NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Dr. Daniel C. Elliott
Dr. David J. Kommer
Dr. Karen Chia Yu Liu
Mrs. Carol E. Seielstad
Dr. Marjorie B. Robinson

State Consultant:
N/A

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Accreditation Visit to:

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

7400 Augusta St.
River Forest, IL 60305-1499
October 16-20, 2010

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

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Concordia University: Chicago

Team Findings:

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

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Concordia University Chicago, in River Forest, a Chicago suburb, is uniquely positioned amid diverse ethnographic and economic communities. Historically African American, Asian, lower income, professional income, and wealthy residential communities are within minutes from the campus center. The university draws its student population both from local communities and across the nation. Concordia University Chicago (CU Chicago) is a member institution of the Concordia University System owned and operated by the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. CU:C is one of ten universities and colleges that form a nationwide network of campuses established to serve students seeking to attend a Lutheran Christian university with undergraduate and graduate academic programs based in the liberal arts, sciences, and fields of professional studies. The location of the campus provides convenient access to one of the world's great metropolitan areas.

Concordia University Chicago includes a College of Arts and Sciences, a College of Business, a College of Education, and a College of Graduate and Innovative Programs. It is these last two colleges that now make up the unit. Each college dean, along with a team of other faculty leader members representing both initial undergraduate and initial and advanced graduate programs, provide administrative oversight for the unit. The Concordia University vice president for academic affairs is the designated senior administrator for the unit. The dean of the College of Education was recruited in 2009 to prepare for the NCATE accreditation. The university restructuring of these two colleges together as one educational unit has led to change in programs, content, outcomes, assessment strategies, and mission. The unit colleges share academic facilities, exchange faculty members as needed, and provide a common academic student support system.

Concordia University Chicago graduate and undergraduate catalogs cite its mission and essence within the context of 21st century America as a "distinctive, comprehensive university of The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, centered in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and based in the liberal arts, equips men and women to serve and lead with integrity, creativity, competence, and compassion in a diverse, interconnected, and increasingly urbanized church and world". This mission is reflected in the conceptual framework. The mission directly influences program course outcomes across the unit, as indicated by a review of various syllabi and faculty interviews. Candidate disposition outcomes can be directly traced to Biblical Christian resources inspired by the university mission statement.

The unit is served by a total of 531 faculty members overall:
College of Education: eight full-time unit faculty, 28 other university faculty, 12-15 adjunct faculty, five full-time and 21 part-time field supervisors.
College of Graduate and Innovative Programs: 40 full-time unit faculty, 10 other university faculty, 293 adjunct faculty, 49 intern mentors, nine reading practicum supervisors, and 31 school counselor intern supervisors.

The unit prepares initial candidates at the BA and MAT level in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education Studies, Secondary English Education, Secondary Mathematics Education, Secondary Physical Education, Secondary Science Education, Special Education, Secondary Social Science Education, K-12 Spanish Language Education, K-12 Art Education, and K-12 Music Education. All these programs are recognized by their SPAs. The advanced programs include: M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction, Curriculum and Instruction with ESL, School Administration (principal and superintendent), School Counseling, Reading Specialist, and Education Technology. The unit also has a doctorate in Early Childhood, as well as in Leadership.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was an NCATE-only visit, although State Board of Education consultants were present to assist the team with writing and understanding Illinois educator requirements

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

The team interviewed program directors, lead faculty members, unit administrators, candidates, graduates, site supervisors, and university supervisors and consulted the unit's electronic document collection website to collect information on the extension of programs beyond the main campus.

The unit consists of two colleges at Concordia University: The College of Education and the Graduate and the Initial programs at the graduate level. The unit offers: 19 cohorts in the Master of Arts in Teaching at nine off-campus cohort sites; 18 cohorts in Curriculum and Instruction with ESL concentration at 15 sites; 53 cohorts in Curriculum and Instruction at 28 sites; 30 cohorts in Educational Technology at 20 sites; 54 cohorts for Reading Specialist certification at 29 sites; 48 cohorts in School Counseling at 20 sites; 89 School Leadership Cohorts at 30 sites, including one online cohort serving candidates living outside of Illinois. There are a total of five programs offered totally online, including a total of 50 courses developed and ready to offer. The Learning Management System presently used is Blackboard.com

The graduate programs for other school personnel offered at the many various cohort locations throughout the region rent facilities from schools districts, and agencies associated with cohort

members. Programs are monitored by each program director to ensure fidelity to program requirements. In addition, identified full-time faculty are given responsibility for monitoring and coordinating delivery of two of the program courses that are taught by various adjunct faculty members. These lead faculty hold training and equipping seminars and meetings with the adjuncts for each of their two courses to ensure consistency and fidelity to course quality expectations. Beyond this, programs have identified "ambassador faculty." Ambassador faculty are full-time university faculty tasked with mentoring and monitoring up to 15 university supervisors for candidate field practice and with coordinating field practices in their respective regions of their assigned graduate programs.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

None

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

1. Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

Meeting minutes and interviews with faculty and administrators demonstrated how the conceptual framework (CF) for the unit has developed since 1999. After a year of writing and discussion by the faculty, the present framework language evolved and has continued to be collaboratively applied. The CF drives the work of the unit as it seeks to "prepare candidates to demonstrate professional integrity, competence, and leadership to those they teach and serve."

For Concordia, "Integrity" is derived from the Biblical Christian values and moral ethic. The unit programs include and integrate "respect for diversity in educational settings" as related to learning styles, family structures, religion, beliefs, disabilities, gender, race, ethnicities, values, and socioeconomic status. The programs demonstrate appropriate standards of conduct and ethical behavior congruent with the standards of their profession.

Interviews with faculty and administration, along with a review of Unit documentation demonstrated how competence is promoted in the areas of knowledge, skills, creativity, and dispositions. According to handbooks, program forms, and faculty interviews, "Concordia educators:
1. meet the standards of their profession,
2. have a commitment to continuous professional development,
3. impact all students' learning and development in a positive way,
4. use a variety of assessment techniques appropriately, and
5. engage in reflective practice."

Servant leadership is the ability to focus a school's mission, personnel, and resources to meet identified

needs. From interviews with candidates, faculty, and administrators, and from program documentation, the team discovered how candidates are prepared as "Concordia Educators." "Concordia educators are servant leaders who:
1. develop an inclusive vision for students' learning and development and create a school culture and programs that focus resources to support all students' learning and development, and
2. build collaborative relationships that aid and support all students' learning and development."

The unit reports its mission as "a distinctive, comprehensive university of The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, centered in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and based in the liberal arts, equips men and women to serve and lead with integrity, creativity, competence, and compassion in a diverse, interconnected, and increasingly urbanized church and world"

The unit's philosophical framework can be seen in course syllabi, faculty interviews, candidate interviews, and unit program publications revealed guiding philosophies for the unit's initial and advanced programs to center on themes of unconditional regard for others, servant leadership, and seeking to demonstrate professional excellence in the various associated professional fields related to unit programs. References in the unit's historical documents cite Johnson and Holubec, Kounin, Bamburg, Brophy, Emmer, Danielson, Kegan, Slavin, Holubeck, Ogle, Joyce and Weil, Richardson, Ball and McDiarmid, Shulman, Vygotsky, Erikson, Kohlberg, Gilligan, Piaget, Elkind, Sylwester, Foreman and Kuscher, Gutek, Neuschel, Likona, Groome, Greenfield, among many others, as a foundational knowledge basis for "integrity, competence, and servant leadership." These knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies drive the Unit work. The foundational pedagogical knowledge resources for Concordia's programs include education reform resources from the past 20 years and widely affirmed research studies and reports (see IR bibliography). Interviews with candidates validated the Unit's affirmation that it promotes candidates' understanding of these trends. The Unit faculty members have created focused themes in their courses that assist candidates to more fully understand how issues of diversity, ethics, technology, and professional development will affect the future needs of the nation's systems of education.

The conceptual framework document includes a detailed essay of the various knowledge bases that make up the unit's foundations for teaching and advanced educational programs. Minutes from unit committee meetings show how this common understanding has developed from faculty collaboration across the years. Course syllabi include bibliographies drawn from all these landmark theorists in the fields of professional education as well.

The unit has embraced the standards from INTASC, NBTS (National Board Professional Teaching Standards), IPTS (Illinois Professional Teaching Standards), and The Illinois School Leader Standards for Principals and for Superintendents as foundational for the unit's candidate learning outcomes and integrated them throughout the conceptual framework. Evidence from a few committee meeting minutes and program documents demonstrates how thoroughly vetted the unit's mission, vision and essence statements are among all the constituent groups. The unit has deliberately integrated all these standards with Biblical Christian values and orientations to both public and private educational enterprises in the nation and around the world.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main

campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

⃝   ⃝

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Concordia University offers six baccalaureate programs leading to state teacher certification in Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education. All candidates are required to pass the content area test before they are allowed to student teach. Pass rates for all test-takers from 2006-2009 was 83 percent (IR Table 4). All initial certification programs with SPAs have received national recognition with the exception of the Reading Education program which is currently in the rejoinder process and the initial program in English Language Arts, which was recognized with probation and was up for consideration by that SPA during the time of our visit. Although initial candidates in English Language Arts must pass the state licensure exam before student teaching, at the time of the SPA report, all other assessments occurred at the end of the candidates' programs, either during or upon completion of student teaching. The reviewers for English Language Arts reported that including major assessments throughout the process would benefit candidates in this program. Review of the documents and interviews with faculty confirmed that the unit has implemented these changes.

Ten programs received national recognition, six received national recognition with conditions, and one received national recognition with probation. The unit received national recognition status for the following programs: Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, M.A.T. programs for Elementary, Science, and Mathematics, Physical Education (Secondary), School Leadership, Science Education, Secondary Education in Mathematics, and Secondary Education in Social Sciences. The following programs received national recognition with conditions: Computer Education (initial endorsement), Curriculum and Instruction: ESL, Early Childhood, Advanced and Baccalaureate, M.A.T. for Early Childhood, and Special Education. No negative patterns existed across the national recognition reports.

Review of documents and interviews with administrators and faculty confirm the unit is in the process of revising programs in response to conditions cited in SPA reports. All candidates in the initial certification programs are evaluated on their professional and pedagogical skills using multiple assessments including the Student Teacher Performance Rubrics (ST-13, ST-9, St-8). Rubrics the initial level contain components of the conceptual framework embedded in the requirements being assessed. Assessment items on the final evaluations for student teaching and portfolio are aligned with the ten INTASC standards and the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.

Interviews with faculty, candidates and graduates verified that the initial program candidates make Positive Impact Presentations to peers and faculty that describe their use of assessment strategies and plans to document positive student learning results at the end of student teaching. Data provided by the Unit Assessment System indicated that the mean score for the Positive Impact Presentation rubric given in spring 2010 for 74 initial candidates was 12.95 out of 15 points. All of the initial candidates scored at or above average on this presentation.

Faculty interviewed stated that employer surveys are under development for BA and M.A.T. initial programs, however, no data presented for employer surveys for current program completers. Interviews with P-12 administrators indicated strong agreement that initial candidates possess needed skills to be successful in their programs. Exit and alumni surveys are completed for all initial candidates. Data presented in Table 104 of the IR for alumni from 2005-2009 and interview data from alumni and student teachers interviewed confirmed that initial program completers understand and can explain subject matter well. They are also knowledgeable and can explain central concepts aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. Mean responses based on a five-point Likert-type scale for 2009 alumni exceeded 3.6 for 54 respondents (IR Table 104).

Interviews with faculty, assessment personnel, and administration reported that employer surveys are under development at both initial and advanced programs using the newly developed assessment system. The team could find no evidence of these newly developed surveys.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit offers graduate program in the Master of Arts in Teaching (both initial and advanced) as well as the Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction

During 2008-2009 advanced candidates engaged in a variety of professional development activities such as professional service, conferences, workshops, and technology training programs. Documentation provides information for each advanced area. Employer survey data presented in IR Table107 for COE and IR Table 108 for Graduate and Innovative Programs (G.I.P.) were identical. In interviews, the team questioned the validity of this table applying to both initial programs and OSP programs. The unit did not explain why these two sets of data were identical. Replacement data was never provided.

Interviews with faculty, assessment personnel, and administration reported that employer surveys are under development at both initial and advanced programs using the newly developed assessment system. The team could find no evidence of these newly developed surveys.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

All initial certification program completers take and pass the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) which includes the following categories: Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessment; Planning and Delivering Instruction; Managing the Learning Environment; Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism; Language Arts; and Educational Technology. Additional assessments include Student Teaching Evaluations (ST-8, ST-9, and ST-13), unit and lesson plan evaluations, reflective essays submitted as part of final portfolio, and the Positive Impact Presentation required of all initial candidates. Positive Impact Rubric Scores reported for spring 2010 program completers confirmed that candidates are able to present clearly and meaningfully. Mean scores based on a scale of 15 exceeded 12 for all programs (Positive Impact Presentation Rubric Scores).

Artifacts including portfolios as well as interviews with faculty, candidate, P-12 administrators, and cooperating teachers confirmed candidates' knowledge of instructional strategies and ability of the candidates to present their strategies clearly and meaningfully. Candidates are required to use a variety of technologies in the delivery of papers, projects, and presentations through their required coursework and field work.

All candidates are required to demonstrate competency using the Learning Management System (LMS) "Blackboard.com," as well as word processing, spreadsheets, and multimedia presentation, as part of their portfolio requirements. Interviews with faculty and candidates, as well as program artifacts, documented their competency in integrating technology. Candidates and faculty reported that technology is integrated into methods classes. For example, interactive whiteboard presentation skills are taught in the social studies and science methods classes among others. Cooperating teachers reported student teaching candidates used a variety of technologies in preparing and teaching lessons. All candidates are required to use a variety of technologies in the delivery of papers, projects, and presentations throughout their programs.

Data gathered from alumni surveys mailed in 2005, 2007 and 2009, demonstrate that initial program graduates in all programs have the necessary skills to help all students learn. Mean scores reported for 54 alumni all exceeded 3.6 for 2009 program completers based on a five-point Likert-type scale (IR Table 104).

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

All graduate programs, with the exception of the Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Technology programs have been nationally reviewed. Advanced degree candidates are required to reflect on one or more issues related to the educational needs of the exceptional learners and reflect on how they can better meet the needs of the exceptional learners in their own practice. Alumni surveys for School Leadership and Reading Specialist confirmed that advanced candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning (IR Tables 105-106). In 2009 mean responses for 35 School Leadership alumni exceeded 3.6, and 41 reading-specialist alumni scored 3.9 on a four-point scale (see IR Tables 105-106).

At present the unit does not complete employer surveys for all graduate-level programs. Similar to initial candidates, advanced candidates demonstrate proficiency in technology in many ways discussed above in Summary of Findings for Initial Candidates in Standard 1b.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

All candidates in the initial certification programs are evaluated on their professional and pedagogical skills using multiple assessments including the Student Teacher Performance Rubrics (ST-13, ST-9, and ST-8). Assessment items on the final evaluations for student teaching are aligned with the ten INTASC standards which address candidates' knowledge and skills in relation to school, family, and community, as well as child and adolescent development in relation to learning, knowledge of professional ethics, laws and policies, and skill in use of research in teaching. Final evaluations by the university supervisor during student teaching indicated that candidates are proficient in all ten INTASC standards based on a five-point rubric. The mean scores for the ST-9 from 2006-2009 indicated mean scores of 4 or higher based on a five point scale for the seventh and final observation by the university supervisor during student teaching (IR Table 98). Mid-term evaluations are completed by the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and the candidate using ST-13.

Data presented in Table 99 of the IR indicated mean ratings based on a five-point scale from 2006-2009 of 4 or higher for all ten INTASC standards. The unit also assesses candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through artifacts submitted as part of a candidate's portfolio covering all ten INTASC standards. Mean portfolio scores for initial programs based on a three-point rubric from 2006-2009 ranged from 2.0 and above for INTASC Standard Four. In addition, the initial program candidates make Positive Impact Presentations to peers and faculty that describe their use of assessment strategies/plans to document positive student learning results during their student teaching. All initial certification candidates are required to pass the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) test. Because passing the APT is a program requirement, the pass rate is 100 percent for all initial program completers. Alumni survey data presented in Table 104 of the IR indicated that initial certification graduates have acquired skills needed for instructional planning, as well as understanding of a variety of needed instructional strategies to develop critical thinking.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills though coursework performance and reflections. Data presented in Table 99 of the IR indicated mean ratings based on a five-point scale from 2006-2009 of 4 or higher for all ten INTASC standards. The unit also assesses candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through artifacts submitted as part of a candidate's portfolio covering all ten INTASC standards. Mean portfolio scores for initial programs based on a three-point rubric from 2006-2009 ranged from 2.0 and above for INTASC Standard Four in the M.A.T. program completers (IR Tables 78-81).

Candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction Program complete a capstone experience that is evaluated by their capstone advisor. Data presented in IR Tables 204 and 207 indicated higher than average scores for all program completers for 2009 summer completers in this program.

Advanced candidates report they are engaged in professional activities such as service learning projects, tutoring, and memberships in national organizations specific to each program. Program reports and faculty interviews confirmed that candidates complete these activities.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in initial programs demonstrate the ability to assess student learning and develop meaningful learning experiences based on assessment results though course-based assignments and through field-based assessments using the ST-9 and ST-13 (Tables 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100 of the IR). Candidates are assessed at least seven times using the ST-9 during the sixteen-week student teaching experience. Summary data presented in Tables 99 indicated that candidates' knowledge and skills in use of assessment in instruction has had a positive impact on students. Candidates plan pre- and post-tests which measure the progress of students in learning lesson objectives and goals which are aligned with state standards. Assessment plans are developed and implemented in the methods courses and student teaching and then are uploaded onto Blackboard to be used in the evaluation of their portfolios at each transition point. Summary data presented show mean scores for candidates exceeded 4, based on a five-point scale for the final evaluations from 2006-2009 (IR Table 100).

Initial program candidates make Positive Impact Presentations to peers and faculty that describe their use of assessment strategies/plans to document positive student learning results during their student teaching. Through this presentation, each candidate must demonstrate his or her understanding that effective teaching includes the cycle of pre-assessment, planning, delivery of instruction, and post assessment. Interviews with candidates and multimedia presentation samples from the positive impact project confirmed that each candidate must meet this requirement. The mean score reported for 74 candidates for the Positive Impact Presentation rubric from spring 2010 provided by the UAS was 12.95 out of a possible 15 points. All initial candidates scored average or above.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidates' ability to impact student learning is measured through a variety of artifacts such as coursework assessments, reflections, and, for Curriculum and Instruction candidates, a capstone paper. Data presented in Table 5 of the IR indicated that pass rates for licensure for other school professionals range from 82 percent for school counseling to 99 percent for advanced reading professionals from 2006-2009.

Evidence from key assessments used for advanced teacher candidates validated their ability to demonstrate understanding of major concepts related to assessment, regularly apply data-driven decision-making, analyze performance data, and use school and community resources that support student learning.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals	Acceptable ▾

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The unit offers Masters degree preparation-for English as a Second Language, School Administration, School Counseling, Reading Specialist, and Educational Technology, which is a new program with no current program completers. Cohort off-campus programs are offered at the master's level in School Leadership, School Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Reading, and ESL endorsement. The unit offers a doctorate degree with specializations in two areas: Educational Leadership and Early Childhood Education (birth to grade three).

Documents demonstrated that, where it is offered, State licensure examination pass rates for other school professionals from 2006-2009 indicated that these candidates have in-depth knowledge of the content they teach. For Reading, School Leadership, and Counseling candidates, the pass rate for state licensure in 2009 was 91 percent or higher for 334 candidates (IR Table 5). Faculty interviewed consistently emphasized this as key in determining candidate competence.

Candidates in Reading, Curriculum and Development, Early Childhood, and ESL take coursework aligned with their disciplines to identify and address areas needing improvement, to design instruction based on students' prior experiences, and to analyze and apply current educational research. School leadership candidates participate in activities related to school law, finance, organization, and coursework designed to understand the impact of school, family, and community contexts on student learning as well as to apply current educational research.

All programs having national evaluations for other school professionals have received national recognition. This includes the School Leadership Program, the School Counseling Program, and the Leadership Program. Program reports for each program provided evidence that candidates are assessed regularly and must demonstrate competency at each phase of the program in order to graduate. Pass rates for licensure for other school professionals across all programs ranged from 85 percent in 2006 to 91 percent in 2009 (IR Table 5).

A review of program data included in the Unit Assessment Report (pp. 107-112) confirmed that professional knowledge and skills are assessed in evaluation instruments by program and field-based faculty at each checkpoint. Faculty interviewed and documents reviewed showed data that had been gathered from an alumni survey in the leadership program (administered after one year out and four years out of the program) from 2006 to 2009 indicated that the graduates do perceive they have acquired the knowledge and skills required of educational leaders. All mean scores exceeded 4.0 on a five-point scale (IR Table 105).

Program completers for the School Leadership program must maintain a GPA of 3.0 or higher for coursework, complete passage of portfolio successfully, pass all required certification tests and complete at least two years of teaching experience in order to graduate. The mean scores for the Internship Implementation Project assessment of all the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) standards for summer 2009 program completers all exceeded 2.0 based on a three-point scale (IR Table 120). The mean scores for the final Internship Evaluations for School Leadership for 318 2009 fall 2009-spring 2010 program completers also exceeded 2, based on a three-point scale. The Ed.D. candidates must prepare and defend a dissertation in addition to successfully completing a

comprehensive examination. Ed.D. candidates must also pass all required certification tests, complete an internship, maintain a GPA of 3.5 or higher in required coursework 51 hours), and successfully defend a dissertation.

Follow-up alumni survey data presented in Table 105 of the IR showed that the mean scores of graduates in School Leadership were 4 or higher, based on a five-point scale, from 2006 to 2009. Reading Specialist alumni survey data presented in Table 106 of the IR indicated that graduates in this program have acquired needed skills for diagnosis of reading disabilities, use of research, and support for students with reading disabilities. Mean scores all exceeded 3.8 based on a five-point scale in 2009. Data from alumni and exit surveys completed by the candidates and their supervisors for School Counseling in 2009 indicated that graduates in counseling have acquired needed knowledge and understanding of counseling approaches and theory. Counseling program completers who graduated in 2007 and 2008 eagreed or strongly agreed that their program provided skill in assessing student learning, understanding major concepts and theories, and ability to use school and community resources to support learning when surveyed in 2009 (see IR page 22).

Faculty and administration interviewed report that a more focused employer survey and data-collection are currently being developed for these programs but it was not available for the team to review.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in advanced programs for other school professionals demonstrate their ability to create positive learning environments to build on students' developmental levels and to understand student, family, and community diversity as they develop their portfolios and progress through required checkpoints in their programs. All programs that have SPA approval for other school professionals have received national recognition. All the performance data discussed in 1e (above) correlated with information obtained in interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers regarding student-learning impact success by other school professionals in the unit's programs.

Exit surveys by the program completers and follow up surveys with alumni (IR Table 105-106) indicated that program completers for other school professionals are prepared to promote the success of all students. Assessment items on the final evaluations for program completion are aligned with each one's SPA standards. A review of SPA reports, syllabi, program artifacts, and portfolios as well as interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that each program for other school professionals required candidates to demonstrate competencies in diverse settings.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data gathered from interviews with P-12 administrators, and cooperating teachers indicated that initial certification program completers from all education programs have acquired needed professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Candidates for initial certification programs must have positive disposition evaluations from coursework professors and a field experience mentor to be accepted into the final professional semester. Candidates with negative disposition evaluations are referred to the Care and Concern Committee. This committee develops an individualized plan agreed to by both the candidate and the committee to improve success for the candidate. Mentoring and counseling are also provided.

Data presented in IR Table 102 confirmed that candidates in each program demonstrate expected dispositions for effective educators. Mean scores for empathy, positive view of self and others, authenticity, meaningful purpose and vision, creativity, and professional habits all exceeded 4 based on a five point rubric for 2007-2009 candidates. A review of the data and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the unit's professional dispositions are aligned with the Conceptual Framework and assessed within each program using the Assessment of Candidates' Dispositions Form (IR Table 102). Cooperating teachers and P-12 administrators reported that candidates they worked with demonstrated the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers. They were impressed with candidates' professionalism and dedication in addition to their content knowledge.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidate's dispositions are evaluated through coursework performance and portfolio assessment. Data presented in IR Table 103 confirmed that candidates in each program demonstrate expected dispositions for effective educators. Mean scores for empathy, positive view of self and others, authenticity, meaningful purpose and vision, creativity, and professional habits all exceeded 4 based on a five-point rubric for all 2007-2009 advanced candidates. ESL candidates are evaluated by university capstone advisors and the end of each required course and at the end of the program via an end-of-course reflection and Capstone Paper Rubric (IR Table 83). Curriculum and Instruction candidates are evaluated through a Capstone Rubric and rating by a capstone advisor at the end of each required course

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Other School Professionals' dispositions are evaluated through coursework performance and portfolio assessment. The dispositions for candidates in the School Leadership Program are assessed using the Assessment of Candidates' Dispositions Form during the required internships. Scores from the candidate self-rating, the mentor rating, and the university supervisor rating reported in Table 103 of the IR confirmed that these candidates demonstrate behaviors consistent with fairness and belief that all students can learn.

Advanced candidates in reading are assessed by the practicum supervisor using the Assessment of Candidates' Dispositions Form. The dispositions for Counselor Education candidates are evaluated at seven different checkpoints before program completion. Program reports for each of these programs confirmed that other school professional candidates' dispositions are reflected in their work with students, families, and communities as discussed in response 1e above.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Through interviews and review of data collections in supporting documents, the team found that candidates in the initial, advanced, and OSP programs demonstrate knowledge-- pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional knowledge-- skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help

all students learn. Based on pass rates for state licensure tests, SPA reports, assessment data from required transition points, and interviews with candidates, faculty, alumni, cooperating teachers, and P-12 administrators, the team confirmed that initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel are able to assess and use these assessments in instruction. As reported in Standard 2, the team expressed concern that no current, reliable employer survey data is available. The administration reports that employer surveys are under development at both initial and advanced programs using the newly developing assessment system.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number &Text	AFI Rationale
1. The Master of Arts in Teaching: Master of Urban Teaching programs have inadequate content and pedagogical preparation.	Program leaders and unit administrators reported that this program was discontinued.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

j͏n   j͏n

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) includes some data collected since 2006. However, the system has been completely revised starting in September 2009 (COE Faculty Minutes 02/09/09) with new technologies implemented and new data sources. There are a diverse range of scoring rubrics that include 1-5, 0- 2, and 1-3 rating levels. Reports were found that drew data from each of these in different ways. Interviews with program councils did not clarify how the diverse scores were relevant to one another for system-wide analysis. Faculty interviewed indicated this was caused by differences in the various rubrics required by different SPAs' requirements. However, no evidence was found to substantiate this reason for differing rubric rating levels.

The IR reported that the data collection system is undergoing retooling and requires retraining of all faculty in its use. At present, the full impact of the new data collection and analysis process will not be felt until well after 2010. The 2010 data submitted from the UAS show collaborative assessment by the community about the unit's progress in using data from the UAS. That said, the team found that there was sufficient data from former system elements to validate the level of quality being achieved by the unit in preparing educator candidates at both the initial and advanced levels.

The UAS involves collection and assessment of data at university and program entry points, professional practice entry point, completion of coursework, and submission for degrees and/or certification. The UAS process demonstrated in unit documents includes candidate demographic data, state and national testing data, candidate performance assessment data, course work, candidate portfolios, and course completion data.

Documentation does not provide sufficient evidence that the faculty regularly evaluate the UAS.

Elements of the UAS are reflective of the state standards and SPA reports provided by the unit for each

of the programs at initial and advanced levels. Data from SPA reports are collected and reported by the UAS coordinator.

Documents illustrated how evaluation measures include performances on state and national assessments and scores derived from rubric-based course and program performance assessments. The rubric is applied to all of these assessments, and the data are aggregated in the UAS and disaggregated by program for various reports.

Rubrics contain components of the conceptual framework embedded in the requirements being assessed. Assessment items on the final evaluations for student teaching are aligned with the ten INTASC standards. The unit also assesses candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through artifacts submitted as part of each candidate's portfolio covering all ten INTASC standards, as well as all Illinois teaching standards.

UAS dispositions assessment data in 2007-08 and 2008-09 demonstrated consistent outcomes among candidates in all programs. On a five-point scale, all the mean scores ranged well above 4.50 and were consistent among ratings by candidates, cooperating mentors, and university supervisors. The scoring instruments used among all programs provide realistic assessment information to determine how well candidates develop appropriate dispositions that match the unit's conceptual frame and philosophical orientation.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The Unit Assessment System, as explained above, is the same for all levels of the unit.

The advanced graduate programs and programs for other school personnel are not as far along in consistently using the system as is discussed at the initial level above. Documentation about assessment from SPA reports, and annual assessment reports provided as electronic resources demonstrated different types of scoring rubrics among different graduate education programs. Faculty members interviewed indicated they thought their SPAs moved them into the type of scoring rubric they were using. Again, there is no evidence that SPAs require differing rubrics. Assessment committee members interviewed explained that faculty members were still struggling with understanding the difference between 'research methodology' and 'assessment measures.' Faculty members interviewed explained differing understanding of why and how they used scoring rubrics for assessing their programs. Unit administrators indicated they struggled to apply standard assessments for the whole unit because of the differences in assessments used. The program teams in the units reported that the UAS application, particularly at the advanced and OSP levels, is yet a work in progress.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Documents demonstrated that the system is under development and implementation with elements from the online services vendor and a new assessment coordinator. The newly revised and implemented system began in 2009 under new unit leadership and a completely revamped university hierarchical structure. Resources are being put toward implementing the system and encouraging faculty and staff to

use the system consistently for both entering and analyzing data.

Data reported from the UAS included both aggregated and disaggregated candidate performance data across programs in the most recent three semesters only, because earlier reported data are from a different system. The UAS information provided included faculty performance data linked with candidate proficiencies in their various courses. Data included demonstrations of initial candidates in professional performances and their impact on p-12 students.

Evidence from electronic documents collections, program and constituent reports called up from the UAS demonstrated the ease with which authorized persons can collect, compile, report, and analyze assessment data. Each program within the unit may have a unique assessment rubric, but the UAS is integrating these data and reporting it. System coordinators interviewed described the stage of development for the UAS and how, within the coming 12 months, even further integration of information will become possible as the software is being adapted.

For example, employer survey data was presented for 2006-2008 but it represented only four respondents in 2007-2008, and the mean responses reported for employers for graduates of Education Graduate Programs (IR Table 108) were identical to the data presented for employer surveys for initial COE program completers for the same time period (IR Table 107). Interview data received from faculty, assessment personnel, and administration reported that employer surveys are under development at both initial and advanced programs using the newly developing assessment system. Reports in the electronic data collection demonstrated how aggregated data may be disaggregated according to off-campus cohort groups, program completers, or for all programs.

When complaints occur they are referred to the Office of Dean in the COE. More challenging problems may be referred to a Care and Concern Committee. Ultimate appeal is possible through the university protocol as stated on page 14 of the student handbook. However, no records of formal complaints were shared with the team. The unit leaders interviewed explained the process, also as it was described in the IR, as well as in the student handbooks. Unit assessment data presented did not address candidate complaints. While a clear process exists in student handbooks, the UAS is not presently a used as a tool to facilitate processing and resolving of students and candidate complaints.

The assessment system is completely integrated with the Learning Management System and the university Student Information System, and maintained using computers and internet cloud computer technology.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The observations and processes cited for the initial programs, above, apply to advanced and OSP programs, along with the addition of these observations. When complaints occur they are referred to the Office of Dean in the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP)

Reports in the electronic data collection demonstrated how aggregated data may be disaggregated according to off-campus cohort groups, program completers, or for the programs of the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP). Interviews with graduate program faculty indicated that not all the programs in GIP were making consistent use of the UAS and OA data that were fully available to them as of fall 2010. Two of the program directors interviewed reported they had not yet taken the opportunity to use the new system data instead of the old system data.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit's IR, electronic documents reviewed, and the unit leaders and faculty interviewed verified that the UAS was implemented in the past 18 months and was developmental as of 2009. The former assessment system was a data base program into which individual candidate demographic data, performance assessment data, and transition point data were manually and individually entered. Faculty and administrators interviewed reported that it was difficult and confusing to access the data and draw out data to use in making decisions about program quality. The data in the old system have been manually re-entered into a newly acquired data access system "Outcomes Assessment" by Blackboard.com. Faculty committee minutes reported that some elements of the institutional memory are missing from the data collection, such as consistent minutes of planning meetings where UAS data might have been used to make analysis and improvement of programs. Nevertheless, preliminary assessment of one semester of the new data system was reflected in modifications to COE for the initial program at this point.

Faculty leaders and program directors interviewed revealed that UAS-generated data are being increasingly used to refine the assessment system itself, as well as unit programs. Only one set of faculty minutes were found observing that data are used by the community to assess, improve, and extend the quality of educator preparation programs at Concordia Chicago.

Data review by faculty is evidenced in minutes of a 9/2/09meeting. These data review resulted in: creating and obtaining approval for k-12 Spanish, relocating a course offered by the College of Arts and Sciences to the COE, and converting assessment rubrics from old diverse systems to the new UAS common rubric.

Interviews with the Unit Education Policy Committee, the COE Education Policy Committee, the Teacher Education Advisory Committee, the UAS administrator, and department faculty verified that faculty and staff throughout all programs in the unit are rapidly adopting a positive attitude toward the growing culture of ongoing assessment that this new UAS is making possible. As of the visit date, the system is developmental, but rapidly developing.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Findings from paragraph one under initial, above, apply to advanced and other school programs as well as these.

As reported in response to Standard 2b, GIP advanced program faculty and leaders interviewed reported inconsistent uses of UAS and OA data to drive and inform program improvement decisions. Unit-wide assessment processes are inconsistent. Program data have not been analyzed by all GIP faculty leaders using UAS and OA data as of the time of the dates for the team visit. Faculty leaders reported plans to grow capacity among Advanced Program faculty members in the uses of the UAS to drive program quality and candidate competency assessment decisions.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The UAS as it has now been developed reflects cutting edge technology and design. Early results viewed by the BOE indicate that the unit community members will be able to make great use of data to monitor and adjust quality outcomes among candidates in all unit programs. Current research under way by selected unit faculty members is investigating the quality of the data recently produced by the UAS and its validity as indicative of candidate quality outcomes.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number &Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
The unit should have an effective system for collecting data, analyzing it, and making unit-wide assessments of candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions.	Faculty reported differences of opinions about how to score assessments and there was not a common rubric to make interpretation of performance outcomes relevant across programs and levels through out the unit.
The advanced programs in the unit do not make frequent and consistent use of the UAS and OA data to drive program assessment and improvement decisions.	Consistent use of the UAS data collection, and the OA data analysis tool will make data-driven decision making for advanced programs more consistent and in line with otherl programs.

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

na

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical

practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

ʝ⌐   ʝ⌐

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has developed relationships with public and private schools across many districts within the Chicago metropolitan area for the purpose of placing initial candidates in field experiences and student teaching as outlined in the Teacher Education Initial Certification Undergraduate Handbook and the Professional Semester Handbook. Written agreements formalize some, but not all, of these placements. University supervisors and mentors at the advanced level collaborate to share resources and expertise to assure advanced candidates are placed in settings that optimize practicum and internship experiences as outlined in the Graduate Handbook.

The Office of Field Experience (OFE) finalizes initial candidates' placements for both field work and student teaching. The office is responsible for coordinating field placements for pre-admitted candidates, candidates who are doing field experience, and those engaged in student teaching. The Office of Field Experience establishes timelines and develops written procedures and official forms to ensure all initial candidates are placed with cooperating teachers who have a minimum of four years teaching experience.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The three advanced programs: school counseling, reading and education leadership; work with individual school sites to place candidates with mentors who can meet candidate needs and fulfill program expectations. For counseling and reading, site selection is a collaborative process between the candidate, the mentor, and the unit supervisor. Details of the candidates' required activities and responsibilities are discussed and agreed upon prior to placement. The nature of program requirements assures reading and counseling candidates have experiences with diverse student populations. Written agreements document the program responsibilities of advanced candidates, their mentors and unit supervisors.

Counseling requires a weekly seminar during the practicum semester and a bi-weekly seminar during the

internship semester. During these sessions candidates and supervisors share experiences and resources. This is also a time for collaboration to assure candidates' professional knowledge and skills develop in a pedagogically correct manner.

During the practicum semester, reading candidates are required to work with middle school or high school content area teachers in EDU 6230. They are required to identify areas of need for students with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and create or modify lessons to make the text accessible for all students. A literacy coaching project is required in EDU 6291, taken during the internship semester

Most leadership candidates complete the practicum and internship in their own work locations; however, interviews confirmed that leadership candidates must complete 15 hours of the internship in a setting that is demographically different than their primary work location. During the practicum and internship, the leadership candidate works on projects, research and appropriate areas of supervision to assure the development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for a variety of leadership roles depending upon the leadership program in which he or she is enrolled.

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The Teacher Education Admissions Committee guides field experience, academic advising and review of initial candidates' qualifications at four points: Transition Point One, Admission to Program; Transition Point Two, Admission to Professional Semester; Transition Point Three, Completion of Professional Semester; and Transition Point Four, Completion of Program. Dispositions are evaluated at both admissions points and at the midterm and final evaluations of the professional semester. Candidates must pass the Illinois Test of Basic Skills before admission to the program and pass the appropriate content area test of the State of Illinois Test System before entering the professional semester. Specific GPAs are also required at program and professional semester admissions. Point Three requires successful completion of the professional semester and an INTASC-based portfolio. Candidates must pass the Illinois Assessment of Professional Teaching Test at Point Four. Transition point requirements are documented and recorded by the Office of Field Experience. Field experiences are developmental; the required number of field experience hours varies by program. Initial candidates must complete 20 hours of field experience before program admission and complete a minimum of 80 hours of field experience before the professional semester. At the beginning of the professional semester, cooperating teachers are invited to an orientation session where they receive instructions and documents to guide them as they supervise candidates during the 16 weeks of student teaching.

The Professional Semester Handbook suggests a progression of candidates' activities and their responsibilities. It is designed to ensure expectations of the candidate, supervising teacher, and university supervisor are aligned, and the candidate can scaffold developing professional skills and dispositions to engage all students in learning. Candidates use technology to enhance classroom instruction including multimedia presentations, interactive white boards, web-based searches, wikis, and blogs. Unit field experience supervisors meet with classroom teachers to monitor candidates' progress and share resources. They observe candidates at least seven times during student teaching and complete

formal evaluations at the midterm and end of the professional semester. The Care and Concern Committee exists to permit faculty and staff to work with candidates on areas of concern that might prevent successful program completion. Electronic messaging such as e-mail facilitates communication between faculty and candidates, and lessons are submitted using technology.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The majority of advanced program candidates are enrolled in cohorts that meet off campus with adjunct faculty responsible for most instruction. Candidates enroll in two eight-week courses per semester. Programs have assigned Ambassadors who are full-time faculty and serve as liaisons to the cohort instructors. In addition to the liaisons, there is a formal method of mentoring adjuncts and detailed instructional guidelines to assure consistency of instruction across cohorts. The Graduate Admissions Office tracks advanced program candidates throughout their programs ensuring they meet entrance requirements and have fulfilled course requirements prior to entering practicum and/or internships. Interviews with advanced candidates, faculty and administrators indicated the strengths of the advanced programs include the emphasis placed on bridging theory and practice. Counseling and reading programs also highlighted intensive field work. Practicum and internship experiences build upon current skills and knowledge to enhance candidates' ability to apply theory and practice to professional responsibilities. Reading and counseling programs meet SPA standards with defined hours for practicum and/or internship experiences.

All programs require a capstone project designed to demonstrate candidates' academic experiences and growth based on the values of the conceptual framework. Capstone elements may include projects, assessments, reflections and dispositions. School-based professionals supervising advanced candidates complete a form used to track the qualifications and experiences of advanced candidates' mentors. Electronic messaging facilitates communication between faculty and candidates and lessons are submitted using instructional technology.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

When initial candidates enter the professional semester, they have had a variety of experiences within the 100 hours of required field experience: 10 hours of general observation, 30 hours of guided observation, 20 hours of individual tutoring, 20-30 hours of small group instruction depending on the program, and 10-15 hours of large group instruction depending on the program. Candidates are required to experience different settings; public, non-public, multicultural, and special education. A review of syllabi indicate the conceptual framework and INTASC standards are the foundation for course work leading up to the professional semester. Reflective assignments are embedded in pre-professional course work, all methods classes, and the professional semester seminar to assure initial candidates develop habits of consideration of classroom events and contemplation of professional practice. The midterm and

final evaluations are based on INTASC standards. The candidate, supervising teacher, and unit supervisor complete the evaluation forms prior to a conference designed to discuss the candidate's teaching practices including the skills and dispositions that assure all students learn. References to diversity are included in syllabi and lesson plan and unit templates. The unit acknowledges the importance of diverse experiences through its requirement that initial candidates complete field observations in multicultural and special education environments, as well as placements in schools with ethnic and socioeconomic diversity.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced candidates are systemically evaluated throughout course work and during the practicum and/or internship semesters to assure growth. Course work and projects are designed to link competence, integrity, and servant leadership to candidates' demonstrated pedagogical knowledge related to the individual programs in which they are enrolled. Candidates in reading and counseling programs acquire the skills necessary to appropriately assess students' cognitive, affective, and motor domains and design appropriate interventions for student growth. All programs require candidates to address issues of diversity through research. The education leadership program encourages analysis of school and community diversity within the internship capstone project. The capstone is designed by the candidate and approved by the faculty mentor. All programs stress reflection as an integral practice within professional responsibilities.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit considers itself a teaching institution that bridges theory and practice. The conceptual framework forms the basis for preparing initial and advanced candidates who demonstrate integrity through responsibility, have developed competency as revealed through the acquisition of the knowledge and skills necessary to teach all students, and cultivate dispositions that value students, family, and community. Course work at both the initial and advanced levels is sequenced to allow candidates to scaffold learning and put theory into practice. Faculty and staff model teaching methodologies, reflective practice, and the belief that all children can learn.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 4: Diversity
The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

ʝ∩   ʝ∩

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit defines diversity within the elements of the conceptual framework: Integrity requires respect for and support of various family structures, religions, beliefs, values, disabilities, and ethnicities and recognizes the cultural influence of age, race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Competence expands the candidates' repertoire of instructional methods and strategies to address diverse learning styles. Servant leadership increases collaboration between the candidate, colleagues, community, and parents to assure an inclusive vision for students' learning and development. These values are embedded in all syllabi reviewed, are evident in discussions with initial and advanced candidates, and are modeled by faculty and staff.

The unit has intentionally addressed diversity within the sequencing of required course work for initial candidates and recognizes it as a foundational element of field experiences. Prior to admission to the program, all initial candidates must take a course related to non-western education systems. Other required courses that focus on aspects of diversity include these examples: EDU3000, Multicultural Education, emphasizes proficiency in using multicultural resources, creating culturally affirming classrooms, and a commitment to setting high expectations for all students. EDU4100, Foundations and Ethics of American Education, explores the social and cultural influences on schools and emphasizes the acculturative role of schools in a pluralistic society. EDU4410, Psychology and Methods for Teaching the Exceptional Learner, addresses assessments and record-keeping, as well as differentiated instruction for exceptional learners, including those with sensory impairments, physical and learning disabilities, and behavioral disorders. The unit mandates 100 hours of field experience prior to student teaching so initial candidates have many opportunities to observe, interact, and reflect on the various forms of diversity presented in classrooms. These include, but are not limited to, differences in culture, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, intellectual ability, learning styles, and multiple intelligences. The unit's requirement that initial candidates have a field placement in a non-public setting provides an additional experience of diversity.

Initial candidate dispositions are evaluated at three transition points, Admission to the College, Admission to Professional Semester, and Completion of Professional Semester. The instrument used for Transition Points One and Two rates "Dispositions of Effective Educators." The "Professional Semester Observation Report" rates the candidate on specific diversity proficiencies aligned with INTASC and the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. Review of documents revealed candidates perform at high levels during the professional semester with continuous improvement from the initial observation to the final observation (most recent data: average 3.93-4.50 on a 5.0 scale). Each candidate creates a portfolio that includes the candidate's education philosophy and evidence of reflective practice with work samples that demonstrate the ability to teach all students.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The discussion for Initial programs (above) also apply to Advanced programs. Advanced programs also address diversity through specific coursework, research, assessment and observation plans, projects, and presentations. The capstone project embedded in Curriculum and Instruction and School Leadership programs summarizes candidates' experiences, including those related to diversity. Leadership candidates must experience at least 15 hours of internship in a diverse setting. Curriculum and Instruction has developed rubrics for the capstone project within EDU6555, Seminar in Reflective Practices. School counseling candidates must take PSY6005, Multicultural Counseling. A review of leadership syllabi emphasizes respect for diversity is a core value of effective leadership. Reading courses emphasize selecting, implementing and evaluating materials that increase the fluency of all

students.

Candidates are assessed in diversity awareness through course work and in their various types of portfolios, according to interviews with department chairs, however no data were presented to illustrate how this assessment has influenced ongoing program adjustments. Graduates and Candidates interviewed were very articulate about concepts relating to diversity in p-12 educational practices.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

| Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidates have many opportunities to work with faculty that represent the unit's definition of diversity; family structures, religions, beliefs, values, disabilities, socioeconomic status ,and recognition of the cultural influence of ethnicity, race, age, and gender. The unit and university faculty bring various experiences to the classroom that enrich instruction. Initial candidates in the baccalaureate program are intentionally placed in field experience and student teaching locations that extend their experiences with diversity as discussed in Standard 3. M.A.T. initial candidates have similar experiences as the baccalaureate program but are likely to interact with more diverse faculty due to the nature of the cohort structure of this program.

Interviews with faculty, as well as iinstitutional data tables demonstrated both cultural and ethnic diversity among faculty especially paralleling the ethnicity of the community.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The discussion for Initial programs (above) is also true for Advanced programs. Advanced candidates' opportunities to work with diverse faculty are similar to those of initial candidates. However, the fact that 80 percent of instructors are adjunct faculty results in greater diversity among these members of the faculty than those who are full-time faculty.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

IR data for 2009-2010 reveal that 66.3 percent of initial candidates are white, 14 percent African American, 10 percent Hispanic/Latino, two percent Asian, and seven percent unknown. Advanced

candidates are 66 percent white, 14 percent African American, nine percent Hispanic/Latino, one percent Asian, and 9.5 percent unknown. While these percentages reflect the institution as a whole, they are not reflective of the geographical area served by the institution, which is reported as 17.4 percent African American, 19.6 percent Hispanic/Latino, and 5.2 percent Asian. In terms of gender, initial candidates are 68 percent female, 32 percent male; advanced candidates are 81 percent female, 19 percent male; the institution is 74 percent female, 26 percent male, but the surrounding area is statistically evenly divided between women and men.

The unit has implemented programs designed to attract diverse candidates. At the initial level, these include the M.A.T. program, recruiting transfer students from community colleges and changing master schedules to accommodate commuter candidates. Interviews revealed a university-wide initiative to attract first-generation students and those from under-represented socioeconomic groups. There are unit-wide strategies to retain diverse students. The Golden Apple Scholars and Teacher Induction Academy are specifically directed towards recruiting the latter two groups. These initiatives have had an impact on the unit. Facilities for all students include the Academic Center for Excellence that houses a peer tutoring program and the Learning Assistance Center. There are active Black and Latino student associations, and many cultural events bring diverse opportunities for interactions with different groups and philosophies.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The cohort structure of advanced programs attracts diverse candidates. Advanced candidates' experience working with advanced candidates are similar to those experienced by initial candidates. However, because of the cohort structure of advanced programs, candidates are more likely to experience greater diversity of colleagues within the advanced programs.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of demographic data from Pre K-12 school sites indicated that initial candidates have opportunities to work with students from the diverse backgrounds that are reflective of the geographic area of the institution. The Unit Assessment Report for 2009 lists the following data for student teaching sites during the 2009-2009 academic year; 49 percent of placements were in a racially diverse setting, 31 percent were low-income settings, and 28 percent were in limited-English environments. Initial candidates' field experiences are recorded by the Office of Field Experience on forms that include the location and type of school setting for each placement. This process assures candidates meet the minimum requirements for field experiences in multicultural and special education classrooms. Interviews confirmed that initial candidates encounter a range of diverse K-12 students throughout field experience and student teaching.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Internship placements for advanced candidates most often occur at their work sites. Data for the 2008-2009 academic year indicate these sites were 32 percent racially diverse, 32 percent low income and 28 percent limited English. At the advanced level, candidates do research, assess data, evaluate programs and engage in other professional activities directly related to multiple aspects of school site diversity. Interviews confirm that advanced candidates in all programs work with K-12 students across the spectrum of diversity.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit incorporates the value of diversity within the conceptual framework and defines diversity as learning styles, family structures, religion, beliefs, disabilities, gender, race, ethnicities, values, and socioeconomic status. The unit's commitment to these values is evident across initial and advanced programs. Diversity is addressed in the modeling and teaching of learning activities that address students' cognitive, affective, and motor domains; it is embedded in field experiences and student teaching at the initial level and the practicum and internships at the advanced level. Interviews with cooperating teachers and employers confirm that candidates are well prepared to work with diverse K-12 students.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

jn   jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The education unit at Concordia University consists of two colleges: the College of Education and the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs. The IR Table 1 indicates that the unit has a total of 531 faculty members. Eighty-nine faculty members (full-time and part-time) are in the College of Education (COE), and 401 professional faculty members are in the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP). There are not sufficient data provided to calculate actual the number of adjunct and clinical faculty teaching in the unit. It is estimated that over seventy percent of teaching faculty in the unit are adjunct and clinical faculty.

Information gathered from the IR and from interview sessions indicates that most of the full-time professional education faculty members have a terminal degree in their field of expertise or are working toward their terminal degree. The IR report states that most adjunct faculty members and clinical supervisors have earned a master's degree or an advanced certification. There is not sufficient evidence to verify the data in terms of the actual number of full-time faculty who have earned a terminal degree.

The unit administration was not concerned that faculty in Masters programs were teaching with only a Masters level degree. Candidates interviewed did not express any concerns about their faculty members lack of competence or mastery in their respective fields.

The IR indicates and administrators interviewed verified that all part-time adjunct faculty members must have three or more years of teaching and/or related educational experiences, successful annual evaluations in their schools and strong recommendations as distinguished practitioners in their field of expertise. Information gathered from the interview sessions confirmed the qualifications of adjunct faculty members. The IR also reports that 100 percent of current school-based faculty members are licensed in the area in which they provide supervision to initial candidates. The on-site interview confirmed that all supervising faculty have the appropriate credentials.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The interview sessions and a review of the syllabi provide evidence that full-time faculty at the initial and advanced levels exhibit knowledge in the content area that they are assigned to teach. Most course syllabi include the unit's conceptual framework and course objectives. Some course syllabi clearly outline and state professional standards. Adjunct faculty members teaching initial programs were provided a template to help them develop their course syllabi. Advanced programs have developed a master syllabus that includes all elements of instruction to maintain consistency across multiple sections of the same course. The course leader then serves as a mentor to guide and support adjunct faculty members on their course development.

Both initial and advanced level faculty have 12 hours teaching load per semester. A majority of initial level courses are offered in 16-week sessions, and all advanced level courses are offered in eight-week sessions. Faculty who teach at the advanced level teach two courses per eight-week session.

Full-time faculty at both initial and advanced levels model best practices, such as inquiry strategies, infusing technology in teaching, or using managerial grid models of behavioral leadership. Adjunct faculty bring rich practical experiences into classrooms and share this knowledge with candidates. Since more than 70 percent of the unit's instructional professional education faculty are adjunct and clinical faculty, it is the program chair or course leader's responsibility to ensure that all part-time faculty model best practices in their teaching.

Initial program courses are offered on campus. Program leaders expressed that they review adjunct faculty's course evaluations, conduct class observations, and provide feedback to adjunct faculty for future improvement. Most of the advanced programs are offered off campus as a cohort group, and adjunct faculty are invited to participate in the CAF (Concordia Adjunct Faculty Experience) activity. Several programs also offer mini-CAF sessions to ensure quality teaching. During interview sessions with teacher candidates at the initial and advanced levels, many expressed their concerns about the quality of teaching by some adjunct faculty members. They indicated that some adjuncts did not model the conceptual framework components of integrity and respect. Several candidates stated that the adjunct was not prepared to teach, and often tired. Some candidates complained about four classes and would

like to transfer to another university. Several Candidates reported an awareness of "something happening" to change the instructors' techniques or replacing them

The unit is supported by Cougar Net and the Instructional Design Team in the use of technology in teaching. Full-time and adjunct faculty are also encouraged to infuse technology in teaching. Candidates inteviewedsaid that technology was inconsistent at off-site locations.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit has developed a document on Policy and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. The document identifies four categories of scholarship activities; the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of application. To keep with the unit's mission, a fifth category, the scholarship of mission has been added to their model of scholarship.

Unit faculty members must provide evidence of accomplishments to support their scholarship in each category. Information gathered from the review of faculty vitae, the IR, and interviews revealed that some faculty engage in scholarship through publications, grant writings, workshop attendance, and conference presentations. Their scholarship works were aligned with the institution and unit's mission. Others had no such scholarship record.

Information gathered from interviews indicated that faculty members are engaged in interdisciplinary collaboration of scholarship. The unit has adopted Boyer's model of scholarship, and faculty's engagement in program development, course revision, and action research are considered as a part of the scholarship. The unit also provides faculty members' engagement in conference participation and presentation. Through an application process, faculty can receive funding to support their conference travel.

There was not sufficient evidence to confirm overall faculty's scholarship productivity. Not all faculty's vitae are current or outline their scholarly work. The examples of scholarship activity range from curriculum revision, project proposal, to publication of a book. Most initial program faculty engaged in professional presentations rather than scholarly writing for peer-reviewed publication. In comparison, the advanced program faculty are likely to engage in research and peer-reviewed scholarly activities. There were no data to support part-time adjunct faculty's ability in modeling best practices in scholarship.

To support faculty members' professional development, the unit offers summer faculty research grants to support faculty's scholarship agenda. The unit also hired grant consultants to support faculty members' grant applications. The president and vice president explained a new initiative, implemented during the fall of 2011, that will support faculty's research agendas by providing reduced teaching loads and allowing the time to engage in their research activities. Some internal resources can also be used to support faculty's scholarship agendas. In the near future, the unit plans create an Institutional Research position to support faculty's research agenda.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit's mission and the "Policy and the Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" document identifies three dimensions of services: service to the profession, service to the university, and service to the church and community. Documents indicate that unit faculty members at the initial and advanced levels provide service to P-12 schools at the local, national, and international levels by offering professional development workshops, assisting with the Lutheran Education Association National Convention, presenting school leadership seminars, and publishing essays at the Lutheran Education Association Journal, etc.

From the review of faculty vitae and the Institutional Report, faculty members have provided service activities which include serving on university committees, presenting workshops to peers, conference planning, mentoring others, political activism on behalf of the profession, serving on accreditation teams, serving as consultants to schools, serving on community boards or organizations, working with marginalized populations, serving in honor societies, youth work, and other service activities.

The unit's conceptual framework dispositions are to prepare candidates to demonstrate professional integrity, competence, and leadership to those they teach and serve. The unit values a servant leadership concept by preparing candidates to become servant leaders. Information gathered from the interview sessions provided evidence to support the unit's faculty model best professional practice in service.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Interviews with faculty and administrators, and council minutes indicated the following.

At the end of each academic session (eight weeks or 16 weeks), candidates use an Online Assessment (OA) system to assess faculty's professional teaching practices. Course evaluation surveys are submitted anonymously by candidates. The OA evaluation questionnaire includes 27 Likert-type scale questions. Course evaluation data from the College of Education was provided in the IR report from the past three years (2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010). The majority of course evaluation mean scores from the College of Education (COE) were above 3.65, with 1 being strongly disagree and 4 being strongly agree. The majority of mean scores from the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP) were all

above 3.42, with 1 being strongly disagree and 4 being strongly agree. The high course evaluations showed that candidates were pleased with faculty's teaching practices. However, candidates' survey return rate was not provided.

The IR report also provided a GAP analysis which showed how well faculty instructors met course outcomes/objectives; the GAP analysis data is presented for each course. Both the courses offered in the COE (51 courses) and in the College of GIP (91 courses) received high scores (1 being not addressed, and 3 being thoroughly addressed). The majority of GAP scores in the COE were above 2.60 with one below 2.0. The majority of the GAP scores for CGS courses were above 2.60.

The unit adopted the Online Assessment (OA) system in August 2009. University students can enter their evaluation data two weeks before the end of academic session. The system remains open two weeks after the end of an academic session. After faculty members submit their final grades, OA assessment results are made available to faculty. The return rate of using the paper-pencil evaluation form was approximately 80 percent; the return rate using the Online Assessment was much lower. Some faculty members reported that they experienced difficulty accessing the evaluation data.

Tenure-track faculty members participate in the peer review process which provides faculty members an opportunity to reflect on his or her own teaching, scholarship and service, and identify areas for further development. The unit dean schedules an individual meeting with each faculty member to review the assessment data and identify performance goals.

Tenured faculty members also engage in a post-tenure review every five years. The post-tenure review process similarly provides faculty members an opportunity to reflect on their teaching, scholarship and service activities. The process helps faculty members to identify areas for improvement and future performance goals.

No evidence of disaggregated faculty course evaluation data for either full time or adjunct faculty were presented to the team.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The Institutional Report indicated that professional development opportunities are made available for faculty members through the university. The Associated of Colleges of Illinois (ACI) hosts monthly meetings to address a variety of current educational issues. Faculty members participate in ACI-sponsored monthly meetings, conferences, workshops, and seminars.

A review of full-time and part-time faculty's vitae showed that most initial and advanced faculty members were engaged in some level of professional development activities. Workshops were offered within the unit to foster faculty members' professional growth.

From the interview sessions, faculty confirmed the unit's support for their professional development activities. Through an applications process, faculty received funding support to present research findings

and collaborative projects. Several faculty members have presented their scholarly work at the international level.

Several in-house professional development opportunities are made available to faculty. No data were given to support how many workshop sessions were offered to support faculty's skill in technology and/or diversity.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit consists of two colleges: the College of Education (COE) and the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP). Most full-time and unit part-time faculty (who are full-time with the university) have earned a terminal degree in their related field. Adjunct faculty and clinical supervisors have earned an advanced degree or a certification; they exhibited qualification and content expertise in their field.

On-site interviews and IR course evaluation data show that candidates are generally satisfied with the unit's initial and advanced faculty members' teaching, field supervision and other related instructional activities. Unit faculty members receive technology support and have the opportunity to engage in collaborative work with colleagues. However, there were some concerns expressed by candidates at interview sessions regarding adjunct faculty's teaching effectiveness.

Unit full-time faculty members are engaged in research and other scholarly activities and have exhibited their academic accomplishments through publications, presentations, grants, program development, action research, and other innovative projects. The unit provides support for faculty's scholarship and professional development activities. Resources are also available at the university and unit levels to support and encourage faculty's engagement in scholarship and professional development.

Most faculty members are aware of the unit's conceptual framework which includes integrity, competence and servant leadership. Unit faculty value service activities and provide service at all levels including the department, college, university, church, community, and professional organization levels.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
Heavy teaching loads and time constraints limit opportunities for all advanced program faculty members to pursue scholarship and service.	Interviews and documentation provided to the team gave inconsistent evidence of a culture of scholarship among advanced programs' faculty.

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
The evidence of scholarship produced by initial faculty was limited.	Interviews and documentation provided to the team gave inconsistent evidence of a culture of scholarship among initial program faculty.

Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

jn   jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	Unacceptable
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Concordia University Chicago includes a College of Arts and Sciences, a College of Business, a College of Education, and a College of Graduate and Innovative Programs. It is these last two colleges that now make up the unit. Each college dean, along with a team of other faculty leader members representing both initial undergraduate and initial and advanced graduate programs, provide administrative oversight for the unit. The Concordia University vice president for academic affairs is the designated senior administrator for the unit. The dean of the College of Education was recruited in 2009 to prepare for the NCATE accreditation. The university restructuring of these two colleges together as one educational unit has led to change in programs, content, outcomes, assessment strategies, and mission. The unit colleges share academic facilities, exchange faculty members as needed, and provide a common academic student support system.

The unit organization chart shows the Vice President for Academics at the top. Reporting to him are the Dean of the College of Education (COE) and the Dean of Graduate and Innovative Programs (GIP). IN the COE the chart shows the Director of Field land Internships and a Unit Assessment System Director each with a support committee. The departments included the MAT, Elementary Education, Special Education, Secondary Education, Early Childhood Education, Department of Christian Education, and Lutheran Teacher Education, each with a chair and support committee. GIP includes: an Executive Director of Doctoral Programs, Assist and Dean of Leadership and Professional Studies, Executive Director of College Services, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, Executive Director of Student Services. The Assistant Dean of Leadership and Professional Studies oversees the Division of Human services, the Department of Foundations and Social Policy research, the Department of Leadership, and the Division of Innovation and Outreach, each with a chair and supporting committee. The Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies oversees the Department of Educational (School) Leadership, Teacher Leadership and Chief School Business Official programs, the Department of Instructional Design and Technology and the Ambassador Program (part time faculty who represent the university out in the districts), each with a chair and supporting committee.

A COE council and a GIP council consider policies and practices within each college's domain. If issues are not resolved they to the Council chaired by the Academic Vice President that includes representatives form COE, GIP, and CAS. From there matters are taken to the President's Cabinet if necessary. No record of events needing to move that high in the organization were presented to the team.

There is a unit leadership plan in place for both the initial and advanced programs (graduate) schools. The College of Education has leadership of the initial licensure areas, including an MAT and endorsements. The College of Graduate and Innovative Programs has the advanced programs. This is referred to as the two colleges/one unit plan. The unique structure prompted a very close look by the team.

An organizational flow chart indicates that curricular and policy changes initiate within departments and programs and are sent to the respective policy committee for action. The policy committee approves and moves the changes forward, or sends back changes that are not accepted. The organizational plan assures that faculty are involved in program design, implementation and evaluation.

Faculty and administrators interviewed explained how policies that have created strong objections can be stopped through a demur process. The demur process encourages wider discussion ,and collaboration and may reduce tension and animosity. Any policy that results in demur requires the competing agents to collaborate on a solution and present it to the entire faculty for vote. Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, who teach content or methods courses for initial candidates explained how this process helps create the collegial atmosphere between colleges that is so necessary to an effective unit.

In the unit's admission system, candidates are provided with two advisers. One adviser is an academic

adviser who is housed within the Registrar's Office for the initial programs and in the office of Graduate Student Services for advanced programs and programs for other school personnel. The Advisors' main responsibility is to make sure candidates takes the correct courses. The other adviser is a faculty member within the relevant program of the unit and is expected to mentor the candidate professionally.

Interviews with support staff and faculty indicated that this system is not yet as smooth as it might be, and candidates are sometimes given conflicting information that creates confusion. From interviews we learned that over the past 18 months, initial candidates were miss-advised by registrar personnel about what classes could be transferred in from another institution. This sometimes meat that a candidate had to repeats a course he or she had already taken at another institution. Interviews with administrators, faculty, and candidates revealed at least ten instances in the current semester where initial candidates received incorrect advising from the registrar's advising center and that this miss-advising conflicted with the advising given by the COE faculty and department leaders and program literature. This resulted in several candidates having to enroll in an additional semester. (see AFI for Standard 6).

Administrators and faculty interviewed explained the university and unit system in place to make sure that catalogs, checklists, and other documentation are accurate. The registrar requests approved program changes be sent to the Registrar's Office in the spring. These changes are given to marketing for the hard copy catalog and to institutional technology for the electronic versions.

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The university was in a dire fiscal situation by 2003 and faced possible closure, owing to the construction of a new education building and new faculty positions, but they decided to fight through the hard times. With the growth of the graduate program, the university was able to right itself and they are now solidly on the way to solvency. Despite the financial problems and due to the unit's part in solving the dilemma, it has benefited by receiving a substantial part of the increasing revenue. The unit receives approximately 70 percent of the university budget expenditures to support its activities.

In looking at financial support for faculty development, interviews with administrators indicated that faculty are to receive $300 for conference attendance and $500 if they are presenting. The team found no policies to support this, and some faculty interviewed were unaware that such a formula exists. Interviews with administrators indicated that faculty members are asked to plan professional development needs in advance so they can be approved and added to the budget. If faculty members have opportunities that arise more suddenly, they can request funds from the administrators. Interviews indicated that these needs are inconsistently met at best. There are no clear guidelines on how these decisions are made. Junior faculty interviewed said that they usually stay fairly close to home and do not apply for national or international conferences. Three senior faculty reported they receive all they ask for in the way of professional development. Two full-time faculty reported that they have their professional memberships paid while the others did not indicate so when asked. Adjunct faculty interviewed indicated they receive no conference or professional development beyond the on-campus seminars they are invited to attend.

A budget breakdown provided by the chief financial officer showed that budgets for professional development have increased 200 percent in the past five years, and projected budgets continue to show this trend. While the team was on campus, the Academic Cabinet announced a new policy to allocate $50,000 for faculty workload reduction in support of faculty professional development and research.

Although the unit has funds available for faculty professional development, faculty interviewed indicated that there is confusion about how faculty may access those funds. The team could not find a policy that makes it clear to faculty how to get the resources to support their professional growth and involvement across the various colleges involved in the Unit.

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Initial programs faculty workloads fall within the NCATE guidelines denoted as "acceptable." Each faculty member is expected to teach 24 hours per year with some reassignment for supervision or administrative duties. Financial support for research will begin with next year. While all the details have not been worked out at this visit for how this support will be provided, it appears faculty will apply for a load reduction to support research activities.

The two college/one unit approach should make it possible to implement a course load of 12 hours per semester for the undergrad faculty and a nine-hour load for graduate. However, all faculty are required to teach a 12-hour load. Faculty who work as chairs or program leaders are provided some reassigned time. Many faculty teach one or two course overloads.

Faculty interviews demonstrated how faculty are provided support for teaching, scholarship and service activities. Historically the university has considered itself a teaching institution, and traditional scholarship was not universally done. In the past several years there have been several changes that are intended to drive the faculty toward more scholarship. The new structure includes a Graduate College, a move to universal acceptance of implementation of the Boyer Model of Scholarship, financial support for research, new faculty hires, and a senior administration focused on creating a more scholarly environment. Interviews indicated this structure would help the unit become more productive with scholarship to support teaching.

One of the clear challenges facing this team was an exploration of the extensive cohort graduate model that is the primary delivery method of several graduate programs. This model has professors traveling to candidate sites to deliver the master's program. Program materials included a marketing slogan assuring students will "not have to travel more than five miles to a program location." The programs supporting documents, as well as interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates, indicates that this program, supported by both full-time and adjunct faculty, is perceived as "effective." While the data collected are still in the developmental stage, there are many indications that the program has a high level of quality and is well received by candidates and the employers who hire them. Interviews with , program leaders, ambassadors, or department chairs indicated a diverse but deliberate attempt to closely monitor adjunct faculty.

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The overall university facility is satisfactory. While the main building dates to 1913 or after, it is kept up-to-date and clean. The administrator in charge of facilities showed the team a document that showed a flat history of spending on facilities maintenance and upgrades that was of concern to him.

The Christopher Center houses the entire unit. This complex is eight years old. It is large, bright, clean and has comfortable and efficient classrooms. Due the growth in the program, most especially the graduate program, faculty office space is at a premium. The original office space is large and well appointed, with newer offices taking on a more modular appearance.

There are at 30 or more active off-site facilities the unit uses to hold cohort graduate classes. These facilities, leased from local schools and districts, provide an uneven classroom experience for both faculty and students. Some are in nice buildings with appropriate technology and instructional design, while others are in older buildings without necessary technology or effective learning environments.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

As a newer facility, the Christopher Center has adequate technological resources. This past year, every faculty member received a new Dell laptop computer. Classrooms have data projectors and wired Internet access.

The Christopher Center has several mobile media whiteboards for staff to use and demonstrate, but there are few classrooms in which they are permanently installed. In interviews with an instructor who offers the basic instructional technology course it was stated that it takes considerable effort to get the needed technology.

An Instructional Resource Center sits prominently on the second floor and is an attractive and valuable resource for both faculty and students. Within the next year the Christopher Center is slated to receive wireless connectivity. The lack of wireless capability has been a complaint of both students and staff.

The most pressing concern regarding unit facilities relates to the graduate program's reliance on cohort sites throughout the city. In interviews with the adjuncts that spend nearly all of their teaching time in these sites, it was noted that many of the facilities lack the same level of technology as campus classrooms. There is clearly an equity issue. The instructors used comments such as, "You make do." Or, "Get creative." Or, "If you cannot find it here, you bring your own." There is a checklist used to

determine if a site is suitable for an off-site program, but a site may be used with very little technology. The cohort model trades convenience for technological equity.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has substantially met most areas of Standard 6, with some exceptions. There is a high level of collaboration within the unit and with faculty across the university. The financial situation of the university is improving, and the unit receives a substantial share of these resources. The facilities on the main campus are very good, though the continued growth of the programs have filled up available space for faculty and instruction. Technology use is good where it can be used. However, much of the instructional program is delivered at several hundred off-campus sites, usually in K-12 school facilities which make it hard to provide equitable technological and environmental resources for candidates attending those sites.

The unit has grown exponentially in the last few years. Administrators and faculty understand the pressures created by this growth.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. A clear procedure and line of authority that defers to initial program faculty expert decisions about transfer credits is currently lacking.	Confusion and conflict arise in undergraduate COE advising due to inconsistent understanding of initial program requirements among Registrar's advisers. Candidates are harmed by inappropriate advise. Through interviews the team discovered multiple candidates have been given incorrect advising that resulted in them missing opportunities to take currently offered requirement courses . They then had to enroll for an additional semester to make up for the advising errors.
2. Graduate faculty loads exceed nine hours.	Graduate faculty load should consider Standard 6 NCATE guidelines represented as "acceptable" or "target."

3. The unit lacks a system to assure adequate facilities at the Advanced and OSP program off-campus location sites.	Inconsistent physical quality among the hundreds of off-campus program sites creates inequity among candidate experiences. Some candidates must complete their programs in poorly equipped sites.
4. The unit lacks clear and consistent policy for faculty to access resources for professional growth	Faculty interviews demonstrated inconsistent understanding about the resources available for professional growth and how to access them. Distribution of those resources were uneven, depending upon faculty member history in the Unit.

Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met	▼
Advanced Preparation	Met	▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

IR, 25 syllabi, 200 faculty vitae, 45 committee minutes, 5 handbooks, 12 SPA reports, 52 linked data tables, 34 flyers and brochures, 10 online eCourse sites, 132 candidate ePortfolios, OA data submission instructional materials, UAS data submission and retrieval instructions, 25 MB of candidate data online,

Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Persons Interviewed

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: