2007 Part C of the AACTE Annual Report

Section 1 - Institutional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE ID:</th>
<th>10213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Murray State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:</td>
<td>01/16/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Accreditation Visit:</td>
<td>F08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Head Name:</th>
<th>Dr. Russell Wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:russ.wall@coe.murraystate.edu">russ.wall@coe.murraystate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head Phone:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head Fax:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st NCATE Coordinator:</td>
<td>Dr. Renee W. Campoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Coordinator Title:</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Coordinator Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:renee.campoy@coe.murraystate.edu">renee.campoy@coe.murraystate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Coordinator Phone:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Coordinator Fax:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd NCATE Coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Name:</td>
<td>Dr. Randy J. Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Title:</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy.dunn@murraystate.edu">randy.dunn@murraystate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Phone:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Fax:</td>
<td>(270) 809-3413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2006-2007 academic year?

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2006-2007 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)
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Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. A change in the name of the unit or institution.
2. The status of the institution (e.g., campuses merged, campuses separated, etc.).
3. Changes in key personnel, particularly the unit head, NCATE coordinator, or university/college president.
4. The addition and/or removal of programs.
5. The addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., addition of a master's degree or doctoral program).
6. Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. (NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.)
7. Significant changes in physical facilities.
8. Significant changes resulting from unforeseen conditions such as natural disasters or health calamities.

Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) 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(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit’s conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

The COE Conceptual Framework was revised in 2007 to include a new disposition pertaining specifically to the graduate candidates, programs and faculty. The disposition of ‘leadership’ was determined to be highly appropriate due to the focus of Teacher Leadership by the Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board (EPSB) in the redesign of all advanced/masters’ teacher education programs. The graduate faculty wanted to increase focus on leadership to follow the development of the candidates’ professional persona from undergraduate students to beginning classroom teachers to experienced teachers and ultimately to school administrators, school counselors, school psychologist, and other school professionals. Leadership is defined within the Conceptual Framework as “ethical change agent to influence classrooms, schools, districts communities and the global society.” The disposition of leadership is a promise that candidates will continue to grow professionally as their school roles change to increased responsibility to accept an ever increasing productive and influential role in improving student learning by continuously refining and improving their own performance in the classroom, school, district, community and society. Graduate programs provide candidates skills and knowledge to increase leadership capability while the schools provide the opportunities to utilize newly acquired skills and knowledge. The particular manner in which programs provide skills and knowledge varies, but research, analysis of student data, assessment, differentiation and diversity to meet student needs are constant themes for all graduate teacher programs. The dispositions of tolerance, responsible, enthusiastic, caring, confident, and ethical continue to be a part of graduate programs, but leadership is added as a maturing element to the candidates’ repertory.

Below is the COE Conceptual Framework in the abbreviated student version to illustrate the new disposition.

Murray State University - College of Education
Conceptual Framework

The goal of Murray State University’s preparation program is to produce candidates who demonstrate the characteristics of a Murray State graduate, the proficiencies delineated by the New and Experienced Teacher Standards and the indicators articulated by the learned societies of their disciplines; thereby practicing as Reflective Decision-Makers, the Theme of our College. The following student Dispositions arise from our theme and are the values, commitments, and professional ethics that MSU engenders in its candidates. The Murray State University undergraduate candidate will become an educator who is:

1. Tolerant - Considers new ideas, alternative possibilities, different perspectives, and people representing a variety of differences without prejudice or bigotry.
2. Responsible - Considers consequences and makes decisions in a rational and thoughtful manner for the welfare of others; acts with integrity to pursue an objective with thoroughness and consistency.
3. Enthusiastic - Is eager and passionately interested in tasks that relate to beliefs about education.
4. Caring - Demonstrates devotion, compassion, and regard for the welfare of others.
5. Confident - Exhibits certainty about possessing the ability, judgment, and internal resources needed to succeed as a teacher.
6. Ethical - Conforms to accepted professional standards of conduct by making decisions based on standards and principles established by the education profession.

The Murray State University graduate candidate sustains the undergraduate dispositions, but with a maturing expertise also embraces the disposition of leadership defined as ethical change agent to influence classrooms, schools, districts, communities, and the global society.

The Knowledge Base including research, theory, philosophy, and practice is the foundation that informs faculty and guides program goals. The success of the program is determined by program Outcomes, Kentucky Performance Standards and the use of instructional technology for all certified programs, including National Program Standards, so that the contributions of learned societies inform MSU program goals. Continuous Assessment connects all elements of the conceptual framework where each program is responsible for utilizing assessment information as a basis for program improvement. The focus of the conceptual framework is to prepare MSU graduates to become reflective decision-makers and to achieve Kentucky Standards:

1. Design/plan instruction and learning climates;
2. Create/maintain learning climates;
3. Implement/manage instruction;
4. Assess/communicate learning results;
5. Reflect/evaluate teaching and learning;
6. Collaborate with colleagues, parents/others;
7. Engage in professional development;
8. Demonstrate knowledge;
9. Utilize technology; and
10. Provide professional leadership within school, community and profession.
Section 6. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Please describe the unit’s plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Section 7. Unit capacity

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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).
**Standard 4. Diversity**

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

**Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:**

**Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:**

**Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).**

**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.

**Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:**

The unit follows standardized and consistent evaluation procedures to evaluate faculty each year as outlined in the university faculty handbook and college policy manual. A Tenure Checklist is used to introduce new tenure-track faculty to the unit’s promotion and tenure policies. Tenure Progress Report is used to document feedback to tenure-track probationary faculty from the department chair and department committee. The Dean also reviews progress of all probationary faculty by interview and written feedback. An annual review is also required for all tenured and untenured faculty. Material submitted by faculty for this evaluation is based on a point system, and is used determine any merit pay that is available to the unit in a given year. The annual review includes observation of course teaching by the department chair for all probationary, lecturer/half-time faculty.

The forms used for the review processes are attached and listed below. NOTE: Much of the formatting has been lost in these documents.

First Year Tenure Checklist  
Annual Review of Probationary Faculty Member  
Your Department Annual Review of Tenured, Probationary, Half-Time Faculty  
Tenure Tracking Merit Pay Tracking through Individual Activity File  

1. Probationary faculty member has read and understands the following documents. □Yes □No  

Murray State University [MSU] Faculty Handbook http://campus.murraystate.edu/org/fac senate/facultyhandbook/  

MSU Faculty Handbook 2.6 Academic Promotion Policy  
And especially  
- 2.6.2 Guidelines  
- 2.6.2.1 Teaching Excellence  
- 2.6.2.2 Research and Creative Activity  
- 2.6.2.3 University Service and Professional Activities  
- 2.6.3 Procedures Covering Application for and Consideration of Promotion  

MSU Faculty Handbook 2.7 Murray State University Tenure Policy  
And especially  
- 2.7.3 The Probationary Period  
- 2.7.3.1 Reduction of the Probationary Period  
- 2.7.3.3 The Annual Evaluation  
- 2.7.4 Basis for Awarding Tenure  
- 2.7.4.1 Faculty Performance  
- Teaching Excellence  
- Research and Creative Activity  
- University Service and Professional Activities  
- 2.7.4.2 Needs of the University  
- 2.7.5 The Tenure Process

03.0 Personnel ~ 03.1 Faculty
And especially
p 03.1D Annual Evaluation of Performance
p 03.1J Promotion
p 03.1K Tenure
p Appendix F: Coe Evaluation Tracking Document

2. Probationary faculty member has been assigned a mentor. □Yes □No

3. Probationary faculty member, mentor and chair have met [Formal Orientation] and reviewed/explained the promotion process. □Yes □No

4. Probationary faculty member, mentor and chair have met and reviewed/explained the tenure process. □Yes □No

5. Probationary faculty member has met with the Department Tenure Committee and the promotion and tenure processes have been reviewed/explained. □Yes □No

We certify that the promotion and tenure processes have been reviewed/explained to all parties’ satisfaction and that all of the above requirements have been met

___________________________________ _________________________________
Probationary Faculty Member Date Chair, Department Tenure Committee/Date

We certify that this process has occurred:

___________________________________ _________________________________
Chair of Department Date Dean, College of Education Date

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES, LEADERSHIP AND COUNSELING
DEPARTMENTAL TENURE COMMITTEE’S
ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBER
A Progress Report Based on a Review of the Member’s Portfolio

Name: Academic Year:

Date of Committee Meeting: Highest Degree: Length of Service:

Much Some Little
Standard or Criterion (See Faculty Handbook) Evidence Evidence Evidence
Presented Presented Presented

A. Evidence of teaching excellence and classroom performance supported by course evaluations, instructional materials, concern for students, and academic advising. (prepared by faculty member)

B. Evidence of research and creative activity in the form of publications, presentations, or reports of pure or applied research. (prepared by faculty member)

C. Evidence of service and professional activities in the form of service contributions to the department, college, university as well as awards and recognitions. (prepared by faculty member)

D. Evidence that this faculty member exhibits qualities skills and/or qualifications needed by the department, college and university. (prepared by committee)

Progress toward meeting criteria for tenure in light of length of service and evidence submitted.

Adequate __________________ Inadequate __________________

Committee Comments: _________________________________________________________

___________________________________ ___________________________
Chair, Tenure Committee Member

___________________________________ ___________________________
Member, Tenure Committee Member
YOUR DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REVIEW
of Tennured ~ Probationary ~ Lecturer/Half-Time Faculty
for Academic Year________

Faculty Member: Date: ____________________

(INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH: This introductory paragraph should be tailored to the individual department if used—highlighting
the positive achievements of the department. Then, follow with…... (choose the appropriate comment section for the individual
faculty)

[TENURED FACULTY: A paragraph with specific evaluative comments @ that faculty member’s achievements. A second
paragraph includes comments about possible contributions the faculty member can make in the upcoming year possibly using
IAF information as one source..

PROBATIONARY FACULTY: Introductory paragraph only. {Formal evaluation has been recorded in a second document.}

LECTURER/HALF-TIME: Paragraphs with evaluative comments related to Teaching Excellence, Research and Creative Activity,
and University and Professional Service.]

“Below is a table depicting summary information regarding total merit points, including those points that were determined for
teaching/research/service and the amount of merit pay recommended by the chair:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Requested Points</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph with* information related to merit pool monies, point money, and computation of individual faculty member’s
recommended merit increase based on this information.

Keep in mind that we usually get an “across-the-board” raise plus merit pay. In addition, at a level higher than the department,
additional pay may be added for Roads Scholars, Residential Colleges, promotion increments, equity, etc.

This annual review reflects satisfactory or above performance in the areas of teaching, research and service.” (Tailor to your
specific faculty)

Conference Comments (If Appropriate):

___________________________________________
Faculty Date Chairperson Date

I concur with the evaluation statements above.

___________________________________________
Dean Date

This document is to be viewed in color

College of Education
Tenure Tracking
Merit Pay Tracking through Individual Activity File
Annual Evaluations

**Note Faculty and Evaluators always sign evaluations and copies are retained by all parties

Evaluation Path for New Faculty Hired in Fall Semester

Date Comment Tenure Information IAF (Merit Information) Evaluation Activities
Non-tenured Faculty Timeline Non-tenured Faculty Timeline
Fall Semester Year 1
1st Tenure Review Materials Collection Begins
First Year Tenure Checklist
Materials Collection Begins
  Faculty Mentor assigned.
  Department Chair and Faculty Mentor give faculty member orientation to the university and college evaluation systems.
  First Year Tenure Checklist completed.

Spring Semester
Year 1
1st IAF Review (for 1 Semester Only)

IAF /Annual Review
submitted to Department in February (calendar year)
  Department IAF Committee (Elected Faculty and Chair) review and evaluate to determine points for merit
  Department chair communicates points and merit pay to faculty member. Copy in department files. Copy sent to Dean.
  Department Chair reviews materials, writes evaluation, and conferences with faculty
  Evaluation in department Files and copy sent to Dean
  Dean reviews evaluation/materials; meets with non-tenured faculty member and department chair. Dean’s evaluation copy to faculty and in dean’s files.
  Dean reviews evaluations of tenured faculty/lecturers/half-time faculty. Signs evaluations. Dean’s evaluation copy to faculty and in dean’s files.

Fall Semester Years 2-5
2nd Tenure Review Tenure Materials submitted for 1 academic year (September 15th)
  Department Tenure Committee reviews materials, writes report, conferences with faculty (Evaluation in departmental Files)
  Chair reviews materials.

Spring Semester
Year 2-5
IAF/Annual Review submitted in February (calendar year)
  Department IAF Committee (Elected Faculty and Chair) review and evaluate to determine points for merit
  Department chair communicates points and merit pay to faculty member. Copy in department files
  Department Chair reviews materials, writes evaluation, conferences with faculty
  Evaluation in department Files and copy sent to Dean
  Dean reviews evaluation/materials; meets with non-tenured faculty member and department chair. Dean’s evaluation copy to faculty and in dean’s files.
  Dean reviews evaluations of tenured faculty/lecturers/half-time faculty. Signs evaluations. Dean’s evaluation copy to faculty and in dean’s files.

Fall Semester Year 6
Formal Tenure Materials Submitted to University
Tenure Materials submitted for Tenure Consideration September 15th
  Faculty Member’s tenure application and supportive material is evaluated by tenure committees and administrators. Evaluations and tenure recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate body:
  Department Tenure Committee
  Department Chair
  College Tenure Committee
  College Dean
  Provost Office – to University Tenure Committee

Spring Semester Year 6
IAF/Annual Evaluation submitted in February (calendar year)
  Department IAF Committee (Elected Faculty and Chair) review and evaluate to determine points for merit
  Department chair communicates points and merit pay to faculty member. Copy in department files
  Department Chair reviews materials, writes evaluation, conferences with faculty
  Evaluation in department Files and copy sent to Dean.
  Dean reviews and signs. Copy in dean’s files

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE FOR TENURED FACULTY
Spring Semester

IAF submitted for merit consideration in February (calendar year)
additional material submitted later for annual review
  Department IAF Committee (Elected Faculty and Chair) review and evaluate to determine points for merit
  Department chair communicates points and merit pay to faculty member. Copy in department files
  Department Chair reviews materials, writes evaluation, conferences with faculty
  Evaluation in department Files and copy sent to Dean.
  Dean reviews and signs. Copy in dean’s files
Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

Program changes since 2002 related to graduate programs include the reorganization of educational administration programs with a pilot program to begin spring of 2008 in a partner district. This pilot will serve as the guide to establish the program in other partner districts. The most notable revisions to the educational administration program include:

- selection of principal candidates by unit and partner districts
- work-embedded assignments that better prepare candidates for leadership in schools
- program framework based on instructional leader model of school administration
- portfolio assessment aligned to ISLLC and TSSA standards
- extensive field assignment linked to standards and work related tasks
- extensive mentoring by administrators trained according to the Kentucky Principal Internship Program model

Reorganization of teacher education programs at the master's level with the Teacher Leader Concept

This 33-hour redesign project will be required for all programs with continuing teacher certification; those programs with new certifications that prepare teachers to work in a new area are not included in the redesign project. The EPSB requires that the new program be collaboratively designed with the units’ district partners. The curriculum of the new teacher leader program makes the following requirements according to the EPSB:

1. Preparation of candidates to be leaders in their schools and districts
2. Training in the use of differentiated instruction for teachers based on data analysis and classroom management
3. Use of reflection to inform teachers on best practice in the preparation of all students for postsecondary opportunities
4. Provision of clinical experiences that examine student achievement in diverse settings
5. Enhancement of instructional design utilizing the Kentucky Program of Studies, Core Content for Assessment, and college readiness standards
6. Provision of evidence of candidate mastery of Kentucky Teachers Standards utilizing advanced performance levels
7. Design and implementation of professionally relevant research projects such as action research and thesis
8. Enhancement of candidate expertise in content knowledge, as applicable

At this point, a faculty committee has designed five new core courses (15 hours) to address most of the requirements above and have begun to develop the 12-hour specializations that will address candidates’ individual requests for specialized instruction and additional content specialization according to candidate needs. Candidates may use existing endorsements (Gifted & Talented, Environmental Education, Instructional Computer Technology, School Safety, etc.) to fulfill the specialization requirement. The program will also include 3 to 6 hours of elective courses depending on the specialization the candidate selects.

The following programs will require revision to meet new program standards set by the EPSB:

- MS in Agriculture
- MS in Career and Technical Education
- MA in Elementary
- MS in Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education
- MA in Learning and Behavior Disorders
- MA in Moderate and Severe Disabilities
- MA in Middle School
- MAT in Mathematics
- MA in Integrated Music
Program Governance

A number of steps have been taken since 2002, to improve the management of graduate programs and to increase the efficiency of candidate paperwork. In the fall of 2002 a new database, COESIS, was designed to track candidate progress through programs. A tracking procedure has been implemented for graduate candidates. A graduate coordinator monitors the flow of paperwork for graduate programs including planned program forms, advancement to candidacy, comprehensive exams, portfolio scores and other forms of assessment and accountability for the purpose of providing feedback to candidates on program progress and to faculty for program improvement. A flow chart to demonstrate the movement of paperwork has been created to illustrate the system for faculty and administrators. To address the issue of advising for graduate programs, a survey to determine advising quality is being developed and will be administered to graduate candidates. At this point the survey has determined that candidates value the following points in the following order (returning telephone/e-mail questions promptly, maintaining current advising information, knowing the student’s program of studies, offering solutions and options to advisees, being available for advising, scheduling convenient appointments as needed). The Program Coordinators Committee continues to coordinate and make decisions related to graduate programs. The committee continues to meet to consider and make decisions related to coordination of graduate programs, but most of the committee’s time and energy has been devoted to the master redesign project.

Attached are three agendas that document the committee’s activities over the past year, and a flow chart describing candidate paperwork and feedback in graduate programs. NOTE: Much of the formatting has been lost in these documents.

Master’s Reorganization Agenda
April 10, 2007

Attending: Greg Gierhart, Robert Lyons, Janice Hooks, Jo Robertson, Jackie Hansen, Ken Purcell, Joe Baust, Arlene Hall, Lee Kem, Tom Holcomb, Chhanda Islam, Ginny Richerson, Error! Contact not defined., Sharon Gill, Doc Holliday, Joy Navan, Steve Herr, Russ Wall, Alan Bakes, Dana Harader, Renee Campoy

- EPSB update and timeline for submission/review and programs implementation
- Review of courselettes with match to EPSB guidelines
- COE timeline for implementation
- Program staffing
- Grant support for course redesign and other funding sources

Requirements

The course will:

- Be collaboratively designed with school partners
- Result in authentic, school/classroom based assessments and field work
- Result in planning and dialogue between school partners and the university
- Result in updated pedagogy and course materials for the program
- Include continuous assessment planning for NCATE documentation purposes
- Include instructional technology that would allow transmission to satellite locations
- Include a plan for scheduling to all satellite locations
- Include the use of Livetext
- Include possible plan for working with guest practitioners

Master’s Reorganization Agenda
May 10, 2007


- Review courselettes with revisions to match to EPSB guidelines, teacher focus group feedback, Kentucky Standards, COE Conceptual Framework and Dispositions**.
- COE timeline for implementation:
  EPSB update and timeline for submission/review and programs implementation
  Summer 07 – Design courses, Review course with a teacher expert in the course field
  Fall 07 (late) – Review courses, Design program with school partners (previous group), Review and discuss within three departments
  Spring 08 – Review, reflect & refine within committee and with each department
  Summer 08 – Prepare proposal for Academic Council and EPSB*
Fall 08 – Begin approval for Academic Council and submit program to EPSB

*See April 11 EPSB "Preparing Teachers as Leaders" proposal timeline.
**Consider new disposition of leadership for graduate programs.

Course Design Requirements

The course will:

Be collaboratively designed with school partners (see timeline for guidelines)
Result in authentic, school/classroom based assessments and field work
Result in updated pedagogy and course materials for the program
Include continuous assessment planning for NCATE documentation purposes
Include instructional delivery to allow transmission to satellite locations
Include the use of Livetext
Include possible plan for including practitioners as guest lecturers

See attached outline for structure and suggestions.

Proposed, Initial, Draft Course Syllabus for Advanced Teacher Preparation Masters/Rank II
Faculty Author: Faculty Critical Friend:
Teacher Expert Reviewer: Date of Review:

I. TITLE:
II. CATALOG DESCRIPTION:

III. PURPOSE: (General statement of what is to be accomplished in the course and how it fits in the particular program of study—may be quite similar to the catalog description.)

IV. COURSE OBJECTIVES: – coded to KY Experienced Teacher or other KY Standards, all objectives must be assessable, identify the major assignment (posted to Livetext) used for student and program evaluation:

V. CONTENT OUTLINE: – clearly updated pedagogy and course materials, authentic school/classroom based assignments, description of plan for including practitioner guest speaker, transmission to other campuses

IX. MAJOR ASSESSMENT: – authentic, school/classroom based assessments with assessment designated for NCATE accountability and program evaluation, including use of Livetext

XIII. SUGGESTED TEXTBOOK AND REFERENCES: Consider using ASCD publications

XIV. PREREQUISITES: Is there a sequence to the core courses?

Master’s Reorganization Committee
Agenda
October 16, 2007


Absent: Arlene Hall, Joe Baust, Robert Lyons

• Big Picture of the Graduate Program and Masters with other Programs
• Review and Revision of Five Core Course Syllabi
• Review Masters Continuous Assessment Design via Livetext

COE Timeline for Implementation
Fall 07 (late) – Review courses, Design draft program, Review and discuss within three departments
Spring 08 – Review draft program with school partners, Review, reflect and refine within committee and with each department, Review and discuss with Arts and Sciences faculty
Summer 08 – Prepare proposal for Academic Council and EPSB
Fall 08 – Begin approval for Academic Council and submit program to EPSB
Flow Chart of Continuous Assessment Checkpoints for Graduate Programs

Check Point One – Admission*
Admission Application sent to Program and Graduate Coordinators for review
Transcript of Previous Degree
GPA from Previous Degree
Teacher Certification (if required)**
GRE Score, (if required)
Graduate Coordinator makes final recommendation and assigns advisor
Program of Studies
Candidate sent: (1) Admission letter from registrar; (2) Letter stating admission conditions, curriculum guidesheets, missing forms or scores, program of studies form, assigned advisor from COE

Check Point Two - Formative Assessment
Advancement to Candidacy form sent after 9 hours
Course Competency/Performance Standards
Disposition of Leadership
Practicum Evaluation (if required)

Check Point Three - Summative Assessment
Portfolio/Standards/Dispositions Completed (if required)
Internship Evaluation (if required)
Comps Passed (if required)
PRAXIS Test Passed (if required)
GPA Check
Verification of Program of Studies
Graduation/Certification/Rank Change

Check Point Four: Beyond Graduation
Survey of Graduates and Employers

*Initial certification at the graduate level is subject to undergraduate admission process and requirements.
**Regarding the “if required” designation, since programs vary in requirements, check individual program continuous assessment plans for program specifics

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not effectively manage and coordinate graduate programs. (ITP) (ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

If you have another comments, use the space below: