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I. INTRODUCTION

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

Valley City State University has evolved from its founding as a “normal school” or teacher’s college in 1890 to its current status as a comprehensive university offering both undergraduate and master’s degree programs. Located in Valley City, a city of approximately 7000 people in southeastern North Dakota, the university serves a geographical area that is not ethnically diverse. The service area’s population is largely white, non-Hispanic (97.4%) with no other ethnic group making up as much as 1% of the population.

The institution is one of the original “Laptop Universities,” and for more than 10 years it has provided its students with technology enhanced learning experience. The university supplies a laptop to every student, utilizes the BlackBoard Enterprise instructional management system, and implements other educational technologies for student and faculty use in teaching and learning.

A change in leadership for the institution occurred this year when the president retired in July, 2008 after 15 years of service. The State Board of Higher Education selected the new president.

The unit provides 15 initial-level undergraduate programs for the preparation of school personnel. The initial level programs, all of which are approved by the state, are listed as follows: elementary education, history, composite music education, biology, composite science, composite chemistry, social studies, Spanish, mathematics, English, art, business, physical education, health, and technology education. The unit offers the following three advanced programs which are all approved by the state: teaching and technology, technology education, and library and information technologies. Two of the advanced programs were initially approved by the State Board of Higher Education in 2006, and the other was
In the fall of 2007, 348 undergraduate candidates and 68 graduate candidates were enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools. 247 (60%) candidates were taking courses on the Valley City campus; 94 (22%) were online learners; 75 (18%) were at the NDSU off-campus site in Fargo; 90.5% of the candidates were white; and 9.5% were minorities.

The unit currently has 12 full-time faculty, seven adjunct faculty, and eight part-time unit, full-time institution faculty. Six of the full-time faculty have terminal degrees, and four of the remaining six are ABD and will complete their doctoral degrees within a year. The dean of education is responsible for administration duties for the unit. Most supervision of student teachers is done by full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty to maintain strong connections with P-12 colleagues.

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?

The protocol for NCATE visits in North Dakota requires joint visits for BOE and state team members. This protocol was followed for the Valley City State University visit with BOE and state team members working well together as a team. There were no deviations from the protocol.

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.).

VCSU has an off-campus elementary education program housed on the North Dakota State University campus in Fargo, North Dakota. In the fall of 2007, 75 students were enrolled in the program. Education faculty members from VCSU travel to Fargo to deliver all program courses face-to-face and use interactive television and BlackBoard to supplement the learning experience. The NDSU site was toured by the BOE chair during the previsit. Advanced programs are offered through online instruction. Graduates from the off-campus elementary education program and faculty members who teach in it were interviewed during the visit in face to face sessions. Graduates and candidates from the advanced programs were also interviewed during the visit in this fashion.

VCSU provides an alternate licensure program for North Dakota in partnership with the State’s Career and Technical Education (CTE) office. Funded initially through a grant, the program offered all professional education courses at low or no tuition cost in a hybrid approach with shorter five-week sessions to accommodate emergency licensed teachers. Though the grant ended in June 2007, the partnership has allowed the program to continue.

The unit is in the process of expanding its online professional education courses for initial licensure specifically in the field of Technology Education in other states. North Dakota enjoys interstate reciprocity with several states including Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York.

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

The unit was well prepared for the visit. No unusual circumstances disrupted the visit.
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.

The unit’s conceptual framework, developed in 1989, has been revisited, revised, and updated by unit faculty. Emphasis on continuous self-study encouraged the faculty to reexamine the conceptual framework and its themes. A broad-based, unit-wide committee worked to develop refined drafts and seek stakeholder approvals. The revamped “living” document organized around preparing leaders with commitments to planning, evaluation, implementation, and reflection was approved by key stakeholders. The vision for the institution and unit as a national leader in the preparation of technologically savvy professionals has been well documented. The visions for the institution and unit align with the conceptual framework. Conceptual framework foundational pillars (plan, implement, evaluate, and reflect) are informed by eight university abilities that guide all faculty and candidates. Since the last visit the conceptual framework has been modified to include the new graduate program.

The knowledge base consists of research, standards, and best practices. The research base is built on studies of the learning process, cognitive development, characteristics of learners, effective teaching, and best practices in the uses of technology. Standards for the knowledge base come from North Dakota state standards, which are organized around INTASC standards and NBPTS standards. Best practices for this knowledge base emerge from the framework referenced to current national reports on what makes an effective teacher.

Coherence is evident in the way the institutional report addressed the conceptual framework in each standard. During the visit, the conceptual framework was evident in the poster session, course syllabi, field experience policies and assessments, and the unit’s assessment system. Faculty and candidates were clear when discussing the vision of the unit and the conceptual framework as seen in their programs.

Diversity is specifically addressed in the university abilities. As an institution, Valley City State University is located in rural North Dakota, and identifies diversity as well as technology as a key values. The unit has adopted diversity proficiency standards. The unit-adopted dispositions demonstrate further evidence of a commitment to cultural and global diversity as well as equitable learning opportunities.

A commitment to technology is evident by the fact that all candidates receive laptop computers, there are smart classrooms, technological support for faculty and candidates is outstanding, and the development and implementation of an effective unit data gathering system for assessment. The unit assessment system is well summarized and aligned with the conceptual framework, state and national standards.

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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:**
Data from the Praxis II [Table 4 on page 10 of the IR] tests show that candidates have sufficient general education and content knowledge. All candidates are required to pass Praxis II before they graduate and elementary education majors are also required to pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam. The data indicates VCSU candidates are exceeding the 80 percent pass rate level on state content and pedagogical knowledge. This finding is supported by data from other key assessments of content knowledge including candidate assessments at key transition points, senior portfolios, candidate GPAs, field experience evaluations, and follow-up surveys of graduates and employers. Data aggregated from faculty ratings on University Abilities indicate that candidates have been able to . Reports from the senior portfolios show that candidates receive mean scores of 3.9-4.04 on a scale of 1-5 (5 being distinguished) on University Abilities. Between fall 2004 and fall 2007, 434 student teachers were rated a mean score of 4.68 on a scale of 1-5 for knowledge of subject matter. Data from the first and third year teachers show that they have an understanding of subject matter and have an ability to use it to create meaningful learning for students. Mean scores of 4.14 were reported during fall 2007. Administrators reported mean scores of 4.45 in similar surveys.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**
Candidates are assessed on content knowledge through portfolios, GPA, content achievement in the core research education course, and self-assessment confidence surveys. Data from the Program Approval
Reports show candidates’ levels of confidence and preparedness increased from a 3.7 to a 4.50 on a 5 point scale from entry level to exit level in advanced programs. Portfolio data from faculty evaluations reveal content learning was rated highest in the areas of the conceptual framework with a 4.54 overall out of a 5 point scale. GPAs for all advanced programs averaged 3.79. Course level assessment data from EDUC 610 reveal candidates scored at the skilled or expert level between 2005-2007 on the ability to apply research and research methods relevant to their advanced field of study. Follow-up surveys from graduates and employers indicate a high level of confidence in their acquired content knowledge. In the Teaching and Technology program, surveys showed a mean score of 4.8 on a scale of 1-5 when graduates rated their mastery over the subjects that they teach. Administrators rated graduates at 4.2 on this area. In the Technology Education program, results from graduates indicate a rating of 4.14 on a scale of 1-5 when asked about mastery of the content that they teach whereas, administrators rated them at 4.5 on the mastery of content being taught.

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:

Data from portfolio assessments indicate that faculty expectations are met by candidates at VCSU as they plan, implement, evaluate, and reflect on lessons. Portfolios evidence Education Abilities and are assessed by candidate self-assessments, administrators, practicing teachers, and cooperating teachers. Self assessment data show increased ratings in perceived confidence in all four of the conceptual framework areas related to Pedagogical Content growth: Plan (3.35 to 4.49, + 1.14), Implement (3.35 to 4.54, +1.19), Evaluate (3.35 to 4.35, +1.00), and Reflect (3.35 to 4.48, + 1.13). Data from 434 cooperating teacher evaluations related to instructional strategies reveal candidates consistently exhibit strengths in the area of pedagogical content knowledge. Faculty representatives from the content areas recently added five questions to the student teaching evaluation instrument to assess candidates’ acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge. Data indicates that candidates earn mean scores between 4.0 and 5.0 on a 5 point scale. Results from the Praxis II: PLT for Elementary Education candidates show a 90 percent pass rate, and 27 VCSU candidates have earned national recognition from ETS for having their scores in the top 15 percent nationally. All VCSU Programs have been approved by the state Education Standards and Practices Board, and North Dakota Program Approval Reports show that across majors, candidates have mastered the pedagogical content knowledge for teachers.

The Technology Ability is chosen by 92 percent of the candidates and cooperating teachers rate student teachers at a mean score of 4.83 on a scale of 1-5 for their ability to apply technology in the classroom. Candidates rate themselves at a mean of 4.56 for applying technology in classroom teaching. Data from beginning teachers (4.31) and administrators (4.55) show that technology integration is a strength of the candidates. Course syllabi and teacher interviews confirm that candidates have the ability to apply technology appropriately.

Data from graduate follow-up surveys show that graduates felt strongest about their preparation regarding technology (4.60 in Domain I), knowledge in their subject matter content (4.23 in Domain II & 4.14 under INTASC standard 1 in Domain III). Employer follow–up surveys mirror the results from candidates.
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The capstone portfolio provides evidence that advanced candidates utilize knowledge of instructional strategies and the conceptual framework. Data show an overall mean score of 4.54 on a 1-5 scale for Teaching and Technology (TT) and Technology Education (TE) majors. Self-assessment data show that candidates’ confidence levels improve from 3.45 to 4.17 between entry into the program and the exit on the NBPTS item related to being familiar with learning theories and being able to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding. Faculty evaluations are confirmed by candidates’ self-assessments which show overall scores of 4.39 on ability to plan lessons, 4.28 on ability to implement lessons, and 4.33 on ability to evaluate effectively and reflect on lessons, given a 5 point scale.

Data confirm that candidates consider technology integration one of the most useful experiences from their graduate programs. Since the master’s programs are online, candidates gain a myriad of technology skills and the ability to apply these skills from both the study of technology as well as the use of new and emerging technologies. Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators confirm that advanced level candidates are very knowledgeable in their respective fields.

Data provided by graduates in follow-up surveys includes responses to items from the NBPTS propositions and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)/ National Educational Technology Standards (NETS). Results conclusively show that graduates have confidence within this area. Candidate narratives provide further evidence of their satisfaction with pedagogical content knowledge and skills gained in advanced programs. Employers rated TT graduates at 4.4 on planning instruction and 4.2 on implementing lessons, and TE graduates 4.5 on knowing the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects.

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Review of the national recognition reports indicates candidates have sufficient professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Key assessments that measure initial candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills include cooperating teacher evaluations, portfolios, candidate self-assessments, and the Principles of Learning: Grades K-6 for elementary education majors. Data from cooperating teachers indicate that having student teachers meet the INTASC standards is a strength of the program. The student teachers who completed their coursework at VCSU and NDSU have very similar cooperating teacher final evaluation mean scores. The evaluations are a positive indicator that the unit is bringing quality instruction to both campuses. The secondary majors have slightly lower mean scores, which may be attributed to differences in the evaluators or other considerations in the program worthy of discussion by the unit’s professional education sequence faculty and the methods teachers in each secondary area.

Data from portfolio evaluations show continued growth in this area. Since the fall semester of 2004, the mean scores for Planning have risen from 3.82 to 3.99, scores for Implementation have risen from 3.74 to 4.00, and they have increased from 3.68 to 3.95 for Evaluation. The rise in the evaluation reflection
scores is especially encouraging to faculty and candidates. Self-assessments from candidates indicate confidence in acquired professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Aggregated data is collected at four points, ranging from when candidates enter the program to when they exit their student teaching experience. Surveys indicate that candidates perceive confidence gains in all attributes throughout each area of the unit’s conceptual framework and pedagogical content as indicated by the INTASC standards. Confidence in INTASC 4, Instructional Strategies indicates the largest area of growth in confidence from an entry level mean score of 3.35 to an exit level mean score of 4.54. The scores for Plan, Implement, and Evaluate also indicate a considerable measure of increased confidence. Data regarding PLT exams shows the VCSU median scores match the national median as recorded by the ETS and is a solid indicator that the elementary education program is producing quality candidates.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators confirm that professional and pedagogical knowledge acquisition is integral to the VCSU and NDSU programs.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Data from faculty assessments of portfolios provide evidence that advanced candidates in the TE and TT programs acquire pedagogical knowledge and skills related to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Portfolios are evaluated by the candidate’s faculty advisor and committee members on a 1 to 5 point scale with 5 being the highest score. Candidates’ artifacts and reflections received the following ratings: Graduate School Core Value: Effective Use of Instructional Technologies (4.19), Expertise in Research (4.24), Expertise in Assessment (4.34), Collaborative or Individual Experience as a Supervisor/Leader/Coach (4.31), Expertise in Curriculum (4.42), Diversity and Global Awareness (4.43), VCSU Conceptual Framework (4.54), Field Experience (4.20), and overall growth in the Philosophy and Program Reflection (4.56).

Self-assessment summary data show candidates rate their mastery over the subjects they teach (4.5), familiarity with skills, gaps, and preconceptions students bring to the subject (4.17), and familiarity with learning theories and ability to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding (4.17) on a 5 point scale. These exit scores reflect significant growth from the time of program entry to exit.

Data from follow-up surveys completed by first year graduates indicate that alumni rate the quality of their master’s degree program as high or excellent in most every area. Employer survey data indicate that employers of the TT graduates rate them highest in the area of Planning Instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals (4.40). Data regarding the TE graduates indicate that they know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to their students (4.5) according to their employers.

Interviews with candidates and recent graduates indicate that candidates gain the necessary pedagogical and professional knowledge.

**1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**
VCSU uses three assessments to acquire unit information regarding candidates’ abilities to assess and analyze student learning, to make appropriate adjustments to instruction, to monitor student learning, and to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences. Data collected from the VCSU faculty senior portfolio evaluations indicate high overall ratings (4.0) on a 5 point scale. Cooperating teacher’s final evaluations from the student teaching experience show candidates have the ability to formally and informally evaluate (4.7016) and reflect on teaching to enhance student learning in the future (4.7488). These ratings are highly respectable mean scores. Data aggregated from candidate self-assessments reveal that they experience considerable growth in perceived confidence in all four of these important conceptual framework areas including: Plan (3.35 to 4.49, +1.14), Implement (3.35 to 4.54, +1.19), Evaluate (3.35 to 4.35, +1.00), Reflect (3.35 to 4.48, +1.13).

Beginning in the fall of 2008, all student teachers will be required to complete a Teacher Candidate Work Sample to provide evidence of impact on student learning. This assignment includes the processes of planning, implementing, evaluating and reflecting, and its results will be included in the candidate’s exit portfolios. Faculty indicate that this method will show how candidates across all programs impact student learning. Data collection and analysis for this project will begin as soon as data becomes available.

Data from employers shows that graduates receive excellent or high quality ratings related to the INTASC Standards related to Student Learning, Diverse Learning, and Learning Environment.

During interviews, candidates indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. Follow-up surveys and discussions with cooperating teachers and employers indicate a high level of satisfaction with VCSU graduates. Graduates confirmed that they feel prepared and confident in their work related to student assessment.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Data from the first class of Master of Education candidates in the summer of 2007 was provided by graduate self-assessments and through graduation portfolios. Candidates’ perceived levels of confidence indicate that their preparation for assessing student learning is high or excellent quality. Graduation portfolio data provide significant positive results related to student learning for teacher candidates. Aggregated data results range from a 4.4-5.0 on a 5 point scale on portfolio items including planning, implementing, evaluating, and reflecting on lessons to ensure that students learn.

Data from graduate and employer follow-up surveys further attest to the success first year graduates are experiencing.

Interviews with candidates at the advanced level indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.

**1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**
There are no state required content tests for candidates enrolled in the Library and Information Technologies (LIT) program. LIT has submitted a state program for North Dakota Program Approval.

Spring 2008 Entry Level survey results provided the unit’s first look at the Library and Information Technologies candidates’ perception of program alignment with ALA and AASL standards. Data from 15 candidates with six or fewer credits in the graduate program show that 40-60 percent feel very confident that Standard 2 “Ensures that the library media curriculum is documented as significant to the overall academic success of all students.” and “Documents and communicates the impact of collaborative instruction on student achievement.” are addressed in the program.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning for Other School Professionals</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Data from the Library Concentration Self-Assessment indicates that (60%) candidates rate themselves as very confident in ensuring that the library media curriculum is documented as significant to the overall success of all students and 40 percent of them can very confidently document the impact of collaborative instruction on student achievement.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

A review of the data and interviews from faculty and candidates confirms that the professional dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed within and across programs. The unit monitors candidates’ professional dispositions at three transition points in the program, assessing them on the areas of: Professional Conduct Toward Students, Professional Practice, Professional Conduct Toward Professional Colleagues, and Professional Conduct Toward Parents and the General Community. Assessment data from Introduction to Education classes, practicum and methods courses, student teaching, and the Disaggregated Assessment of Dispositions provide insights regarding candidate dispositions related to a new Disposition Form that was initiated in 2007. Data are reviewed by the Director of Student Teaching to identify any candidates with areas of concern. Recent findings show that an extremely low percentage of unacceptable dispositions have been noted at the completion of the program.

Data from the Introduction to Teaching classes show there are low percentages of unacceptable dispositions. Being responsible and accountable for decisions and actions (2.22%, 5 candidates) and being punctual and prepared for class (1.78%, 4 candidates) are the two areas cooperating teachers found the greatest areas of concern. Data from methods classes are also collected and aggregated. Faculty members were more willing to rate a candidates’ efforts as unacceptable and the unit is able to view higher percentages of unacceptable dispositions. The four disposition attributes with the highest
percentage of unacceptable dispositions include: (1) Being punctual and prepared for class (8.38%, 28 candidates out of 334), (2) Complying with course and program policies and expectations (5.71%, 19 out of 334), (3) Being punctual and prepared for class, and (4) Being responsible and accountable for decisions and actions (4.50%, 15 out of 333 candidates). Data from student teaching show an extremely low percentage of unacceptable dispositions. Data from all disposition surveys are disaggregated in the Central Assessment System so the unit can look for discrepancies.

Data show that administrators rate the unit’s graduates high in their ability to communicate and interact with parents/guardians, families and the community to support student’s learning and well-being. The first and third year teachers’ surveyed had a response rate of 45 percent. The response rate for administrators surveyed was 29 percent.

Cooperating teachers and P-12 administrators indicate that they believe candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers. They are impressed with candidates’ professionalism and content knowledge.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Professional dispositions for advanced candidates and other school professionals are collected using the same criteria as in the undergraduate program. All of the graduate programs are online, and the professional dispositions data are collected in the core courses, field experiences, and the final Capstone Portfolio course. These courses have been selected in order to ensure assessment by multiple evaluators, at varying points throughout the program, and to guarantee the dispositions are completed in courses that all candidates must take. The data indicate candidates rate high in all of the dispositions aggregated. Being punctual and prepared for class (6.70 %) and complying with course and program policies and expectations (4.15%) are the two disposition areas unit faculty members have rated as unacceptable most frequently. The data represents candidates from all three academic concentrations. Data were collected on all NBPTS propositions, including Proposition 1, “Teachers are committed to students and learning and the belief that all students can learn.” Eleven of the 12 first year graduates, 91.67 percent, rated their preparation as excellent or high quality. To assure graduates retain the observed professional dispositions into their teaching careers, the unit surveys graduates and their employers. Candidates are rated directly and indirectly through NBPTS 1, 3, 4, & 5. NBPTS 2 is more closely related to subject matter. Data show that 100 percent of graduates state they believe that all students can learn and that they have the ability to recognize individual differences and treat students equitably, indicating positive professional dispositions that are shared by candidates. Interviews reveal that candidates speak well of their education and their ability to relate to and teach their students in a professional manner.

**Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

Standard 1: Candidates Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions has been met by VCSU unit. Initial candidates consistently score above the state average on licensure exams. Candidates’ strengths in content and pedagogical knowledge are documented by data collected from self-assessments, cooperating teachers, and employers. Capstone portfolios provide evidence of candidates’ continual progress and development in the program. Candidates have a myriad of opportunities to learn about and to infuse technology into their pedagogical experiences throughout the program. Candidates are given opportunities to develop and refine professional dispositions in a variety of venues throughout their program of study.
Candidates in all programs develop and model the professional dispositions expected at the initial and advanced levels. The unit has used existing data to make informed decisions about candidates and program revisions. In 2007, a new rubric was designed to better meet the unit's needs. The newly revised centralized assessment system allows the unit to enter professional disposition data for each individual candidate. The assessment system allows the unit to aggregate data from professional disposition areas of strength or concern. When candidates need to improve on professional dispositions, faculty meet with them to discuss plans for doing so. Evidence shows that the unit has made informed decisions to improve the program based on data-driven decisions.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Former Category I.C. - Content Studies The social sciences preparation for elementary education majors does not reflect the global nature of the knowledge base for social science.</td>
<td>The North Dakota State Standard for elementary education social studies no longer includes a “global” requirement. Therefore, the courses required at VCSU meet the state requirement. See 50015.2e The program requires the study of social studies - Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies - the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas - to promote elementary candidates' abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and independent world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

2a. Assessment System

| Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Assessment System – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit is continuously evaluating its assessment system. The institutional report, exhibits and interviews provide evidence of the assessment system’s evolution since the last NCATE visit in 2001. As stated in the IR, in the fall of 2007, the system moved from a “collection of spreadsheets and databases managed by a few” to a centralized assessment system (CAS) supported by the university’s information technology staff.

The unit has involved faculty, administrators, and university staff in the development of the system in several ways. Some faculty attended semi-annual NCATE orientation meetings, as well as assessment related sessions at AACTE. They also visited with colleagues in sister campuses across the state gathering information about their assessment systems. They continue to have a voice in the development of assessments, rubrics, surveys, etc. through regular School of Education and Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Committee meetings. The graduate faculty through the work of the Graduate Council has been especially active in the last two years developing assessments and procedures for collecting data for their relatively new MS Ed. The direct involvement of P-12 community is less evident, although the Teacher Education Committee includes classroom teachers and administrators and interviews with this body showed they have opportunities for input and decision-making.

At the initial level, the unit assessment system reflects the conceptual framework which describes four Education Abilities and nine University Abilities tied to seven broad goals for the teacher preparation program. While all four Education Abilities are assessed, candidates have some choice as to which of the University Abilities are selected for review and assessment. Professional, INTASC, and state standards are also reflected in the assessment system and represented in the conceptual framework.
through three knowledge domains: Foundation Studies, Specialty Studies, and Professional Studies. Multiple assessment and evaluation measures are used to assess candidates at four transition points: admission, entry to clinical practice, program completion and post completion. Measures used to monitor candidate performance at the initial level include: GPA, Praxis I & II scores, self-assessment surveys, disposition surveys, field experience and student teaching evaluations, formative and summative portfolio assessment, exit surveys, and post completion surveys of graduates and employers.

At the advanced level, the unit assessment system reflects the conceptual framework which describes four Education Abilities and six Core Values tied to seven broad goals for the teacher preparation program. Professional (NBPTS) and state standards are also reflected in the assessment system and represented in the conceptual framework through three knowledge domains: Core Courses, Concentration Studies, and Professional Studies. Multiple assessment and evaluation measures are used to assess candidates at four transition points: admission, entry to clinical practice, program completion and post completion. Measures used to monitor candidate performance at the advanced level include: GPA, candidate self-assessment surveys, disposition surveys, field experience evaluations, formative and summative portfolio assessment, action research project evaluation, and post completion surveys of graduates and employers.

Evaluation measures to monitor and assess unit operations are less evident; however, the unit recently conducted a survey to determine whether or not the length of time spent student teaching should be increased. The survey results were presented to the Teacher Education Committee, and a decision was made to increase student teaching from 10 to 12 weeks.

The unit listed multiple actions to eliminate bias and establish fairness accuracy and consistency of assessment in the IR. These actions were verified through conversations during the visit.

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

The information related to Standard 2a is the same or nearly the same for initial and advanced programs. There were a few differences in the types of assessments used, but these were minimal, and so it seems appropriate to combine the findings into one section.

**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:**

The unit maintains its centralized assessment system, CAS, through a collaboration with the university IT staff. The instructional technology staff at the university has a very strong and extremely supportive working relationship with the unit. Generally, the assessment coordinator and administrative assistants enter data into the system.

The assessment system provides regular information on applicants’ qualifications and candidate performance at key transition points at both the initial and advanced levels. The data are drawn from multiple assessments from both internal (rubrics and surveys developed by the unit) and external (PPST, Praxis) sources. Assessments are completed by many stakeholders including: cooperating teachers, employers, graduates, faculty, candidates and supervisors.
Individual candidates can view summary information and results of their self-assessment surveys. Advisors can view summary information, professional disposition evaluations, field experience evaluations, candidate self-assessments, and the portfolio evaluations of their advisees. The assessment coordinator, dean, assistant vice president of academic affairs (also chairs the MS Ed. program) and administrative assistants can view all data entered into the CAS including aggregate and disaggregate data on dispositions, field experiences, self assessments, portfolios, PPST and Praxis II scores, and graduate and employer surveys. Faculty evaluations, faculty surveys and course evaluations’ data are also collected and entered into the system, but it is not clear how these data are used to improve faculty performance, programs or unit operations.

Exhibits, interviews and presentations by the dean and assessment coordinator provided validation of the systematic nature of data collection. Fall semester data are entered into the CAS in December and January; spring semester data are entered in May and June, and summer data are entered in August. The Assessment Responsibility Chart and the Calendar of Assessments documents outline the data collection procedures.

The assessment coordinator has primary responsibility for data collection, summary and analysis. According to the IR, reports are prepared and shared with the faculty in September and February during School of Education and Graduate Studies (SEGS) meetings; however, interviews did not support this and a review of SEGS minutes did not provide evidence that assessment data has been shared routinely and systematically with faculty across the unit. An interview with the assessment coordinator revealed that data are shared with some faculty in programs on an as needed basis, but no general review and discussion of data has yet taken place. The coordinator noted that they are considering instituting an annual retreat in the near future.

The IR stated that assessment reports are generated and shared with the Teacher Education Committee in November and April. TEC membership includes program area faculty, candidates, public school teachers, an administrator, the dean, and the assessment coordinator who is also the field placement director. Although comprehensive data are not presented as depicted in the Calendar of Assessments exhibit, TEC meeting minutes (10-31-07), exhibits (classroom management data) and interviews with TEC members did show that some assessment information is shared and data-driven decisions are made.

The unit disaggregates candidate assessment data for the distance elementary education cohort attending classes at North Dakota State University in Fargo as shown in the assessment system PowerPoint presentation by the assessment coordinator.

Records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution are maintained in hard copy format in secure files in the office of the dean of the school.

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

The information related to Standard 2b is the same for initial and advanced programs, and so the sections have been combined.
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The assessment coordinator regularly analyzes candidate and graduate performance data to track the progress of individual students. The coordinator also analyzes data and targets areas of concern at the course and program level. For example, the coordinator discussed his concern that data showed that a high percentage of candidates do not elect projects related to the University Abilities that are important to the unit such as Global Awareness. Candidates are required to select from five of nine Abilities to include in their portfolios. The issue has been discussed with faculty informally and at School of Education and Graduate Studies' meetings, but there has been no program change offered as yet.

Cooperating teachers, supervisors, and the assessment coordinator routinely share professional disposition and field experience assessments with individual candidates to help them improve their performance. It is not clear whether candidate assessment data are regularly shared with faculty across the unit to improve programs and performance.

There does not seem to be an organized process for routine sharing and analysis of comprehensive data from initial and advanced program assessments across the unit. It is apparent that assessment data is shared with key faculty at certain times for particular purposes. For example, a random sampling of ND Education Standards Program reports at the initial level revealed that preparers accessed data to assess candidates' abilities related to program standards. Course projects, student teaching evaluations, portfolio evaluations and Praxis II scores were the primary assessments analyzed. Also, a review of ND Education Standards Program Approval reports at the advanced level revealed that preparers also accessed some of the data. Primary assessments analyzed includes: GPA scores, capstone portfolio evaluations, and candidate self-assessments. Still, there does not seem to be a systematic and routine process for sharing assessment system data (aggregated and disaggregated by program area) with unit faculty in order to support data-driven program changes; although the implementation of an August conference or annual retreat was mentioned during interviews.

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

The information related to Standard 2c is the same for initial and advanced programs, and so the sections have been combined.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has invested a tremendous amount of effort to develop a comprehensive assessment system that assesses and monitors candidate performance. Data for initial and advanced programs are regularly collected, aggregated, summarized and analyzed by the dean and assessment coordinator who then route results to selected individuals and committees who have may an interest in the findings. The consistent, systematic and routine sharing of the data across the unit to improve programs and unit operations has yet to be fully realized.

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.]

The unit, in collaboration with university IT staff is continuously developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system.
Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit does not routinely and systematically share assessment data with faculty across programs to make program improvements.</td>
<td>Documentation did not provide evidence that the comprehensive data available in the system is routinely presented to all of the faculty in the unit for their review, discussion and subsequent action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit does not routinely and systematically collect, analyze and summarize data to improve unit operations.</td>
<td>There was very limited evidence that the unit has included the assessment of unit operations in its assessment system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.]

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

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

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

There is ongoing collaboration between the unit and school partners with regard to the type and duration of the field experiences. Unit faculty also meets with area teachers and administrators to gather their perceptions through focus groups, and online surveys. Education candidates and alumni are also polled as to their preference for the length of the student teaching experience. Using the input, documented by the artifacts from students, cooperating teachers, alumni, and the Teacher Education Committee (TEC), the unit decided to increase the required student teaching experience from ten to twelve weeks and to increase the remuneration rate for cooperating teachers starting in the 2009-2010 academic year. The twelve week student teaching experience is optional for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Field experiences are monitored using a structured timeline of cooperating teacher and university supervisor’s verbal and written evaluations of the candidate’s experience. Candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors receive handbooks for student teaching that succinctly and clearly outline the program’s conceptual framework, guidelines and expectations. New cooperating teachers are afforded the opportunity to go through the handbook with the University Director of Student Teaching during the initial visit to the teacher’s classroom. In the summer of 2006, a cooperating teacher workshop was held in conjunction with another university to provide teachers graduate credit free of charge in order to increase the pool of available cooperating teachers.

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

Advanced Program field experiences are also evaluated by the instructors. Fewer artifacts document collaboration between the advance program candidates and partner schools as several of the field experiences are at the candidate’s own work site. An online website also allows students to share ideas and concerns about their initial and advanced teaching experiences as well as request advice and provide support.

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

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Candidates are required to have three field experiences (observation, practicum, and diversity) prior to student teaching. The experiences are intended to be diverse in nature and applicable to their major area of study. Candidates are exposed to a variety of educational settings that are documented and monitored by the university. Practicum experience hours will increase by 80 hours from 400 hours to 480 total.
hours beginning with the 2008-2010 catalog. Students and faculty report that successful completion of the field experiences results in greater understanding of the importance of incorporating diversity into the planning and teaching of lessons.

The student teacher placement is determined by considering the prior field experiences of the candidate as to not replicate any previous site. Final placements are determined by the Director of Student Teaching drawing from a pool of qualified cooperating teachers from the area. Opportunities for distant placement are also accommodated by contracting with university supervisors from other institutions. Candidates are required to teach full time for two weeks of their ten week experience. Cooperating teachers are validated as being in compliance with state licensing requirements, have a minimum of three years teaching experience, take a student teaching class and are recommended by school administrators. That this is current practice is verified through submitted artifacts and cooperating teacher interviews.

University supervisors make a minimum of four visits into the classroom during the course of the student teaching experience. These visits typically occur during the first, third, seventh and final week of the experience. Interviews with cooperating teachers revealed that additional informal visits occurred, and that open and comfortable communication is the norm for their contacts with the university supervisors. Cooperating teachers can call and email the university supervisors as well. They pointed out that their experiences with the unit could be summed up as a good partnership.

The student teaching experience provides the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the conceptual framework elements of planning, implementing, evaluating, and reflection. Interviews with teacher education candidates, cooperating teachers, and graduates validated their understanding and application of this process.

Documentation of candidate personal and professional growth throughout the field experiences is currently monitored electronically. This process began in the fall of 2007. Candidates express during interviews that they like the prompt feedback on how they are progressing and then in turn are able to focus and work on any areas that need improvement.

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

Advanced program portfolios are aligned with the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards core propositions and provide opportunity for thoughtful reflection. Program candidates in Teaching and Technology along with Technology Education are required to complete two experiences (practicum and field) that are approved in advance and total 30 hours. Library and Information Technologies candidates complete a cumulative field experience throughout the course of their program. Capstone classes require that students put together a document that summarizes and reflects learning gained from the various practicum and field experiences.

The advanced program technology candidates are required to take three technology classes that may be taken in connection with the field experience. This experience is summarized in the Capstone Portfolio.

Support for the advanced candidates is provided through discussion boards and online faculty assistance. Accompanying documentation validates this assertion.

### 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:

Candidates must meet seven teacher education criteria before being allowed to student teach. The unit has a high completion rate of 836 of 839 (99.6%) since the fall of 2001. Candidates who did not have positive experiences the first time were later able to successfully complete their experience with a different placement.

Various key assessments are made before, during and after the candidate has completed student teaching. Cooperating teachers complete evaluation forms based on the unit’s conceptual framework. In addition, cooperating teachers fill out professional disposition forms on candidate field experiences, while the unit faculty complete professional disposition forms for core, methods coursework and field experiences. Candidates self-assess their confidence levels with regard to domains, abilities, conceptual framework, field experiences, and standards. They also reflect on their experiences by keeping journals.

Recent graduates that were interviewed expressed a desire to have had more understanding of the special education terminology and how to deal with Individual Education Programs (IEP’s), and a specific course that focused on classroom management, even though they stated that the subject is imbedded in the coursework they took. Finally, recent graduates stated that they were exposed to Smartboard technology, but would like to have had hands-on learning opportunities to practice using it prior to graduation.

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

Documentation was provided by the unit that indicate advanced program assessments are accomplished through forms completed by the university faculty and supervisors. The candidates’ own reflective statements are required in their Capstone Portfolio. University instructors also complete professional disposition assessments.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The field experiences of the unit provide varied opportunities to observe and work with diverse populations. The unit faculty communicates regularly with the candidates and schools and maintains a good rapport with cooperating teachers and administrators that appreciate their personal touch. In addition the unit is viewed as a good partner to work with in the area.

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.]

The unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. They jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional
Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional, pedagogical skills, and professional dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults. Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit’s conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well designed opportunities to learn through doing.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Standard I.H Quality of Field Experience: Pre-student teaching experiences for secondary education majors are insufficient.</td>
<td>The number of pre-student teaching experiences for secondary education has been sufficiently increased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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:

Candidates at the initial and advanced levels are encouraged and provided the opportunities to study diversity throughout their course of study. The unit's definition of diversity is in keeping with NCATE’s vision of diversity that diversity is the differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. When interviewed, the unit and school faculty, as well as candidates echoed this definition.

The unit outlines four proficiencies related to diversity that all candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate throughout their course work. (1) Candidates understand the importance of diversity through awareness and knowledge of global perspectives and categories of diversity by collecting and analyzing demographic data and other activities that would help them plan appropriate activities. (2) Candidates research and teach lessons that address diversity and reflect the conceptual framework by adapting instructional materials, teaching strategies, and learning style instruments during peer teaching in courses and in field experiences. (3) Candidates encourage positive classroom climates that value diversity by developing classroom management plans and activities that promote equity and tolerance during peer teaching in courses and in field experiences. (4) Candidates demonstrate fairness and learning by all by completing and accumulating professional disposition evaluations and reflections documented in journals and their philosophy of teaching papers.

These proficiencies are laid out in a matrix which aligns them to all required core course work at both the initial and advanced levels. Faculty members are required to address these proficiencies when writing course syllabi. Candidates address them when doing lesson plans. Review of course syllabi and candidates work samples and reflections demonstrated their use of these proficiencies throughout their course of study.

Initial candidates are required to take three courses that directly address diversity - EDUC 240, Educating Exceptional Students, EDUC 283, Understanding Cultural Diversity, and EDUC 352, Cultural Diversity Practicum. At the advanced level, candidates take EDUC 657, Exceptionality, Diversity, and Differences as well as the Cultural Diversity practicum. As a part of the general education
course required by the institution, candidates take a required Humanities course which includes a diversity component. An optional special education practicum of one to three credits (25 hours/credit) is available to candidates as well as several other elective courses that further support the diversity standard.

All candidates at the initial (25 hours) and advanced (10 hours) level are required to participate in a diversity practicum. For initial candidates, this consists of a three day trip to sites such as intercity school district with 72 percent ELL population in St. Paul, MN, a Hutterite Community in rural Minnesota, or Indian Reservation in North Dakota. Advanced candidates design a cultural diversity experience in the school district or communities where they are currently working and submit it for faculty approval.

Throughout the institution, there are club and special activities that address diversity such as Fiesta Mexicana, “What in the World”, and Taste of Diversity Day. Candidates also have the opportunity to take part in activities such as, Black History Month, Foundations of Poverty Day, International movie night, Day of Diversity Awareness, Veteran’s Day, VCSU One for Africa Bazaar and maintain a Native American Medicine Wheel near the campus. The annual North Dakota Winter Show is held yearly in Valley City. Forty-eight ELL candidates have traveled to Mexico as a part of the cultural exchange program.

Assessment tools addressed these same proficiencies throughout all candidates’ course work. Evidence reviewed displayed candidate self evaluations and reflection from a variety of settings including the diversity practicum. Further assessments are done by faculty and school based personal evaluation (see table 8.1, page 47 of IR) of initial candidates’ performance in field experiences. These same proficiencies were addressed in the graduate school portfolio (see links 4a.3.2 and 4a.3.3 page 47of IR) assessments and self assessments. Further evidence that diversity is being address and assessed was seen in the unit’s aggregated data of the dispositions which scored all candidates at a high level.

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

Findings related to element 4.a were the same for initial and advanced programs so the section have been combined.

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

Community College (Sitting Bull Community College) which is located on Standing Rock Indian Reservation approximately 200 miles from Valley City. Candidates take courses at North Dakota State University which is located 40 miles east of Valley and has a more diverse higher education and K-12 school faculty.

Recruitment and retention of a more diverse faculty is on-going and a difficult task given the state’s low faculty salaries and the isolated rural setting of the institution. The unit has advertised in a variety of professional publications including the Journal of Higher Education and Chronicle of Higher Education,
and local newspapers. They have contacted other institutions with high faculty diversity and used list serves in hopes of recruiting a more diverse unit faculty with limited success. An established search committee reviews applications, sets up interviews, and then makes recommendations to the vice president of academic affairs. In some cases, the unit has offered potential candidates higher salaries in order to attract a more diversity faculty member. All these efforts have brought few results.

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

Findings related to element 4.b were the same for initial and advanced programs so the section have been combined.

**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:**

The ethnicity diversity breakdown for unit initial candidates is similar to the breakdown of the institution with a few cases where the unit has more candidates of color. However, it exceeds the community diversity. The other diversity measures are more varied. There are more females than males, a 62 percent first generation college population, 12.7 percent of the candidates’ families live below the poverty level, 31.4 percent older than average population (25 years+), and 72.9 percent of the candidates come from homes that live below the North Dakota mean income for four-person families. There are 28 candidates who are currently in the National Guard and have been deployed at one time or another.

There are currently 31 International students from 14 different countries who are attending VCSU on a tuition waiver at a cost of $55,250 as well as 47 students on a cultural diversity waiver at a cost $156,275. The institution provides host families in the community so these students feel supported and this increases the retention of these students. Since 1995, VCSU has sent 38 students on exchange experiences in Mexico and hosted 48 Mexican students through the exchange scholarship program with a Mexican sister university.

The advanced candidates take all course work on-line. Although it limits their face to face interacts with diverse peers, they are given the opportunity to interact with each other through blogs and chat rooms. There are opportunities for some candidates to get together but many live long distances away (17 different states), which makes this impossible.

Efforts to recruitment more diverse candidates have been on-going. The unit has offered campus tours to political refugee candidates, high school seniors, and other interested individuals. Institution representatives attend career fairs in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, visits with high schools guidance counselors, mailings to high school seniors, and web site information. The campus holds a “Viking” visit day where they bring in potential students for campus tours and specially planned activities. Increases in on-line participates have been one focus to diversify the candidate pool.

There are in place several campus committees that work to recruit and retain diverse candidates, Campus Diversity Committee and the International/Multicultural Task Force. These two committees analyze current statistics, brainstorm ideas, and act on suggestions to recruit and retain diverse candidates. The
unit does offer tuition waivers in a good faith effort to recruit, support and retain diverse candidates.

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

Findings related to element 4.c were the same for initial and advanced programs so the section have been combined.

### 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:

The ethnic diversity of the P-12 students in the field experience settings is representative of the community and state. (Table 10 page 54 of IR) Although this category of diversity is limited, candidates to do have opportunities to work with students from other areas of diversity such as low socioeconomic, English language learners, and special education. Due to diversity limitations, experiences outside the local community gives candidates a wider range of experiences with diversity when they go to other surrounding communities, Indian Reservations, Hutterite Community, or travel to neighboring states for field experiences.

All candidates in initial programs complete a 25 hour cultural diversity practicum while all advanced candidates participate in a 10-hour diversity practicum. They complete additional 40 and 80 hour field experiences and a 10 week student teaching experience. Candidates are required to be evaluated on their field placement diversity skills at key transition points during their undergraduate coursework. This is done through case studies, planning differentiated instruction, lessons plans, reflective journals, Power Point presentations, videotaping, or a combination of these methods.

All advanced candidates have opportunities to work with diverse students either in their own classroom or in another setting arranged by the instructor of EDUC 657. Diversity is assessed for the advanced candidates through their portfolio, confidence surveys, disposition checklist, action research, field experiences, and finally their employer survey data. Interviews with graduate students, graduates, and administration indicated that advanced candidates are confident in their abilities to teach and facilitate students in their classrooms with diverse backgrounds, characteristics, and abilities.

To assure that initial candidates have had a diverse experience prior to graduation, the coordinator of student teacher placement reviews all field and practicum placements prior to assigning a student teaching placement. If there are areas of diversity to which the candidate has had limited exposure, these are addressed when making the student teaching placement. This assures that all candidates have had a variety of diverse experiences including ethnicity, grade level, rural/urban settings, social economic status, and special needs students.

Superintendents and principals interviewed reported that although their ethnic diversity is limited, their schools do have between 35 to 50 percent free and reduced lunch students and 18 to 35 percent special needs population. They felt that the candidates who are placed in their buildings are well prepared and confident in their abilities to address the diverse student populations.
Recent graduates felt that the unit prepared them to work with all students. Their experiences with diversity at VCSU gave them the skills and exposure they needed to teach in their current position.

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

Findings related to element 4.d were the same for initial and advanced programs so the section have been combined.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Given the limited opportunities for diversity that exists within the community, surrounding areas, and the state of North Dakota as a whole, VCSU has made clear efforts to take advantage of the diversity experiences possible for their initial and advanced candidates. The course offerings and diversity experiences in field placements vary and provide the candidates with the background they need to teach in all areas of diversity. When experiences have been unavailable to candidates within the local community, the unit has secured other opportunities in the state, out of state or even out of the country. The unit with the support of the institution has made a good faith effort to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. These efforts are ongoing and remain a priority. The unit has been more successful in attracting diverse candidates to their program and has seen growth in this area due to their efforts. The Department of Teacher Education remains the strongest and largest department on campus.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.d. Field –based clinical experiences with diverse students are inadequate for secondary education majors.</td>
<td>Since the 2001 NCATE visit, the unit has added a required twenty-five hour cultural diversity field placement for all secondary education majors. Candidates have a choice of completing this experience in an ELL school in downtown St. Paul, Minnesota, at a Hutterite Community in Minnesota, or at one of several Indian Reservations located in the state of North Dakota. The candidates document their participation through reflective journals, Power Point Presentations, case studies, planning differentiated instruction, lessons plans, videotaping, or a combination of these methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Documents show there is a total of 27 unit faculty. Out of the 12 full-time tenure track faculty, half have terminal degrees, and four are ABD. Interviews, vitae, and other documents in evidence show all faculty have expertise in their assigned areas. Interviews with cooperating teachers and other clinical personnel verify that the unit complies with the North Dakota state law that requires that clinical faculty members
are required to hold a valid teaching license, have at least three years teaching experience, and to complete coursework or a workshop on how to properly supervise student teachers. Exhibits and interviews show faculty members who supervise candidates in a clinical setting are or have been licensed in the areas they teach or supervise and have contemporary professional experiences in their areas including work in public schools.

### 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):**

Course syllabi and interviews with faculty, recent graduates, and candidates demonstrate faculty have aligned instruction with the conceptual framework, institution, state and professional standards, current research, and developments in their fields. Faculty provide candidates with occasions to demonstrate their critical thinking, problem solving and reflection through such assignments as mini-teaching, unit plans, group projects and other assessments. Professional dispositions of candidates are evaluated during their field experiences and in their method courses as evidenced by interviews with candidates and faculty members as well as course syllabi. According to interviews with candidates and recent graduates, current research such as differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, and project-based learning are modeled by the faculty. Exhibits and interviews indicate faculty use a wide variety of assessment tools to assess student learning.

### 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):**

Although according to the policy manual, publication is not a requirement for promotion or tenure, exhibits and interviews with faculty demonstrate that all unit faculty members are engaged in scholarship related to teaching, learning, and their fields of specialization. Interviews also indicate that it is an expectation that they be so engaged in research. Their research and inquiry range from knowledge generation to evaluation of teaching methods as evidenced by presentations and publications.

### 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**
According to documents and interviews, all unit faculty members are involved in some aspect of service to the university and to the profession, including P-12 schools, in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit’s mission. Service ranges from committees within the university to collaborative work with others in the profession. Evidence confirms that a recent collaboration involved Technology Education faculty, multiple school districts, more than thirty local teachers and a two-year campus.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Documents and interviews show that all non-tenured faculty are evaluated annually and tenured faculty are evaluated every three years on teaching, professional development, scholarship, and service to the university and community. Interviews show that evaluations are done following procedures in the policy manual. In addition, faculty members complete professional goals and annual reports on a yearly basis which are used in collaboration with the Dean to address specific ways that teaching, scholarship, and/or service can be improved. Tenured, non-tenured, and adjunct faculty are also evaluated by candidates in the courses they teach. Data from these evaluations indicate they do very well in all areas; this is also confirmed by interviews with candidates and graduates.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Interviews confirm that in consultation with their respective dean and department/division chairs, all unit faculty create individual development plans which demonstrate faculty interest in professionalism and a commitment to ongoing development and serve as a basis for awarding development money for personal improvement and professional growth. In addition, a full-time professional development specialist has been hired to assist faculty growth in assessment, technology and emerging practices and diversity. Professional development for faculty is also provided by EduTech, a non-profit organization housed near campus and the chief information officer and Information Technology staff members.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Standard 5 is met by the unit. Interviews with candidates and recent graduates show that faculty model good teaching. Interviews with faculty, graduates, and candidates verify documentary evidence that candidate and student learning are of primary importance to both unit and clinical faculty. Exhibits and interviews with faculty demonstrate that all unit faculty members are engaged in scholarship related to
teaching, learning, and their fields of specialization. Several faculty members explained how their use of data from assessments led to changes in their courses or delivery.

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.]

Unit faculty highly regard candidates’ learning and adjust their own instruction to enhance that learning. Interviews and other evidence show many of the professional education faculty are recognized as outstanding teachers by both candidates and colleagues in VCSU and in schools. Evidence noted in 5E indicates that the unit’s evaluation system includes regular and comprehensive reviews of the professional education faculty’s teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Unit leadership provides for planning, delivery, and operation of all teacher education programs. A letter from VCSU’s president, located in the Teacher Education Handbook, clearly states that the School of Education and Graduate Studies (SEGS) has primary responsibility for, and authority over, programs, courses, and curricula related to the professional preparation of teachers. The dean of the SEGS chairs the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) that is comprised of members from all VCSU divisions, the professional community, and candidates. This committee serves in an advisory capacity to the dean of the SEGS and consists of one faculty member from each academic division; the dean of SEGS; and the director of student teaching. Additional membership includes two public school teachers (one elementary and one secondary), and two candidates enrolled in the VCSU education program (one elementary education major and one enrolled in secondary education). The TEC is charged with reviewing issues related to admission to teacher education and student teaching, approval of site placements, review of recommended curriculum changes, and periodic review of policies governing teacher education.

Teacher Education Committee minutes and interviews with members provided evidence of the professional community’s involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of teacher education programs at both initial and advanced levels. Additional evidence of the professional community’s involvement includes survey results whereby practitioners provided feedback and suggestions for use toward program improvement. Faculty indicated that consultation with field based cooperating teachers aided in gathering information to help strengthen program effectiveness. North Dakota State University’s graduate faculty served as resource consultants to VCSU’s faculty to help develop coursework for graduate programs. Faculty use Blackboard to share syllabi and course materials. In addition, the unit promoted co-teaching and provided financial support for faculty pursuing advanced degrees.

Curriculum Committee members confirmed that curriculum change is a systematic process at VCSU.
that begins in academic divisions and moves forward to the Curriculum Committee. Approved changes are forwarded to the TEC and Faculty Senate for approval. Professional education program curriculum changes follow the same approval process.

Staff in the Office of Admissions confirmed that student services are available to candidates enrolled in traditional and online education programs. Candidates have access to advising and counseling through a variety of means including participation in class meetings, email, individually scheduled appointments, and through Blackboard. The VCSU Catalog and Graduate Catalog clearly define how advisors are assigned once candidates declare a major. Advisors are charged to provide candidate guidance throughout the entire academic program.

The unit works with the Enrollment Services Office to contact and recruit individuals interested in programs offered in teacher education. The VCSU Catalog, Teacher Education Handbook, and Graduate Catalog clearly define and detail both initial and advanced teacher education program requirements including admission, continuation, and program completion. Special accommodations are available for students with disabilities through Student Disabled Services. Academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising remain accurate and current.

**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):**

Leadership within the unit indicates that the current budget to support programs designed to prepare candidates for careers in education is reasonable. Salaries, operating budgets, and funding for equipment have steadily increased since 2002 and are comparable to funding for programs within other divisions across the university. The SEGS’ base budget in FY 2007 was $1,019,788, accounting for 29 percent of the academic budget designated for academic programs. The budget for 2008 is $1,053,152 which equates to 28 percent of the university’s academic budget.

Financial support for professional development opportunities is available from the unit, the vice president for academic affairs (VPAA), and grant funding. The VPAA stated that funding was provided to support faculty travel to present at professional conferences and to attend accreditation workshops. Additional financial support was provided to faculty pursuing the terminal degree. Exhibits and interviews provided supporting evidence that the unit received 31 percent of the 2008 university travel budget.

External funding through the Bush Foundation ($50,000) was available to help support faculty professional development efforts. These opportunities focused on the development and implementation of the Central Assessment System (CAS), implementation of new teaching and learning strategies, online and distance learning innovations, and dissemination of research findings at regional and national conferences. The Faculty Development Committee and the Growth Initiative are additional examples of available sources from which faculty could seek funding for professional development activities.

Budget changes since the last accreditation visit include funding for the addition of professional faculty and staff positions and line items for the advanced programs. Two new faculty members, an
administrator for the graduate program, and an administrative assistant to provide assistance with
graduate programs were added to improve and strengthen overall program quality. The budget allows all
faculty to engage in professional development, scholarship, and service as noted in Standard 5.

6c. Personnel

| Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Personnel – Advanced Preparation       | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
The unit maintains clear policies regarding faculty workload assignments. Department chairs and deans,
in consultation with faculty, determine faculty workload assignments. Undergraduate teaching
assignments are limited to 12 credit hours per semester, and may include supervision of clinical practice.
Graduate faculty workload assignments include nine semester hour teaching and supervision
assignments. In calculating faculty supervision workloads, one credit hour equals to an assignment of
1.5 students.

Faculty workload assignments allow time for faculty involvement and participation in
research/scholarship and service activities. Examples of these activities are documented in faculty vitae
and were validated during faculty interviews. Schedules also allow faculty time to assume normal
faculty responsibilities such as advising, preparing for online course presentations, and developing
candidate assessments. Through Bush Foundation Grants faculty engaged in scholarly activities specific
to technology integration, brain research, assessment and other emerging practices. Supervision
workloads are within 18 candidates for each full-time equivalent for faculty member.

Support staff includes two administrative assistants, one student worker, and a quarter time assistant.
One of the administrative assistants is assigned full-time to the SEGS. Responsibilities include
maintenance of all teacher education records, performing routine budget operations, assisting candidates
interested in teacher education, providing clerical services, supervising the student worker, and
supporting faculty. Another administrative assistant employed in 2007 is assigned part-time to the unit
(Graduate Studies and Research) to assist the dean and department chairs in graduate program
development. This assistant is the key contact for prospective graduate students. Additional functions for
the part-time assistant includes assisting in the development and maintenance of a data base used to
track graduate candidates and their admission requirements.

The SEGS ensures that the use of part-time faculty contribute to the integrity, coherence, and quality of
the unit and its programs. The adjunct faculty members interviewed indicated that they received support
from the unit to help in their teaching responsibilities. Faculty indicated that they felt well prepared to
teach their course assignments and to incorporate the conceptual framework throughout course content.
Part-time faculty are required to have the same qualifications as full-time faculty in order to maintain
program integrity.

6d. Unit Facilities

| Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
Unit programs are housed in excellent facilities in McFarland Hall. Faculty offices are located in the newly renovated, spacious three story building. Classrooms are large, well equipped with advanced technologies, and have wireless Internet connectivity. In addition, all classrooms have overhead projectors and large screens that allow faculty and candidates to practice using technology for instructional purposes. Spaces utilized by the unit are handicap accessible and ADA compliant. Facilities at the off campus site at North Dakota State University are comparable to campus facilities.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
Core programs are not dependent on external funding. The division of Information Technology plays an essential role in providing resources that support faculty and candidate needs. The VCSU Help Desk provides support for computers, networking, and interactive video services. All registered candidates have access to a personalized web-based portal that organizes network services and provides a single point of access to email, a personal calendar, custom technical support documents, VCSU news and information, personal web site and file storage space, software downloads, and web-based class information. All VCSU classes use Blackboard to enhance candidate learning that includes tools for course handouts, announcements, group and private discussions, test administration, internet links, and delivery of course content. The university also obtains institutional site licenses for a variety of professional software that includes Microsoft Office Professional and antivirus software. Other software is distributed to users based on the unique needs of learners. Some classes use internet based, two-way interactive video to provide real-time collaboration with other professionals at multiple locations. The university provides notebook computers for all full-time on-campus students. Options are available for part time and distance learner candidates to acquire notebook computers as well.

Interviews and survey reports provide documentation that both faculty and candidates enthusiastically support the technology rich environment available at VCSU. Faculty have become proficient at integrating technology into the instructional process, including online environments. Candidates use the laptop computers throughout their coursework at VCSU beginning with note taking during class instruction. Having the notebook computer available throughout their educational program is especially important as candidates develop electronic portfolios to document and illustrate their personal skill and proficiency in teaching.

University support for the development and implementation of the unit’s CAS is documented in the institutional report and verified through interviews with faculty, the dean, the VPAA, and the chief information officer (CIO). The CAS was jointly developed by information technology staff, key leaders in the SEGS, and the professional community. The purpose of the CAS is to coordinate a continuous process utilizing multiple assessments at key transition points to document how each candidate is progressing through the teacher education program. Through the CAS, candidates and advisors are able to view and track candidates’ individual progress throughout the program. The CAS also provides
aggregated outcomes for reflection and knowledge-based decision making while improving the quality and experience of teacher education preparation at VCSU.

Sufficient library and curricular resources exist at the institution and are easily accessible.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The budget allows faculty opportunities for active involvement in scholarship. Professional partnerships with public schools and other educational communities are encouraged. VCSU makes a significant commitment to maintain a technology rich environment that includes laptops for faculty and candidates. Substantial funding is allocated to improve and promote the use of technology throughout the campus. The unit has demonstrated a strong commitment to providing state of the art technology for candidates, faculty, and unit operations.

**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.]**

A technology rich environment is available for candidates and faculty. Upon admission to the university, all on-campus candidates receive laptops that are used throughout their educational experience at Valley City State University.

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Persons Interviewed

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCSU exhibit_listing.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSU NCATE__Interviewee_Interviewers.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSU Poster_Sessions__NCATE.doc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: