units on the campus with clinical components.

MSUM Response: It is difficult to provide evidence of budgets related to comparable units. The School of Teaching and Learning (STL) is considered the "Unit" for teacher education although STL does not include all teacher education programs as Secondary/K-12 licensure programs are housed in other colleges. Additionally, the College of Education and Human Services administrates other programs outside of education, (i.e., Social Work, Counseling and Student Affairs, Speech Language Hearing Services). It is therefore difficult to make comparisons of budgets for education vs. other units with clinical experiences. Within the School of Teaching and Learning, Early Childhood, Elementary Education and Special Education each have their own budgets. In #3 below, it is suggested that we use the school of nursing as a comparable analysis to the Unit, however, STL's budget is broken down to multiple program levels and Nursing's budget isn't so it is difficult to make the comparison. During the onsite visit the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services will be available to provide further information.

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

1. *Can the unit provide the Faculty Handbook so that faculty load policies can be confirmed?*

MSUM Response: The Inter Faculty Organization Master Contract defines [faculty work load](#) requirements in Article 10. The [faculty handbook](#) is for new faculty. It does not include information about work-load.

2. *What data or exhibits exist to demonstrate how the Dean's Advisory Council's input is being considered by unit faculty and unit leadership?*

MSUM Response: STL not only considers but also often reflects the Dean's Advisory

Council's input on departmental policies and practice. For example, while STL was revising its admission criteria, Council members recommended requiring a passing score on the MTLE Basic Skills Tests before student teaching as well as raising our admission GPA requirement from 2.75 to 2.8. (DAC Meeting Minutes [10-17-12](#); [12-12-12](#).) As noted in the [SARTE policy](#), these requirements are now in place. Another example is that Council members suggested us to do background checks for ED 205 students at a meeting on [Oct. 17, 2012](#) and we let them know our decision to do so at a meeting on [Dec. 12, 2012](#). Meeting agendas and minutes are located on our Accreditation/Self-Study website.

3. *Can the unit provide budgets of units comparable to CEHS? (It appears that MSU-Moorhead does have a school of nursing and a comparable analysis would be beneficial.)*

MSUM Response: Please see response to AFI #2 within Standard Six.

4. *Can the unit provide an updated copy of the organization chart, since it did not work within the exhibits?*

MSUM Response: The [organizational chart](#) for the College of Education and Human Services communicates the organizational leadership for teacher education.

5. *Can the unit provide updated admission and degree requirements? (The link within the exhibits did not work.)*

MSUM Response:

[Freshman Admission Requirements](#)

[University Admission Requirements](#)

[Teacher Education Admission Requirements](#)

[Catalog descriptions](#) of initial and advanced programs identify all program requirements.

[University Policy for Graduation Requirements](#)

6. *Can the unit provide a comprehensive report of overload for all faculty members in all schools, not just the School of Teaching & Learning?*

MSUM Response: [Exhibit 6.4.h.2](#) presents the Faculty Assignment Record that includes overload for faculty within the STL. Faculty overloads for teacher education faculty outside of STL are now presented in [IR Addendum IX, Overload for](#)

[Secondary/K-12 Faculty.](#)