

**NCATE**

The Standard of Excellence  
in Teacher Preparation

# INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Focused Visit

Continuous Improvement Pathway

UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

UOG Station

Mangilao, GU 96923

December 3-5, 2014

**Type of Visit:**

Full visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Full visit - Advanced Preparation

# Institutional Report for a Focused Visit or Full Visit Within Two Years Updated May 2013

## OVERVIEW

**This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.**

### I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

**I.1 Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).**

The University of Guam's mission is Ina, Diskubre, Setbe – to Enlighten, to Discover, to Serve. It is dedicated to the search for and dissemination of knowledge, wisdom and truth. The University exists to service its learners and the communities of Guam, Micronesia and the neighboring regions of the Pacific and Asia. The University prepares learners for life by providing the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities through the core curriculum, degree programs, research and outreach. At the Pacific crosscurrents of the East and West, the University of Guam provides a unique opportunity to acquire indigenous and global knowledge.

The University's history dates back to June 1952, when the island government established the Territorial College of Guam as a two-year teacher-training school under the Department of Education. The College, located on a high school campus in the village of Mongmong, had an initial enrollment of approximately 200 students; most of them experienced teachers, and a staff of 13.

The College moved to the present campus in central Mangilao in 1960 where a two-story classroom building and a library had been erected. The College's academic programs expanded to accommodate increasing enrollment and student needs.

In 1963, administrative control of the College was transferred from the Department of Education to a five-member governing Board of Regents. Accreditation was first granted in 1963 as a four-year degree-granting institution. In August, 1968 the College was renamed the "University of Guam." The University continued to expand in students and in physical structures.

On June 22, 1972, the University was designated a land-grant institution by an Act of the United States Congress. The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences was created in March 1974.

Administrative autonomy was granted on October 4, 1976, with the enactment of Public Law 13-194, "The Higher Education Act of 1976," which became effective on November 3, 1976. The Act, with subsequent amendments, established the University as a non-membership, non-profit corporation under the control and operation of a nine-member Board of Regents appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Legislature. Public Law 17-55 enacted on June 11, 1984, provided further autonomy to the University and established staggered terms for members of the Board of Regents.

In the early 1990's the Board approved a physical master plan that resulted in construction of a library extension and renovation, construction of the Micronesian Area Research Center, Computer Center, the English and Communication Building, the Humanities and Social Science Building, a large lecture hall, and the School of Education Building. With a \$14 million USDA loan, the Leon Guerrero School of Business building was opened for occupancy in July 2006. Currently, UOG has two Colleges, three

Schools, and an enrollment of approximately 3,628 students and 180 full-time faculty that represent a diversity of island, U.S. mainland and Asian ethnicities.

The University of Guam, a land-grant institution accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, is the major institution of higher education in the Western Pacific. A central part of the Land-Grant mission requires the University of Guam to engage with the community, serve the needs of Guam and the Micronesia region, and provide knowledge-based research to the community. With a gorgeous view of Pago Bay and the Pacific Ocean, the University is a 161-acre campus on Guam's east coast. As the largest of some 2,000 islands that make up Micronesia, Guam is about three hours flying time from Tokyo, Manila, Taipei, Hong Kong, and Seoul and occupies a major strategic location for the United States that operates large U.S. Navy and Air Force bases.

---

4000 character limit

**I.2 Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.**

School of Education Mission

The mission of the School of Education is to prepare teachers, professionals, and leaders in education to meet the multicultural educational demands of Guam and the region in the Pacific.

The Unit

The Unit consists of all academic programs that lead to certification or licensure both at the initial and the advanced levels. SOE offers six bachelor's programs and seven master's programs, leading to careers in teaching, counseling, reading, school leadership, and other fields. SOE is organized into two academic divisions: 1) Foundations, Educational Research and Human Studies (FERHS); and 2) Teacher Education and Public Service (TEPS). FERHS provides foundations for undergraduate and graduate students and hosts two graduate programs in Administration and Supervision and Counseling. TEPS provides undergraduate and graduate programs in Elementary, Early Childhood, Secondary, and Special Education, as well as programs in Reading and Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL). An elected chairperson heads each Division and each program has a faculty designated as the Program Coordinator. SOE works in collaboration with the College of Natural and Applied Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences particularly as its work relates to content preparation in initial teacher preparation programs, as well as general education.

In the Fall of 2014, the SOE will begin to address recommendations from the Good to Great (G2G) initiative. In Spring 2013, the University embarked on a rigorous journey to move the institution from Good to Great. All programs (academic and administrative support) were examined in terms of their fit to the UOG statement of greatness, sustainability, quality and demand relationships. The review of all programs was completed and final results were disseminated to the University community in May 2014 and implementation to take place in fall 2104.

---

2000 character limit

**I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.**

Initial programs offered include: Early Childhood, Elementary Ed, Elementary Ed -Chamorro, Elementary Ed–English as a Second Language, Secondary Ed, Special Ed, Physical Education, and Master of Arts in Teaching.

The SOE also offers two off-campus programs: the Partnership BA in Elementary Education Program and the Individualized Degree Plan (IDP). The Partnership BA is designed for pre-service students with an associate's degree in Teacher Preparation-Elementary or Teacher Education-Elementary, currently offered by the College of Micronesia-FSM. The IDP is designed for regional in-service teachers who wish to obtain an undergraduate degree in education from the University of Guam.

Advanced level programs include the Master of Arts in Counseling and the Master of Education with the following specializations: Administration and Supervision, Reading, Secondary Education, Special Education, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The M.Ed. degree is designed for certified teachers seeking advanced knowledge of teaching and learning in a specific area.

The Master of Education with specialization in Reading is the University of Guam's first online program. Approved by WASC in August 2011, the program is offered to students on Guam and the Micronesia region. This program was previously known as Language and Literacy.

It is important to note Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) recognition is not required by the "state." Some programs were able to avail themselves of support from the SPAs, which lead to a desire to seek review. Other programs continue to be monitored through internal processes. Programs recognized by their SPA include Elementary Ed (ACEI, 2019), Special Ed (CED, 2015 with conditions), PE (NASPE, 2015 with conditions), Administration and Supervision (ELCC, 2021), Reading (IRA, 2019). Other programs have had recognition in the past and have since expired. The decision to pursue external or internal review has been left up to the programs. With limited faculty resources, some programs felt it would be better to focus on the internal review process. Data continues to be collected for all programs and analyzed for program improvement.

Other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals: Faculty in the Masters of Arts in Counseling program are currently considering CACREP accreditation.

---

2000 character limit

#### **I.4 Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.**

SOE faculty adhere to a constructivist view of learning consistent with preparing a multicultural student population. Rooted in constructivism, the Conceptual Framework has established a foundation of excellence for preparing SOE candidates for reflective decision-making, knowledgeable scholarship, and effective communication required to provide equitable educational experiences for all students in diverse P-12 school settings. Constructivist theory has a rich history, most famously initiated by John Dewey (1938) in his progressive model for teaching and learning. Consistent with Dewey's beliefs, current research on constructivism agree that learning is the active process of constructing rather than passively acquiring knowledge (Gordan, 2008; Henson, 2009; Larochelle, Bednarz, & Garrison, 2009).

Fundamental to constructivism is the belief that instruction is the process of supporting the knowledge construction by the learners rather than the mere communication of knowledge.

The Unit prepares candidates as described below in the elements of the Conceptual Framework:

##### **Knowledgeable Scholar**

According to Darling-Hammond (2005), the single most important determinate of what students learn is what their teachers know. We believe it is essential that candidates not only master content knowledge, but also have the pedagogical, professional and technological knowledge required of a knowledgeable scholar. Pedagogical content knowledge refers to teachers' deep knowledge about the processes and practices of teaching and learning applicable to the teaching of specific content (Shulman, 1986). It is the collective wisdom of one's teaching practice with respect to content knowledge, subject expertise, pedagogy, students, and the curriculum (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008; Schartz, 2008). Recent definitions include the integration of technology into pedagogy (Cavanagh & Koehler, 2013; Koehler, M. J. & Mishra P., 2009; Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Coined Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge, TPACK is the knowledge and skills that teachers need to integrate technology into instruction

in specific content areas (Koehler & Mishra, 2008) through rich connections between technology, content and pedagogy (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Technology is infused throughout the SOE conceptual elements. The knowledgeable scholar is also well-versed in professional knowledge that includes knowledge about learning, diversity, professional ethics, legal and policy issues, and the roles and responsibilities of the teaching profession (CAEP/CAEP Glossary).

#### Effective Communicator

Effective communication is vital to the role of an educator. The effective communicator is skilled in verbal and nonverbal forms and is able to deliver a clear message. Verbal and non-verbal communication affects communication transaction, interpretation, and meaning. Therefore, it is useful to distinguish between the two types. Verbal communication is "any type of spoken communication that uses one or more words" while "nonverbal communication is all of the messages we transmit without words or over and above the words we use" (Tubbs & Moss, 2006, p. 12-13). Skilled in intercultural communications (Sorrells, 2013), the effective communicator understands that cultures have different ways of communicating verbally and non-verbally and seeks to understand how students from different countries and cultures act, communicate, and perceive the world around them.

#### Reflective Decision Maker

Drawing from the seminal works of Dewey (1938), Schon (1987) and Zeichner & Liston (1996), Minott (2009) defines reflection as careful consideration; a process of disciplined intellectual criticism combining research; knowledge of context, and balanced judgment (critical thinking) about previous, present, and future actions, events or decisions. Recent literature on reflection (Bradbury. H., Frost, N., Kilminster, S. & Zukas, M. 2009; Thompson & Pascal, 2012) argue for critical reflection that is grounded in the reality of modern social change and an emphasis on reflection as a social practice (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006) that takes place within communities of teachers who support and sustain each other's growth. Given the evolving perspective on critical reflection, SOE faculty encourage candidates to become socially responsible and critically reflective practitioners by actively participating in school, district, local and global communities.

#### Professional Commitments and Dispositions:

Dispositions are fundamental to the Conceptual Framework. Both initial and advanced programs assess candidates as knowledgeable scholars, effective communicators, and reflective decision makers. The Unit's disposition rubric evaluates the candidate dispositions based on four levels: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. The Knowledgeable Scholar component assesses candidates' commitment to identifying their own learning style and P-12 students' learning styles. The Effective Communicator component assesses candidates' willingness to communicate enthusiastically, and the Reflective Decision Maker component includes an assessment of candidates' sensitivity to diversity.

#### Alignment of Proficiencies with Professional and Institutional Standards

The conceptual framework provides a context for assessing candidates' performance on professional, state, and institutional standards. Course syllabi and assessment rubrics are aligned with the SOE Conceptual Framework, professional and institutional standards. Candidates in initial programs must meet the InTASC Principles. Candidates in advanced programs for other school professionals use the standards of their professions to guide candidate learning and performance (i.e.ELCC). Candidates in advanced programs also address the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). All syllabi are aligned with the UOG Institutional Outcomes (ILOs).

6000 character limit

### I.5 Exhibits

I.5.a	Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)

I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS
I.5.a	Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.b	More Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

See **Attachment** panel below.

## 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.*

### 1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

#### 1.1.a Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

**Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.**

<p>Assessment of content knowledge is garnered through a variety of data sources and at key transition points. The first transition point is admission to SOE.</p> <p>Candidates may be admitted to SOE once they have completed a minimum of 54 credits. Generally the 54 credits are comprised of general education courses including essential skills (written, spoken, and quantitative), arts, global studies, individual and society, modern language, personal development, regional studies, science, and philosophy. This breadth provides the foundation and exposure to multiple content disciplines. A minimum of a 2.7 GPA is required however; as noted in the table below, candidates far exceed the minimum. Secondary education candidates are also required to calculate their specific content area GPA as part of the admissions application.</p> <p>Table 1-01 Candidate Content GPA Averages for Admissions</p> <table> <thead> <tr> <th>Semester</th> <th>SOE Content GPA</th> <th>ECE Content GPA</th> <th>ELEM Content GPA</th> <th>SPED Content GPA</th> <th>SEED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Spring 13</td> <td>3.62</td> <td>3.64</td> <td>3.58</td> <td>3.76</td> <td>3.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 13</td> <td>3.22</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>3.01</td> <td>3.78</td> <td>3.47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The aggregate data from admissions committee ratings for Spring 13 and Fall 13, indicate the evaluators noted 42% of the candidates had GPAs in the Target range of between 3.3 to 4.0, 43% in Acceptable range of 2.7 to 3.3, and 14% were Unacceptable or below 2.7 and therefore not eligible for admissions.</p>	Semester	SOE Content GPA	ECE Content GPA	ELEM Content GPA	SPED Content GPA	SEED	Spring 13	3.62	3.64	3.58	3.76	3.48	Fall 13	3.22	2.6	3.01	3.78	3.47
Semester	SOE Content GPA	ECE Content GPA	ELEM Content GPA	SPED Content GPA	SEED													
Spring 13	3.62	3.64	3.58	3.76	3.48													
Fall 13	3.22	2.6	3.01	3.78	3.47													

In addition, Praxis I scores indicate all candidates have basic reading, writing, and math skills. Finally, candidates initiate an InTASC portfolio with artifacts that demonstrate content knowledge competency. As an admission requirement, candidates are required to identify artifacts related specifically to standard 4, content knowledge. The admissions committee rated candidates as 21% on target with their artifacts and 63% were acceptable. Artifacts of candidate work from their professional education courses reflect a strong desire to teach and the ability to critically analyze and synthesize their initial field experiences. Candidate disposition data show ratings ranging from basic to distinguished levels. Based on the ADR for FA12 and SP13, unit ratings for candidate dispositions at entry indicate that most candidates are rated as proficient with 47% for Knowledgeable Scholar, 56% for Effective Communicator, and 51% for Reflective Decision Maker. Although low, 7% of candidates earned a rating of Basic in Reflective Decision Maker.

At midpoint, the semester before student teaching or internship, the candidates in the initial teacher preparation are expected to complete and pass the professional core courses, specialization courses, practicum, related area requirements, and electives in their respective programs with at least a grade of C in undergrad and at least a grade of B in the MAT. Many of these courses include an element of assessment of content knowledge. For example, to assess this content knowledge, the lesson delivery rubric in methods classes measures "knowledge of subject matter" in two elements. An electronic InTASC portfolio of key assessments is reviewed at this time. This allows the candidate to further refine evidence of content knowledge under the InTASC Standard 4. In addition, at this point, candidates must pass Praxis II Content exams. Programs are encouraged to examine the content categories to identify areas of strengths and improvements needed. The English for Education major for the secondary education program has changed its requirements as a result of this examination of category scores. These changes have included fewer electives and an increase in required literature and linguistics courses. Praxis II Content scores are being disaggregated and scores meet the minimum state standards as set forth by the Guam Commission for Educator Certification.

#### Table 1-02 Candidate Praxis II Content Test for Mid Point

Semester ECE - Praxis II Content (149) ELEM - Praxis II Content(149) SPED - Praxis II Content (151)  
SEED - Praxis II Content

Spring 13 N=4\* N=7 155 av. N=5 165 av. N=12 15 pts. av. above cut off

Fall 13 N = 0 N=10 162 av. N=3 172 av. N=8 11pts. av. above cut off.

\* no score required due to catalog year

At the conclusion of student teaching or internship, the student may update their InTASC portfolio prior to the final submission. We rely on the classroom supervisor to provide much of the assessment of content knowledge considering they work side-by-side with the candidate over 6 hours a day. These supervisors, with years of experience, contribute feedback on a candidate's content knowledge in regular tripartite meetings with the candidate and university supervisor. The content knowledge is documented on both the lesson plan and lesson delivery rubric.

6000 character limit

### 1.1.b Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

**Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the pedagogical content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.**

Pedagogical Content Knowledge is not assessed at entry, as no pedagogical course work has been completed. At mid-point, the first point of data collection for pedagogical content knowledge, programs

have identified key artifacts that demonstrate a candidate's ability to effectively teach their specific content. Artifacts include lesson plans and lesson delivery and associated rubrics. Additionally, the candidates complete an electronic portfolio with artifacts for a minimum of six InTASC Standards. Table 1.03 below, represents the coordinator's assessment of InTASC Standard #5 Application of Content.

Table 1-03 Mid-Point Evaluation of InTASC #5

Semester ECE - ELEM SPED SEED

Rating T A T A T A T A

Fall	13	100%	16%	84%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Spring	14	100%	20%	80%	75%	25%	70%	30%

Pedagogical content knowledge at exit is measured through classroom and university supervisor observations and data. As mentioned above, at the conclusion of student teaching or internship, we rely on the classroom supervisor to provide much of the assessment of pedagogical content knowledge considering they work side-by-side with the candidate over 6 hours a day. These supervisors, with years of experience, contribute feedback on a candidate's pedagogical content knowledge in regular tripartite meetings with the candidate and university supervisor. In Spring 2014, the pedagogical content knowledge is documented on both the lesson plan and lesson delivery rubric. In the final InTASC portfolio, Standard 5, Application of Content, candidates provide two artifacts that represent their ability to meet the standard. The university supervisor and program coordinator evaluate these portfolios. Classroom supervisors have access to student teachers' InTASC portfolios. In an effort to streamline data collection from classroom supervisors, the SOE implemented a new assessment in LiveText. In Spring 2014, Classroom Supervisors were involved in evaluating InTASC standards electronically. In addition to formal observation data, classroom supervisors evaluated candidates on meeting the InTASC standards and on Lesson Delivery. Data from Spring 2014 indicates 84% of our candidates are on Target and 15% Acceptable for Pedagogical Content Knowledge for the InTASC Standard 5. For lesson delivery classroom supervisors rated the candidates as 78% very good, 15% good, and 5% fair. This new data process, provides the SOE with comprehensive data that in the future will inform greater improvement.

6000 character limit

### 1.1.c Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

**Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.**

Key assignments from courses are identified as meeting professional knowledge criteria. In the first two courses, Intro to Teaching and Human Growth and Development, elements of professionalism, such as knowledge of the teaching profession and how children grow and develop are emphasized and assessed. Students have used these key assignments in their entry portfolio to demonstrate professional knowledge. Additionally, GPA in these courses, is collected as an indicator of professional knowledge. Pedagogy is introduced in the Technology Applications for Educators course through the use of the ASSURE lesson planning and use of and evaluation of multiple strategies using technology. Students

have used key assignments from the technology course in their entry portfolio to demonstrate pedagogical knowledge. The standards measured in the entry portfolio cover Learner Development, Content Knowledge and Instructional Strategies. While the artifacts are not prescribed, candidates often pull from their samples of work in their pre-entry courses and professional and pedagogical competencies in these areas are measured. The performances on these artifacts are reflected in the students' final grades in the courses taken prior to admissions. In Table 1.04 below, GPA of professional knowledge for the unit is provided.

Table 1.04 Unit Professional Knowledge GPA  
Semester Average GPA for Professional Courses Rating  
Rating T A U  
Sp 13 3.50 53 46 0  
Fall 13 3.67 43 45 10  
\*Target – 4.0-3.4  
Acceptable – 3.3-2.7  
Unacceptable – 2.7->

At midpoint, Professional and Pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates are primarily measured through Praxis II PLT. All test categories are examined with an overall passing score required in order to continue through midpoint. Test categories identified as Professional are Students as Learners and Professional Development, Leadership and Community. Test categories identified as Pedagogical Knowledge are Instructional Process and Assessment.

Fall 2012 midpoint data indicated Secondary Ed candidates earned 77% of the points possible on professional knowledge with three scores above the average performance range and none below. For Pedagogical knowledge, data indicated the students earned 77% of the points available with two scores below the average performance range in instructional process and assessment. Although, assessment is the same category where one student earned 100% of the points. Early Childhood and Elementary Education candidates earned 72% of the points possible on professional knowledge and four scores were above the average performance range. For pedagogical knowledge, data indicated candidates earned 67% of the points available. Special Education candidates earned 68% of the points possible for professional knowledge and 65% of the points possible for pedagogical knowledge..

Spring 2013 had similar results with data indicating secondary ed candidates earned 68% and 70% of the total professional and pedagogical points possible on the PLT. Early childhood and elementary candidates earned 75% and 74% of the total professional and pedagogical points possible on the Praxis PLT.

The candidates' final InTASC portfolio presentation provides a holistic view of the candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge. Students highlight these competencies during their oral presentations. Reflective practice is a component of professional knowledge and this component is measured at exit as well. Generally these presentations are rated by a minimum of two faculty in the candidate's program.

6000 character limit

### **1.1.d Student Learning for Teacher Candidates**

#### **Summary processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the knowledge, skills, and ability to affect student learning.**

The development of a candidates affect on student learning, or impact on student learning (ISL) as defined at the SOE, begins primarily after entry. After entry candidates can take upper division

education courses that integrate content, pedagogy, and professional knowledge, all aspects that affect students' learning. At midpoint, students are required to provide evidence in their InTASC portfolio of competencies in assessment, but not specifically ISL. The ISL data is collected at exit through InTASC Standard 6 and through their oral presentation. The methodology, student growth, and candidate reflection are measured as part of the ISL competency. Very good for student growth is: "there is evidence of improvement in student learning and teacher effectiveness." Good for student growth is: "student learning or teacher effectiveness is minimal." Finally, fair is: "there is a decrease in student learning."

The elementary program integrates ISL in ED392, elementary practicum. Candidates are to develop and implement eight lessons from which the candidates do an initial assessment of students, develop a plan of action, and conduct a post assessment. Candidates then reflect upon the process, the learning, and the teaching. The data is collected in livetext as a key assessment for the course.

The secondary education program initiates the discussion of the impact on student learning in the content area literacy course and in the methods courses. However, data on the ISL is not collected until candidates are in their student teaching experience. At the weekly meetings with the candidates, ISL is discussed and explicit directions and guiding questions are provided. Candidates must complete a measurement of their impact on student learning generally through a pre-/post test. The Secondary Ed ISL data indicates a need to work on the methodology of the pre/post test administration and data analysis with only 62% of the candidates receiving a very good. However, student growth and the candidate's reflective practices were strong with 77% of the students earning a very good. The MAT follows the above format, however the process is primarily emphasized in internship where specific guidance on the process is provided. More emphasis and earlier guidance may increase the candidates' ratings of 60% very good in methodology, student growth and candidate reflection and 40 % rated as good.

In the Physical Education/Health program, Impact on Student Learning (ISL) data is initially collected through the practicum experience courses, PE392a – Field Experience in Teaching Elementary Physical Education and PE392b – Field Experience in Teaching Physical Education and Health: Secondary that are co-requisites to the method courses PE352 –Elementary PE Methods and PE353 – Secondary PE Methods. Students create a Teacher Work Sample (TWS) in which, a component is an analysis of student learning. ISL is again emphasized during the student teaching experience where the Candidates collect data throughout the semester and present the data and reflection during an oral presentation.

At exit, all the candidates in the SPED initial preparation program have met the standards for pedagogical and professional knowledge assessed through reflective writing of reports. Their impacts on student learning (ISL) were informally assessed on lesson planning and lesson delivery. An ISL rubric aligned with InTASC and CEC was developed in Fall 2013 with implementation during the Spring of 2014.

---

6000 character limit

### **1.1.e Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

**Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals' demonstration of the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.**

For pedagogical and professional knowledge in the M.Ed. in Reading Program, data for AY2012-13 reveal that all candidates met the standards, receiving a score that was, on average, at the acceptable or target level. No candidates were at the unacceptable level. Midpoint and Exit Capstone Portfolios show

evidence that candidates have met the program competencies and standards at an acceptable or target level. A capstone Portfolio and PRAXIS II for Reading Specialist with a passing score approved for licensure on Guam are required for those candidates seeking Reading Specialist certification. A capstone Portfolio and passing score on written comprehensive exam are required for students who do not seek Reading Specialist certification. One student chose to seek Reading Specialist certification and passed the PRAXIS II. The remaining 13 students passed the written comprehensive exam at an acceptable or target level.

The M.Ed. in Administration and Supervision is another program that prepares Other School Professionals. The candidates in this program have demonstrated acceptable performances in the three elements of the Unit's conceptual framework. To assess knowledge, the program has used either the comprehensive exam or the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

In May, 2011 Guam adopted the SLLA as a licensure exam. ADSU interns complete a LiveText internship portfolio that is aligned with the ELCC standards. Interns gather artifacts during their administration internship that provide evidence of their learning and application of the ELCC standards. The portfolio contains at least two artifacts for each of the ELCC standards along with the intern's written reflection explaining the artifact and discussing the intern's application of the artifact to his or her learned experience of the ELCC standard.

The M.Ed. in TESOL program requires candidates to submit a Midpoint Portfolio on LiveText prior to the ED692 Practicum course and a Capstone Portfolio as an exit assessment. The Midpoint Portfolio contains artifacts that demonstrate candidates' content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge. Artifacts in the Capstone Portfolio must show evidence that candidates have met the program competencies and standards. The Praxis II is required as an assessment of content knowledge at the exit point. Passing score for the Praxis II is 140.

The M.Ed. in Special Education has offered a professional (non-Thesis) track for the last three years with a non-traditional accelerated one-year program of study using a Cohort of 15 educator candidates. At mid-point, prior to formal Internship, each candidate must submit an electronic portfolio that contains reflections and artifacts that show the accomplishments of the standards in the SOE Conceptual Framework. The mid-point assessment of the candidates reveals acceptable to target performance. For the content-based Praxis II, 100% of candidates pass, with 86% reaching the target level. Although we have had very good success with our candidates in terms of content knowledge, it is apparent to the SOE that the M.Ed. in SPED does not fit the CAEP definition of an advanced program. The M.Ed. was recognized with conditions until January of 2013, yet because of the CEC advanced program definition, the SOE did not respond.

---

6000 character limit

### **1.1.f Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

**Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals' demonstration of abilities to create and maintain positive environments, as appropriate to their professional responsibilities, which support student learning in educational settings.**

Candidates in the M.Ed. in Reading Program determine the impact on student learning (ISL) in all field experience courses wherein classroom applications of literacy strategies are analyzed for ISL. However, the two pivotal courses for determining ISL are the clinical courses ED643 Practicum Assessment and ED644 Practicum Literacy Lab. In ED643 Practicum Assessment, candidates assess and tutor a school-aged student identified as having reading and writing difficulties. They use a range of assessment tools and methods to assess individual learners' reading and writing development, to design instruction, and to involve the learner in self-assessment. Candidates collect, analyze, and synthesize data to determine ISL

and provide recommendations for instructional intervention in the ED643 key assessment Diagnostic Case Report. In ED644 Practicum Literacy Lab, candidates implement the instructional interventions recommended in the ED643 Diagnostic Case Report to determine ISL. They collect, analyze, and synthesize ISL data in the ED644 key assessment Literacy Lab Case Report. The ISL data reveal that all candidates met the Target benchmark.

The Teacher Work Sample is an extended assignment that requires the TESOL candidates to assess their instructional choices and strategies and their impact on student learning. The TWS focuses on the decision-making process involved in the planning and delivery of a 2-4 week unit of standards-based instruction for English Language Learners. It is designed to help teachers understand the connection between teaching and student learning and the impact on student learning by analyzing the multiple, dynamic relationships between planning, instruction and assessment.

For the M.Ed. in SPED, the final exit electronic portfolio is used to assess candidates' pedagogical and professional knowledge. The portfolio contains informal information on their ISL along with 1-2 artifacts on each of the 10 standards of CEC. The electronic portfolio is evaluated using the rubrics on the LiveText system. Also at exit, the candidates have to take Praxis II. All the candidates at exit have demonstrated the target level of performance.

---

6000 character limit

### **1.1.g Professional Dispositions for All Candidates**

#### **Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of professional dispositions expected by the unit.**

SOE has been actively in pursuit of effective ways to assess, encourage and support successful and constructive student dispositions since the development of the disposition instrument in 2002. Although the original disposition rubric was created in 2002, Faculty have been asked regularly to make recommendations to update and align the rubric to the conceptual framework. Most recently, the diversity elements were specifically pulled out of the disposition rubric in an effort to provide explicit data relative to diversity, whereas in previous visits the data had been embedded within the disposition rubric.

This instrument is used at three critical points – entry, mid and exit. Acceptable performance of applicants in the three elements of the disposition rubric for all the initial teacher preparation programs is noted. At both admissions and midpoint, candidates must seek input from faculty outside of the SOE on the candidates disposition. At midpoint, 99% of the initial candidates are rated as either proficient or distinguished in all three components of the rubric. Advance programs indicate 100% of the candidates are proficient or distinguished; this is quite different from entry of advanced candidates who were rated with 89% of the students as proficient or distinguished as knowledgeable scholars or effective communicators and only 70 % were proficient or distinguished for effective communicator. This data influences the instructors to include more reflective practices throughout their classes and hence the increase in ratings by midpoint.

Tracking student dispositions at exit has always been carried out by individual instructors and student teaching supervisors and supervisors assigned in the clinical experience courses for other school personnel. The candidates are counseled and advised according to the demonstration of their disposition toward students, families, colleagues and community members.

---

6000 character limit

**Summarize results from follow-up studies of graduates and employers regarding your teacher education graduates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, ability to help all students learn, and professional dispositions.**

As a part of the follow-up study of the School of Education (SOE) completers, an online survey was conducted during the months of February and March 2014 in Guam Department of Education (GDOE). Since most of SOE graduates are employed in GDOE, a preliminary meeting with the GDOE superintendent determined that an online alumni survey was the best option to gather data, an email was sent with a hyperlink to the survey.

Survey results were analyzed using Qualtrics software package. A total of 151 participants made up of 124 teachers, 12 school administrators, 7 guidance counselors, and 8 others, responded to the survey. Participants were asked to refer back to their education in the School of Education at the University of Guam. They responded to each item on a scale from 1 as "not well prepared" to 5 as "well prepared" and in some cases "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Candidates were also able to answer with "Not Applicable" in which case their response didn't count. Content Knowledge was defined through items that indicated how well participants were prepared including developing "strong content area knowledge in my area of specialization" and developing "strong pedagogical content knowledge." Sixty-four percent of the participants responded that they were prepared or well prepared..

Pedagogical content knowledge and skills, included items referencing integrating technology into the grade level or subject taught and understanding and organizing curriculum for student learning. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated they were prepared or well prepared. Additionally, 65% of respondents were prepared or well prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. In the ability to help all students learn, 67% of the participants' indicated they were prepared or well prepared.. Items included addressing needs of students with a disability and working with culturally and linguistically diverse learners and communities. Professional knowledge and dispositions garnered 63% of the respondents who said they were prepared or well prepared with items including collaboration with colleagues, understanding organizational structures and employing leadership and organizational theories. In general, only 20% of participants' indicated a low level of satisfaction with the overall quality of the professional preparation in the major program area show. Positive responses range from a percentage of 56% to 67% with overall satisfaction at 80%. This suggests that although the candidates generally agree they were prepared in content, pedagogical content, and professional skills, the school should continue to review the results and determine areas where more specific improvement could occur.

The SOE conducts an annual Employer Survey of GDOE school administrators as a means of assessing and improving the quality of the teacher graduates from SOE. The survey provides an avenue for the school administrators to tell SOE how we can better meet the needs of our teacher candidates as well as future administrators. In administering the survey, the school administrators are given a list of SOE's recent teacher graduates. Administrators who work with any of the named graduates then complete survey items keeping these graduates in mind. Teacher graduates' skills are rated in four areas on the survey: (a) content knowledge, (b) pedagogical knowledge, (c) professional knowledge, and (d) impact on student learning. Ratings are based on a Likert scale of: 5 = very satisfied, 4 = quite satisfied, 3 = satisfied, 2 = somewhat satisfied, 1 = not satisfied, and 0 = not observed. The survey results inform SOE as to what school administrators believe are strong aspects of the teacher training program or areas for needed improvement.

For the 2012-2013 survey, 27 out of the 40 GDOE schools responded. Ten elementary and 10 secondary school administrators completed the survey (N = 20). Seven school administrators indicated that none of

the teachers in the attached list of graduates were working in their schools, so they did not complete the survey. Of the four skill areas assessed in the survey, content knowledge and impact on student learning had the highest mean ratings ( $M = 3.67$  and  $M = 3.62$  respectively), revealing that the school administrators were "quite satisfied" with the teachers' knowledge of their content and ability to assess their impact on student learning. Professional knowledge had the third highest mean rating ( $M = 3.52$ ) indicating that the school administrators were "satisfied" to "quite satisfied" with the teachers' professional knowledge. The lowest mean rating was for the skill area pedagogical knowledge ( $M = 3.42$ ) in which the school administrators indicated they were "satisfied" with the teachers' instructional methods and activities in imparting content knowledge. None of the individual skill items assessed in the survey received a rating below "satisfied" as the ratings of individual survey items ranged from 3.1 (for the teachers' ability to accommodate needs of students with disabilities) to 4.1 (for teachers' skills in preparation of lessons).

The overall results of the survey indicate to SOE that strengths in the teacher training program are in our candidates' content knowledge, impact on student learning skills, and professional knowledge skills. Although the teachers' pedagogical knowledge received an overall satisfactory rating from the school administrators, SOE does realize there is room for improvement in this skill area, as we would like to see this rating increased to quite satisfied or higher. Further disaggregation of the results in this pedagogical knowledge skill area reveals that the teacher candidates' ability to accommodate needs of students with disabilities is a target area for improvement in our teacher training program.

---

6000 character limit

## **1.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

### **AFI 1 / AFI Rationale**

Candidate performance assessments in some programs have not been aligned with the standards of specialized professional associations.

According to SPA reports, most programs have not been aligned to SPA standards. Only Reading Specialist and Elementary Education programs are SPA recognized without probation and/or with no conditions until 2019, evidence that these programs are aligned with the standards of the specialized professional associations.

#### **Response to AFI 1:**

The performance assessments or key assessments for each program are aligned with the current standards for professional associations. Additionally, for programs without SPAs, the assessments are aligned with either InTASC or NBPTS.

### **AFI 2 / AFI Rationale**

The unit has insufficient evidence to determine whether all candidates in the initial and advanced secondary education programs possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the unit has identified as essential for program completion.

The SPA reviews, with the exception of Reading and Elementary Education, indicated that the programs have not provided sufficient evidence to determine whether or not candidates have the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

#### **Response to AFI 2:**

Although some programs will maintain their National Recognition until 2019 and beyond, other programs have chosen not to use the SPA review process. The evidence of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as demonstrated by key assessments, are available onsite. It is important to note Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) recognition is not required by the "state;" however, some

programs have chosen to undergo SPA review. Other programs continue to be monitored through internal processes

#### AFI 3 / AFI Rationale

There are insufficient data across programs at both initial and advanced levels to draw conclusions about candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Without data, it is difficult to support the assertions of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions.

There are insufficient data and a lack of consistency in measures of content or pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions according to Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review data and institutional measures. Reading Specialist and Elementary Education are recognized until 2019.

Programs in Physical Education and Special Education Advanced are recognized with conditions until 2013; conditions include providing needed data. Other programs have not provided sufficient evidence to determine whether or not candidates have the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The program in Special Education Initial is on probation until 2015. Programs in Science Education and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages require further development. Programs in Administration and Supervision, English Education, and Social Studies Education did not submit SPA reports and, thus, are not recognized. Early Childhood submitted a SPA report in September. The Secondary Mathematics and Science programs did not have enough candidates to submit a SPA report. The MAT is new and, thus, did not submit a SPA report.

#### Response to AFI 3:

Knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed at the unit's transition points. All transition data is available in the ADR. The evidence of knowledge, skills, and dispositions are available onsite. Although our candidates have demonstrated proficiency in terms of content knowledge, it is apparent to the SOE that the M.Ed. in SPED does not fit the CAEP definition of an advanced program. The M.Ed. was recognized with conditions until January of 2013, yet because of the CEC advanced program definition, the SOE did not respond. Additionally, it is important to note Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) recognition is not required by the "state;" however, some programs have chosen to undergo SPA review. Other programs continue to be monitored through internal processes

#### AFI 4 / AFI Rationale

Aggregated data are not available to describe the breadth of experiences relative to knowledge, skills, and dispositions at both the initial and advanced levels.

Because several programs have incomplete data, it is not possible to aggregate data across initial or advanced programs or across the unit.

#### Response to AFI 4:

Knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed at the unit's transition points. All transition data is available in the ADR and is attached as evidence. This annual report disaggregates the data and provides a unit summary, identified as SOE.

#### AFI 5 / AFI Rationale

Disaggregated data are not available for several programs with regard to knowledge, skills, and dispositions in each program (initial and advanced). There is a need to disaggregate data by program in order to determine candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in each program. Because several programs at initial and advanced levels have incomplete data, it is impossible

#### Response to AFI 5:

Knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed at the unit's transition points. All transition data is available in the ADR and is attached as evidence. This annual report disaggregates the data and provides a unit summary, identified as SOE.

## AFI 6 / AFI Rationale

GPA and Praxis data are insufficient to determine content knowledge for initial and advanced candidates.

SPA reports indicate that several programs have not followed the NCATE guidelines for using GPA as a content measure. Praxis data are unclear and, in some cases, incomplete.

## Response to AFI 6:

In the 12-13 ADR, GPA and Praxis data were disaggregated. Additionally, Praxis results are analyzed through subtest results as opposed to the pass/fail collection process.

In addition, students submit a portfolio for evaluation, which allows the unit to assess content knowledge assessment information.

12000 character limit

### 1.3 Exhibits for Standard 1

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.3.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.3.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.3.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.3.h	Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.3.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates
1.3.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

1.3.a State Program Review and Findings.pdf
1.3.b Title II report Year 2011.pdf
1.3.b Title II report Year 2012.pdf
1.3.b Title II report Year 2013.pdf
1.3.c Key Transition Points Assessment.pdf
1.3.d ADR FA12-SP13 D1SSEMINATION.pdf
1.3.e M.Ed. Administration and Supervision.pdf
1.3.e M.Ed. Reading.pdf

1.3.e PE.pdf
1.3.e SEEG.pdf
1.3.e SPED Advanced.pdf
1.3.f Aggregate Data on Professional Dispositions.pdf
1.3.g ISL 1.pdf
1.3.g ISL 2.pdf
1.3.g ISL 3.pdf
1.3.g ISL 4.pdf
1.3.g ISL 5.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 1.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 2.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 3.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 4.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 5.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 6.pdf
1.3.h Portfolio 7.pdf
1.3.h Instructions for viewing Portfolios online.pdf
1.3.i ALUMNI SURVEY.pdf
1.3.j Employer Survey.pdf
1.3.k Data Collected by State and or National Agencies.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

## Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

### 2.1 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

#### 2.1.a Assessment System

**Summarize content, construct, process, and evaluation of the unit assessment system, its key assessments in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards, and its use in monitoring candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.**

The groundwork for the Unit's current assessment system began over 15 years ago with the admission of students to the then College of Education. The search for a data management system ensued and LiveText was adopted by the Unit in 2005. Faculty began the process of developing and refining key assessments and aligning course syllabi with the SOE Conceptual Framework, InTASC, and SPA standards. In 2004, through conversation with our K-12 classroom supervisors, long established evaluation instruments were revised to more accurately define student achievement. Annual review aligns syllabi with updated standards and the Conceptual Framework. These changes are shared with the SOE Advisory Council.

Many of the multiple sources of data were designed in conjunction with P-12 teachers and administrators. Cooperating teachers and Classroom Supervisors provide feedback and share concerns about the assessment system. The SOE Advisory Council, comprised of representatives of the University and the P-12 community, meet on an annual basis to provide continuous input. The College of Natural and Applied Sciences (CNAS) and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) faculty met with SOE during two collaborative meetings in AY2011-2012 and intermittently to discuss program needs, test results, student needs.

As a result of continuous reflection and actions implemented, 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 Unit and its programs. The following sections provide a more in-depth examination of the assessment system.

The Committee distributes an Assessment Data Report (ADR) to faculty each Fall that reports all the transition point and unit assessment data from the previous year. SOE hosted an Educators Summit in Fall 2011 and Spring, 2013 that included stakeholders from UOG, the community, SOE student organizations, UOG support and resources representatives, SOE Advisory Council, and the UOG President and Guam Department of Education Superintendent. The purpose of the Educators Summit was to engage our stakeholders in the Unit's assessment process and to obtain recommendations based on the data reported in the ADR. Regional leaders expressed their support of the accreditation process, noting that CAEP accreditation is good for the region as a whole.

A systematic review of our existing assessment practices, found that many types of data were already being collected, including various performance measures, but needed to be integrated into a unified system. Our development work has thus consisted of several significant tasks (a) designing organizational structures to ensure that assessment data are collected, disseminated, and systematically used to improve teaching and learning (b) ensuring that all programs are included in the assessment system (c) finding ways to make the existing assessments more fair, accurate, and consistent, and (d) aligning course syllabi with the SOE Conceptual Framework, Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), Guam Professional Teacher Standards (GPTS), InTASC, SPA, and NBPTS standards.

The key assessments for candidates in the Initial programs focus on: A) Admission to the program or entry; B) Completion of coursework prior to student teaching/internship or midpoint; and C) Completion of student teaching for undergraduate candidates or Internship for MAT candidates, professional portfolio review, impact on student learning assessment and dispositions check; D) exit survey; and, E) follow-up surveys of employers and alumni. Each of the key assessments provides data for the Unit faculty on progress candidates are making related to their knowledge, skills, and dispositions as delineated in the Conceptual Framework competencies.

To ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards and professional standards, all applicants and SOE candidates must submit key assessments at the program level and at each decision point. Only qualified candidates may proceed in the program. Assessments are aligned with the SOE conceptual framework, ILOs, InTASC, GPTS, and NBPTS standards. The assessments are uploaded into LiveText for review and analysis. The collection of admission data occurs fall and spring semesters. For the initial programs, the SOE Admissions Committee ensures the timely collection and review of admission portfolios via LiveText.

Data management for the unit assessment system is centralized and electronically managed by the Administrative Assistant. The Administrative Assistant also provides LiveText training to faculty and candidates as needed.

The performance of the unit operation is assessed through multiple sources including exiting candidates, alumni, and employers. Each semester candidates in student teaching and internship settings evaluate their program experiences through the use of an exit survey. Faculty use the data to make changes as needed. An Alumni survey is administered every five years. Data collected allows programs to evaluate effectiveness based on the perspective of a practicing teacher and allows the program to determine if there are gaps in the training. The most recent survey was administered in Spring of 2014 and data from

that survey is in Standard 1.

The Unit implements annual collection of employer surveys. This data is aggregated and disseminated in the Fall. The Unit uses an assessment calendar to ensure that assessments are collected and used in a timely manner to improve Unit operations.

8000 character limit

### 2.1.b Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

#### Summarize processes, timelines, and outcomes of data collection, analysis, and evaluation of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

The Unit adopted the use of LiveText as a data repository for the School of Education. Through this, faculty monitor key artifacts at the course level, but the greater use is for capturing information at the transition points of entry, midpoint, and exit. For programs that choose not to enter data directly into Livetext, hard copies of artifacts are retrieved from the faculty and results are inputted into Livetext. All candidate data are collected through the SOE, which administers, collects, and analyzes the data. Three transition points have been identified for collecting and analyzing data: entry, midpoint, and exit. In addition to these points, the SOE has identified key artifacts to be used as a means of measuring student performance. These key artifacts include transcripts, portfolios with evidence and reflections, course assignments, national exams, and disposition and diversity assessments. Deadlines for submission of admission and midpoint portfolios are in October and March. Students applying for admission into the SOE initial programs submit their Admission Portfolio to the SOE Admission Committee via LiveText for evaluation. Additionally, passing Praxis I scores, a minimum GPA of 2.7, completion of 54 credits, and dispositions reflective of exemplary teacher candidates are required as part of the selection process for the candidates. Teams of two committee members evaluate the candidates' submissions and the Chair of the committee reviews all results and if there is disparity can review the submission and make a decision. The committee also reviews all results together to determine borderline candidates and to clarify issues or concerns about the results.

Table 2.1: Students Admitted (Entry)

Entry	ECE	ELEM	SPED	SEED	PE	TOTAL
SP13	4	4	5	10	2	25
FA13	1	4	12	5	2	24

At midpoint, candidates are required to resubmit their admissions portfolio with additional artifacts included, pass Praxis II content and Praxis II PLT, have the appropriate GPA and disposition, and have completed all education courses with the exception of student teaching or internship. The program coordinator and Field Experience Coordinator evaluate the submissions with a recommendation for the final field experience. The field experience coordinator works with the faculty and candidate to either place or find avenues to help the student be successful.

Table 2.2: Student Teachers Recommended for Placement(Midpoint)

Midpoint	Term	ECE	ELEM	SPED	SEED	SOE	
Spring		13	4	6	5	12	27
Fall		13	2	5	3	15	25

#### Exit Information

At exit, candidates having completed their student teaching or internship are required to submit a final portfolio in December or May, demonstrating competency in all ten InTASC standards. Additionally, an oral presentation to the Program Coordinator, University Supervisor, and Classroom Supervisor is conducted for the candidate to showcase accomplishments and/or growth and present ISL data and

reflections. Classroom Supervisors submit an exit evaluation, Formal Observations from the University Supervisor and Classroom Supervisor are collected and maintained with either the Program Coordinator or the Field Experience Coordinator. In Fall 2013, Classroom Supervisors were trained in uploading their formal observations directly to LiveText. Some software complications were experienced. Upon resolution of the issues, all formal observation data are now maintained in the LiveText repository.

Table 2.3 Program Completers (Exit)

Exit ECE ELEM SPED SEED TOTAL

SP13 3 8 4 18 33

FA13 4 6 5 12 27

Follow-up Information

The School of Education continues to monitor their completers' progress in two ways; employer surveys and alumni surveys. The employer survey is distributed each summer to school building administrators in the Guam Public School System and gathers data on first year teachers. Data is disaggregated into four categories; content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professional knowledge and impact on student learning. The 26 item survey is scaled on a 4 point likert system with 1 indicating not satisfied and a 4 indicating very satisfied. Results are very positive the lowest category being pedagogical knowledge averaging 3.42 (satisfied to very satisfied) to Content knowledge averaging 3.62 (satisfied to very satisfied).

Alumni surveys are also distributed every 5 years. In 2014 a total of 151 participants made up of 124 teachers, 12 school administrators, 7 guidance counselors, and 8 others, responded to the survey. Participants were asked to refer back to their education in the School of Education at the University of Guam. They responded to each item on a scale from 1 to 5 as "not well prepared" to "well prepared" and in some cases "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Sixty-four percent of the participants responded that they were prepared or well prepared in the area of Content Knowledge. Fifty-Six percent felt they were prepared to well prepared in the area of Pedagogical skills. In general, only 20% of participants' indicated a low level of satisfaction with the overall quality of the professional preparation in the major program area show. Complete results of both these surveys are available in the exhibit room.

Although there is no formal procedural handbook, the SOE operates with a clear knowledge of assessment timelines as outlined through practice and timelines for transition points for the candidates. The timelines are indicated below.

Table 2.4: Assessment Calendar

Month Activity

September Admissions Orientations

Midpoint Orientations

October Entry Deadline

Midpoint Deadlines

November Dissemination of Assessment Data Report

December Final Oral Presentations (Portfolio, ISL) Exit

Exit Surveys of Completers

Classroom Supervisor Surveys

February Admissions Orientations

Midpoint Orientations

March Entry Deadline

Midpoint Deadlines

May Final Oral Presentations (Portfolio, ISL) Exit

Exit Surveys of Completers

Classroom Supervisor Surveys

Alumni Survey (every 5 years)

June/July Employer Survey

8000 character limit

### 2.1.c Use of Data for Program Improvement

#### **Summarize processes, timelines, activities, and outcomes derived from use of data for program improvement of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.**

Data are collected on candidates and programs throughout the year. Each fall the Assessment Committee (CAEP Administrative Assistant) prepares the ADR on data collected on candidate and Unit assessments from the previous year. Data are presented to faculty and stakeholders during the fall CAEP Retreat. These data are shared with faculty and used: (1) to reflect on the progress of candidates within programs, (2) to assess overall candidate proficiencies at the points of admission, mid-point, and exit, and (3) to determine particular program affects and how programs can be improved. The recommendations are compiled and reviewed. Program changes are initiated at the program level and routed through the appropriate Division, the SOE AAC, Dean, and then forwarded through the UOG approval process.

Assessment findings are used in various ways to improve program quality and unit effectiveness and thus to strengthen candidate performance.

Faculty conduct ongoing formative evaluation of candidates' performance as they proceed through the program courses. They identify weaknesses so assistance can be applied in a timely manner. Summative evaluation at key assessment points ensures that applicants and candidates are qualified to move on to the next stage of their program or to graduate. Results of key assessments are available to candidates on LiveText and candidates receive the scored rubrics with feedback in their Live Text accounts.

Candidates receive ongoing feedback about performance levels through grades, evaluations of course key assessments and course portfolios on LiveText, classroom and university supervisors, and in advisement meetings with program faculty. Formative assessment of dispositions is evident in the feedback given by course instructors through the use of the disposition rubrics. The dispositions of candidates are also formally screened upon admission and at the midpoint.

The Unit implements systematic collection of data from alumni every five years, employers annually, and program completers every semester. Each semester, candidates in student teaching and internship settings evaluate their program experiences. Faculty use the data to make changes as needed.

The Unit collects, analyzes, and disseminates data about candidates, courses, programs, and the Unit with the goal of understanding the program strengths and determining areas that require growth in order to enhance continued improvement.

Faculty use the assessment data to improve both personal performance and the performance of candidates. Based on formative assessments within courses and in the field experience, faculty members alter or extend instruction, re-teach important concepts, structure feedback to meet individual needs, and assist candidates in goal setting and attainment. Faculty members use the data not only to work with individual candidates, but also to improve instruction and supervision for future candidates.

Evidence from formative and summative assessments, along with confirming evidence of candidate performance after graduation, is used to examine programmatic success and revisions. Candidate evaluations of courses and alumni surveys also are used to revise and improve the program.

Formal attention to summarized data is also a part of our assessment system. Program faculty members analyze data that are unique to their candidates and use it for program improvement. The unit also specifically analyzes summarized data from key assessments, especially the assessments that are shared across programs.

In summary, all performance and disposition data are shared with faculty and used to: (1) reflect on the

progress of candidates within programs, (2) assess overall candidate proficiencies at the points of admission, midpoint, and exit, and (3) determine particular program affects and how programs and the unit can be improved. Faculty annually meet to provide feedback on assessment instruments and to discuss whether any changes are warranted. During the Fall Semester retreat, the ADR from the previous year is shared for discussion and feedback with faculty and the Advisory Council.

Unit changes impacting candidate performance, programs and unit operations from January 2013 to December 2013 include:

1. Consistent review of key artifact submissions on livetext to ensure candidate data is collected and assessed electronically by faculty.
2. Organized orientations for entry were implemented to guide candidates on requirements for artifact submission and reflective components in the InTASC portfolio.
3. Identified specific InTASC standards to be met prior entry.
4. Results of the admissions committee review at entry are immediately available to the candidate, as a means of formative assessment.
5. As a result of going through this assessment process, TEPS agreed to update the catalog to clearly reflect the need for entry into SOE in order to take upper division courses.
6. Organized orientations for midpoint were implemented to guide candidates on requirements for electronic submission of their mid-point application and portfolio.
7. Identified specific InTASC standards to be met prior mid-point.
8. The system has been set up to allow for review of the application and portfolio by the program coordinator and the field experience coordinator to ensure there is more than one reviewer of the data.
9. For exit: Classroom supervisors may now submit observation and evaluation data electronically through livetext. This allows the school to run electronic reports on candidate performance.
10. Student Teaching final oral presentation data is also captured electronically. The University Supervisor and Program Coordinator assess the candidates on their final InTASC and ISL presentation.
11. Data from employer surveys drove changes in the secondary education program by adding a special education and a classroom management course.
12. Implementation of requiring faculty reflections on candidate performance as a specific component of the annual faculty evaluation.

---

8000 character limit

## **2.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

### **AFI 1 / AFI Rationale**

The unit does not have an assessment system in place to assess candidate performance, program quality, and the unit operations.

There is a process in place for collecting data assessments through the use of LiveText technology. The unit has not involved all of its stakeholders in the development of its assessment system. The conceptual framework is not tied to state or professional standards based on the unit (this is occurring in some programs).

### **Response to AFI 1:**

The Unit adopted the use of LiveText as a data repository for the School of Education. Through this, faculty monitor key artifacts at the course level, but the greater use is for capturing information at the

transition points of entry, midpoint, and exit. For programs that choose not to enter data directly into Livetext, hard copies of artifacts are retrieved from the faculty and results are inputted into Livetext. All candidate data are collected through the SOE, which administers, collects, and analyzes the data.

#### AFI 2 / AFI Rationale

The unit has not taken steps to eliminate bias in assessments and is not working to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its assessment process.

Faculty provide assessment data to the Assessment Data Report (ADR) technology coordinator who then enters the data in LiveText. Although the ADR is discussed at faculty retreats, not all assessment data are included, resulting in inconsistencies of inter-rater reliability at major transition points. For many programs, assessments are course embedded and only one faculty member is evaluating a key assessment. It is unclear how cooperating teachers are being trained to use the clinical and student teaching evaluation instrument as cooperating teacher mentoring sessions have not yet been held

#### Response to AFI 2:

##### Test of Fairness, Accuracy, and Consistency

##### Fairness and Accuracy

Assessments are fair when they assess what has been taught and accurate when they measure what they propose to measure. Assessments are accurate when they measure what they purport to measure.

To ensure fairness and accuracy, the unit relies on the standardized internal and external measures:

- Content of the assessment instruments are correlated with course syllabi to ensure that candidates are assessed on what is taught.
- Assessment of candidate proficiencies is based on multiple assessments at key transition points based on a common set of evaluation instruments.
- Syllabi include statements that encourage candidates with disabilities to seek accommodations, as necessary.
- Candidate dispositions are assessed at multiple points in the program using the same assessment instrument.
- Course syllabi distributed by faculty on first day and posted on LiveText.
- Faculty members are available to advise students and clarify any points of concern. Despite these efforts, candidates occasionally are unable to meet requirements at the key transition points in a timely fashion. They may be: (a) placed on academic probation; (b) denied advancement in their preparation programs; (c) asked to follow a plan of assistance; and/or (d) encouraged to explore career alternatives other than the field of education. All efforts are made to address those students who do not meet requirements at each transition point. For example, the Admission Committee consults with the respective program coordinator and program faculty for their recommendation when a student does not meet the requirements. Students may further appeal to the Dean. At the midpoint, students who do not pass student teaching or internship are mentored by program faculty and generally allowed to retake the course the following semester. These cases are handled on a case-by-case basis, with input from program faculty and university supervisors.

##### Consistency

Assessments are consistent when they produce dependable results or results that would remain constant on repeated trials. To ensure consistency, the Unit relies on the following multiple measures to guarantee this endeavor:

- Faculty use common course outlines and every course has identified a key assessment with rubrics to measure candidates on the same knowledge and skills regardless of who teaches the class, and to ensure that expectations for candidates are clear. Rubrics are aligned with the Unit's Conceptual Framework and

with national, professional, and GTPS standards.

- Cooperating teachers and university supervisor training is conducted to ensure fairness, consistency, etc. with regard to evaluating student teachers.
- Assessments for student teaching are available to candidates and all stakeholders in handbooks; candidates are made aware of assessments in student teaching orientation sessions and during the Student Teaching Seminars.
- At least two or more faculty members must read and score an applicant's admission, mid, and exit point assessments.

AFI 3 / AFI Rationale

The unit does not regularly and systematically collect and analyze candidate performance data to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

There is no evidence of a system to collect, aggregate, analyze, and report assessment data across all programs to comprehensively evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs. An annual Assessment Data Report (ADR), data from transition points assessments, is used at faculty retreats to discuss outcomes. However, not all data needed are included in the ADR.

Furthermore, the process is not formalized or consistently followed by all programs and by all faculty.

Response to AFI 3:

Actions have been taken to ensure that programs and faculty comply with the assessment requirements within the unit. The obvious missing data in the previous ADRs has led to continued improvement as all faculty recognize the need to gather data in order to seek or demonstrate improvement. Recent ADRs demonstrate that all programs are contributing to the assessment system.

AFI 4 / AFI Rationale

The unit does not regularly and systematically use candidate and graduate performance data to make changes and improvements in its programs.

Candidates and faculty have access to LiveText. However, not all faculty and not all programs use LiveText to make changes and improvements in its programs. Although the ADR is discussed among faculty at retreats and outcomes shared with stakeholders at summits, not all assessments are included due to not all faculty and not all programs using LiveText.

Response to AFI 4:

Actions have been taken to ensure that programs and faculty comply with the assessment requirements within the unit. The obvious missing data in the previous ADRs has led to continued improvement as all faculty recognize the need to gather data in order to seek or demonstrate improvement. Recent ADRs demonstrate that all programs are contributing to the assessment system.

12000 character limit

**2.3 Exhibits for Standard 2**

2.3.a	Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.3.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and

	evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.3.e	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.3.f	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.3.g	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system
	2.3.a Assessment System.pdf
	2.3.a Unit Assessment.pdf
	2.3.b Admission Criteria.pdf
	2.3.b Admission Data.pdf
	2.3.c Fairness Accuracy Consistency and Free of Bias.pdf
	2.3.d Assessment Calendar.pdf
	2.3.d Policies on Ensuring Data are used for CI.pdf
	2.3.d Practice Admissions Timeline 2014.pdf
	2.3.e Procedure for Handling Student Complaints.pdf
	2.3.e Student Complaints UOG-Student-Handbook.pdf
	2.3.f File of Student Complaints.pdf
	2.3.g Changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

### 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.*

#### 3.1 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

##### 3.1.a Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

**Summarize processes and outcomes of collaboration between unit and school partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences, and in sharing of responsibilities, resources, and expertise.**

The School of Education (SOE) partners with schools on Guam, the US affiliated island nations in Micronesia who have adopted the American school system model and other stakeholders to 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. Guam is comprised of several school entities, the Guam Department of Education (GDOE), the Catholic Diocese schools, various other secular schools, private schools and the Department of Defense schools referred to as Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS or DoDEA). Collaboration among the different entities is accomplished through a variety of methods. Collaborative discourse about recommendations, needs, and modifications for field

experience, delivery, design, and evaluation transpire during many forms of meetings. The Field Experience Coordinator (FEC) attends principals' meetings, and meets individually with principals, head masters, and other school level administrators through school visits. Continual communication is also maintained through emails and phone calls. Recommendations from school level administrators include a need for streamlined processes with regard to placement. This articulated need resulted in a shift in the organizational structure and modification to the practicum form. Discussions are currently in place about continuing to identify quality master teachers, timely placements, and open lines of communication. For the final field experience direct access to the Student Teacher/Internship Handbook is available through the University of Guam (UOG)/School of Education (SOE) web page. Hard copies are not provided, unless specifically requested, as it is a large document.

School level administrators and the FEC share responsibilities and expertise when placing candidates. The FEC and school administrators identify what each school can accommodate in terms of observations, practicums, and/or student teachers. Responsibility is also shared when identifying suitable classroom supervisors.

Field experience is integrated into the initial programs from the first course candidates take. This first course (ED192), a corequisite to Intro to Teaching (ED110), allows students to observe at the elementary, middle, and high school. This arrangement allows for the courses at this level to cycle through a four-week observation schedule and students arrange for their own observation with the school based on this approved cycle. All other field experience arrangements require the SOE faculty member to request placement from the FEC. Since the last full visit, forms have been created and have continually undergone minor revisions to make them easier to complete. The principals have also asked for additional information in order to have the ability to directly contact students for more information to assist in selecting a placement. On the request form, faculty provide outcome expectations for the experience.

Because SOE respects and values the school level administrators, all communication begins with them. Students and SOE faculty are discouraged from directly contacting classroom teachers to make field experience arrangements. Principals are asked who on their staff can fulfill the practicum or student teaching mentoring. Principals are provided with a request form that outlines the expectation of the experience for the student. In the case of Classroom Supervisors for student teaching it is necessary to have a minimum of five years of teaching at the level and content, certification, and satisfactory or above teacher performance. The application process for student teaching has been completely revised and is now done electronically. This process includes additional data to help SOE understand where students are in their preparation. This process has allowed the FEC to provide immediate access to the application to the coordinator and advisor for review and approval.

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) has been developed with St. John's School, an independent religiously based school. MOAs are unnecessary with GDOE and DoDEA because they have internal policies in place that allow UOG to contact and place students in their schools. In the case of GDOE, UOG is the primary provider of teachers to fill their vacancies and, as such, work with UOG to provide the practicum and student teaching opportunities in a timely manner. The FEC schedules a meeting each semester with GDOE Personnel and the Guam Commission for Educator Certification (GCEC) to expedite the process for placement of Teacher Candidates in full time jobs once they graduate. DoDEA's policies are worldwide in regards to Teacher Candidates and the FEC follows their process. At the beginning of each semester the FEC holds meetings and a general training for Classroom Supervisors on the duties, responsibilities and expectations of the service they are providing. Updates to the process are communicated through the University Supervisors and the FEC. At these meetings, Classroom Supervisors are given program specific instruction on what will be expected and looked for.

In Fall 2013, training was provided to the Classroom Supervisors on LiveText and they were given

access to their Teacher Candidate's portfolio and asked to upload their formal observations. SOE feels this is an important addition to developing reliable data and involving the Classroom Supervisor in the final assessment of the Teacher Candidate. At present Classroom Supervisors are asked to complete exit surveys. Added to the exit presentation by the Teacher Candidate is a demonstration of how they have impacted student learning. This was added to ensure preparation and execution of lessons included the most tangible aspect of teaching, learning. To date, candidate data indicates we are moving in the right direction. Enforcement of Praxis and catalog requirements have provided information for Program Coordinators to use in strengthening program preparation and also provided tangible data that SOE is producing Candidates prepared to enter the teaching profession. When candidates are assigned to student teaching a meeting is held where general requirements and expectations are reviewed and reiterated. Candidates are to complete a minimum of 15 weeks of student teaching and are encouraged to either begin with the opening or remain through closing of the school year at the school they are assigned. University Supervisors meet with their assigned Candidates throughout the semester to discuss accomplishments, address issues, and answer questions that may arise. These group meetings help Candidates to collaborate with each other and develop ideas of how they can address situations that may have come up.

Program Coordinators have initiated contact with the Curriculum and Instruction office of the GDOE to be included in trainings offered by GDOE to their teachers. This has helped to develop a better partnership with GDOE and to better inform the Program Coordinators of the direction and issues facing GDOE. SOE faculty have also made themselves available to conduct workshops and provide informational sessions for GDOE or other entities, when requested. SOE partners have indicated they are more satisfied with the execution of the SOE's field experience program with the increased involvement of the partners. Inclusion of DODEA has been a positive experience by allowing for experiences working with populations not found in GDOE or other partner schools.

---

8000 character limit

### **3.1.b Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practices**

**Summarize the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practices; expectations for mentors and supervisors; and outcomes of candidates in meeting proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards during their field and clinical experiences.**

Field experience, in concert with the SOE Conceptual Framework, is a major component of course requirements. The design involves the partners throughout. The FEC works under the direction of the Dean and in collaboration with the SOE Faculty. The FEC has developed a process to coordinate all practicums, observations, service learning, student teaching, internship, and other experiences in schools for Candidates. The FEC, along with the Program Coordinators (PC), conduct professional development experiences for Classroom Supervisors (CS), and work with faculty to maintain data on midpoint and exit reviews of SOE Teacher Candidates (TC).

For course field experiences, professors send the FEC a list of students, practicum expectations, timelines and schools where the student would like to complete the experience. The FEC contacts the Principal and informs them of the requirements. The Principal selects a qualified instructor and provides them with a copy of the requirements. The form is returned to the FEC, who forwards it to the professor for distribution. The Cooperating Teacher informs the student of the class requirements and when the student can begin the practicum experience. The outcomes for the initial experience in ED192 are two-fold, the first is to help the students determine if the career in teaching is really for them and the second is to develop reflective writing skills. This practice continues in other observation courses, where the goal is to observe for specific strategies or practices and in turn reflect on such. In practicum, the

outcomes are for practice. For example in the secondary methods course, the students deliver micro lessons in the cooperating teacher's classroom, the practice allows the student the experience students and to refine lesson delivery skills and classroom management. The cooperating teachers provide feedback that allows for continued growth.

Student Teaching/Internship has been designed to provide full time teaching practice. A CS must possess a minimum of 5-years of teaching experience at the level, full certification, and demonstrate strong teaching skills. Principals nominate the CS and the PCs along with the FEC, concur or disapprove. The TC completes a 15-week program. Meetings with CSs and/or TCs are conducted throughout the semester by the FEC and the University Supervisors (US). Meetings are intended to be constructive and address TC issues and provide CSs with assistance to improve mentoring skills. Involvement of CSs with TCs occurs daily. The CSs review lesson plans and provide feedback prior to delivery. Other formative assessments include reflection papers, reports, and student assessments. Formal communications and summative assessments are conducted during the 4 assessment conferences as well as through the "Classroom Supervisor Evaluation" survey form at the end of the student teaching experience. During tripartite meetings, formal communication is held between the US, CS, and the TC, to discuss the TC's progress.

The Master's of Arts in Teaching (MAT) is an initial certification program to develop secondary teachers. All courses within the program require a minimum of 10 practicum hours, which vary from observation to microteaching as assigned by the instructor. A full semester internship is also required. Candidates in the MAT program must complete the same number of hours as a TC in the undergraduate program. Employment as a classroom teacher for a minimum of 15-weeks is required. Five formal observations by the US, one formal observation by a school level teacher in that content area, and a formal observation by the Principal are conducted to insure the Candidate is progressing successfully.

Field experiences for advanced programs are most often dependent upon the employment of the Program Candidate. Continuums of experiences are required from course observations, practicums, and through clinical/internship experiences. When possible, advance candidates will complete internship at other locations with the approval of the PC, the Principal or Supervisor (non-school placement), and the FEC. However, most often, internship occurs at the work place. The Principal must approve all components of the practicum. All programs requiring an on-site supervisor also require fully qualified and experienced individuals in the field.

The M.Ed-Administration and Supervision involves 300 hours of internship at the school level under the supervision of a Principal. The internship experience requires exposure to all facets of administration to include, curriculum, student supervision, business, and policies and procedure meetings and implementations. The Principal reports on the Candidate's progress during the US's five formal observations and meetings. At the conclusion of each formal observation, the three sit down and review the progress the Candidate is making. Assessment of the interns outcomes are documented in the ELCC aligned internship portfolio.

In practicum experiences, Candidates begin facilitating sessions. Candidates, record sessions and review the video recording with their instructor to identify strengths and weaknesses. The internship in Guidance and Counseling provides the student with the full range of counselor responsibilities appropriate to the school setting. During internship, Candidates assume increasing levels of responsibility for a range of counseling activities. Supervisors serve as mentors, meeting regularly with the Candidate and provide them with both verbal and written feedback toward meeting outcomes. Throughout the semester the USs meets with the Candidate and supervisor to review the Candidate progress.

The M.Ed- Reading requires a yearlong practicum experience taken midway in the program. In ED643,

Candidates assess a school-aged student identified as having reading and writing difficulties using a range of tools and methods. Candidates collect and synthesize data and provide recommendations for instructional intervention in a Diagnostic Case Report. In ED644, Candidates submit a follow-up case study report that builds upon the Diagnostic Case Report previously completed. This case study allows for the documentation of Candidate's effects on student learning and the ability to develop instructional environments supportive of student learning.

The M.Ed.-Special Education program requires 10-15 hours of practicum experiences per course plus an internship which involves ten major field experiences generally required of special educators, i.e. present a professional development workshop, attend parent support group, interview director of Vocational Rehabilitation, coach a Special Olympics team, etc. All course work is aligned with meaningful fieldwork using formal rubrics.

In the M.Ed. in TESOL program, candidates engage in field experiences in specialization courses across the program courses, culminating with the ED692 Practicum course. ED692 provides candidates with an opportunity to teach English as a Second Language in a classroom setting. They solidify their understanding of the connection between teaching and student learning by analyzing the multiple, dynamic relationships between planning, instructions and assessment. All Candidates that are employed full-time as a classroom teachers can immediately apply knowledge and skills.

Regionally, SOE partners with the community colleges on the islands or state education offices to accommodate instructional needs, especially those relating to field experience and CSs. These off-campus locations meet the same requirements as the on-campus.

---

8000 character limit

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

**Summarize proficiency expectations and processes for development during field experiences and clinical practices; and outcomes based on demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn.**

All field experience completed by students is based on the SOE Conceptual Framework, InTASC and/or Standards, and the degree being sought. Initial and advanced programs build the field experience around national standards for that particular content area. Field experience begins with the introductory courses for education, ED192 and progresses through to the final course, ED492, student teaching. Each course's field experience is intended to build on previous experiences. Beginning with ED192, candidate's exposure to the types of students in the K-12 schools is designed into the field experience requirements of the course. ED192 has included specific observation requirements exposing students to wide variety of learning styles, to include special needs and English language learners. This experience is to provide students with an opportunity to become aware of the exceptionality of the student population and the need to meet the learning styles of all students. Each course builds on the foundation developed in ED192 and expands the knowledge base of the student through actual exposure and experience.

Prior to entering Student Teaching or internship, Teacher Candidates are required to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills through the Praxis II Content and PLT, at least a 2.7 overall GPA and a 2.7 GPA in the professional preparation courses, submission of an outside disposition assessment, and completion of 16 artifacts and reflections on the InTASC standards. Through these requirements the Program Coordinator and the FEC make a decision as to the readiness of the Teacher Candidate to begin the final undergraduate requirement. If it is determined that the candidate is not ready or has not met all requirements then student teaching is not approved. In these cases, students are encouraged to strengthen

the area they have not met, either through additional course work or test preparation.

To ensure that Teacher Candidates have the necessary knowledge and skills to succeed in field experience, PRAXIS II content and PLT requirements are monitored and enforced at the appropriate transition points. The FEC monitors and assists candidates having difficulty scheduling PRAXIS II exams and maintains a database on SOE candidate performances for all programs. Prior to clinical placements, the FEC makes the final review of the applications to ensure all requirements for each student's University catalog have been met. This includes assurance that students with catalog requirements beginning 2007-2008 have completed the PRAXIS II content exams with passing scores as set by Guam Commission for Educator Certification (GCEC) and, beginning with the 2010-2011 academic year, the PRAXIS II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). The PLT was added by the SOE to demonstrate graduating students were not only knowledgeable in their content area, but also knowledgeable in pedagogy. The PLT became a Guam certification requirement beginning with school year 2011-2012.

At the conclusion of clinical practice, the University Supervisor conducts a final review of the Teacher Candidate utilizing the Teacher Candidate's formal observations, input and evaluation by the Classroom Supervisor, oral portfolio presentation, and the final portfolio demonstrating attainment of the ten InTASC standards through artifacts and reflection. As part of the oral portfolio presentation, the programs now require the Teacher Candidate demonstrate an impact on student learning. This requirement provides another indicator that the Teacher Candidate has met a component of the SOE Conceptual Framework. Field experience requirements for courses are developed by each program and are monitored and evaluated by the instructor of record. In the case of methods courses, students are expected to observe and teach at least one lesson. The Cooperating Teacher provides feedback to the course instructor. Additional expectations for the experience are course specific. Advanced and Other Programs follow the same process as the undergraduate program. Each instructor develops their practicum requirements based on the particular program outcomes. Internship requirements within each program may vary depending on program outcomes. All contain a Praxis II requirement; however, in the case of the Reading Master's, a comprehensive exam may be substituted. Again, the field experiences for each course is developed and evaluated by the course instructor. The number of hours may also vary depending on requirements.

SOE continuously seeks new and innovative ways to ensure that candidates gain the skills needed to have a greater impact on student learning. In collaboration with our partners, plans are designed to strengthen and maximize the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of Teacher Candidates and other School Professionals in alignment with the SOE Conceptual Framework. Without this work, SOE would not continue to improve.

Using data collected on field experiences, there was a realization that several areas need strengthening. Disposition data are collected at entry and midpoint; however, they need to be collected upon the completion of field experience. The institution of this collection point closed the loop with respect to professional growth. In addition, it was identified that there needed to be more systematically collected data on candidates' impact on student learning (ISL). In response to this, the Secondary Program added ISL as a part of the exit oral presentation. Further development in this area is on going in all programs.

---

8000 character limit

### **3.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Acton Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

NA

12000 character limit

### 3.3 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.3.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.3.b	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery)
3.3.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty
3.3.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.3.e	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.3.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
3.3.g	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

3.3.a.1	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding.pdf
3.3.b.1	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice.pdf
3.3.c.1	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty.pdf
	3.3.c Statement.pdf
	3.3.d Examples of Support and Evaluation of Clinical Faculty.pdf
3.3.e.1	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection.pdf
3.3.f.1	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning.pdf
	3.3.g Data on Candidates Entering and Exiting Clinical Practice.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

## 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.*

### 4.1 Diversity

**Summarize the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences; descriptions of and processes for development of diversity proficiencies; and the outcomes based on key assessments.**

The School of Education (SOE) at the University of Guam recognizes diversity in the following terms: differences among groups of people and individuals based on race, ethnicity, disability, physical ability, gender, socioeconomic status, language, religious beliefs, political beliefs, age, sexual orientation, and geographic region in which they live. Diversity is one of the characteristics of American higher education. One of the strengths of the SOE is our remarkable diversity.

The University's general education curriculum is itself designed to develop candidates' proficiencies related to diversity. General education courses for this purpose are listed in the undergraduate catalog under the following categories: Global Studies (diverse culture), Modern Language (different languages), Regional Studies (ethnicity), and Search for Meaning (gender). SOE candidates are encouraged to enroll in HI211 (History of Guam) or ED265 (Culture and Education in Guam) to fulfill general education requirements as they focus on multicultural and multilingual topics.

The SOE provides candidates with opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions that address "diversity" proficiencies. The diversity proficiencies are defined relative to SOE's Conceptual Framework. These proficiencies target candidates' awareness of diversity in different domains, ability to establish communication patterns that incorporate diverse views, and exploration of diverse views and perspectives in drawing conclusions (see Exhibit 4.3.a). The SOE courses that all candidates have to take include ED192 (Practicum Observation and Participation), ED201 (Human Growth and Development), and ED300 (Educational Psychology). In ED192, candidates take part in their first practicum experience and complete 12 hours of classroom observation in elementary, middle, and high schools. The instructors emphasize observation hours in ESL and SPED classrooms, and students provide reflections of their learning experiences from these classroom observations. ED201 and ED300 provide an introduction to diverse learners and the need for schools to consider the individual needs of the learner. The ED300 course, in particular, offers an analysis of the complex factors involved in individual differences in learning, motivation for learning, and socio-cultural factors as they affect the education of children and youth. In addition to these foundation courses related to diversity, elementary majors are required to take ED215 (Introduction to Exceptional Children). To ensure that secondary education program candidates learn more about special education and gain knowledge and practicum experience working with students with disabilities prior to student teaching, two courses were added as a requirement for secondary education majors: the existing course ED446 (Including Students with Disabilities in the Regular Classroom) and a new course ED463 (Secondary Education Classroom Management in a Diverse Society). This curricular change will be enforced by AY 2014/15. At the Masters level, ED600 (Issues and Philosophies in Culturally Diverse Schools) is a core course for most programs, and ED615 (Diversity in Education) is required for the Masters of Arts in Teaching program. Both courses are geared toward issues of diversity. SOE programs also have other courses that address diversity proficiencies. Exhibit 4.3.b identifies specific course components that address and assess diversity proficiencies in the programs' courses and Foundations' courses.

The diversity proficiencies have always been embedded in the existing disposition rubric, but have now been extracted and made more explicit as a separate diversity matrix. Key artifacts are identified in courses that address diversity proficiencies, and these artifacts provide assessment of candidates' attainment of these proficiencies based on three levels: unacceptable, acceptable, and target (as detailed in Exhibit 4.3.a). These key artifacts are identified in Exhibit 4.3.b by program by course. Additionally, key assessments aligned with the professional, national, and the SOE Conceptual Framework standards related to diversity are embedded in all course syllabi. The SOE's Conceptual Framework has three components: Knowledgeable Scholar, Effective Communicator, and Reflective Decision Maker. The

Framework requires a professional commitment to acquisition of a knowledge base, teaching competence, and student learning. The Framework further emphasizes the importance of preparation in content, pedagogy, and professional skills as well as the critical importance of supporting learning for all students. Syllabi, assignments, and assessments are typical examples of faculty reflection during their daily practice. SOE faculty members are greatly engaged with their candidates in the classroom setting and in the field experience, evaluating candidates through observations and formally in examinations of candidates' performance. As an assessment instrument, the SOE's disposition rubric, a systematic assessment of candidate dispositions, is utilized to evaluate the candidate dispositions based on four levels: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. Dispositions are fundamental to the Framework. The Knowledgeable Scholar component is designed to assess candidates' commitment to identifying their own learning style and P-12 students' learning styles. The Effective Communicator component assesses candidates' willingness to communicate enthusiastically, and the Reflective Decision Maker component assesses candidates' sensitivity to diversity.

---

8000 character limit

#### **4.1.b Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

**Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse faculty; qualifications and expertise of faculty in supporting candidates in their development of expected proficiencies; and the unit's affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity.**

Students have opportunities to engage in multiple educational experiences provided through the structure of the SOE. The unit is divided between two divisions— Foundations, Educational Research and Human Studies (FERHS) and Teacher Education and Public Service (TEPS). Both divisions insure that students do not leave the University with only one professor's perspective. Students take core courses in their programs from diverse Foundations faculty and program-specific courses from a diverse pool of full-time and adjunct faculty in the FERHS and TEPS divisions. Programs generally include courses outside of their endorsement, for example the Elementary education program requires students to take courses from both Special Education and ESL faculty. Candidates in initial programs generally leave the University having had a minimum of seven different education faculty.

The SOE is committed to the recruitment, hiring, and retention of faculty with teaching experience in multicultural settings. All job announcements have this requirement. The University of Guam actively seeks applicants who possess a global vision and who are interested in working in a dynamic, multicultural institution. Our recruiting range is from a local, regional, and national pool of candidates. The University's hiring practices, as an equal opportunity employer and provider, comply with Guam Public law 24-109 relative to provisions and requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. As such, SOE has a diverse faculty, allowing candidates experience in working with faculty with diverse philosophies and backgrounds. Mentorship is an important activity for retaining diverse faculty members and is practiced at SOE. See Exhibit 4.3.d.

In addition to the information available in Standard 5, Faculty Qualifications, and in the exhibits for Standard 4, the Faculty of SOE are hired based on their qualifications in their specific content. A Special Ed faculty member brings expertise in Special Education. Therefore, when a candidate takes a special education course or an ESL course, the students are trained in not only the content of the course from an expert, but are provided the support to connect the theoretical information with practice.

---

8000 character limit

#### **4.1.c Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates**

**Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse peers; and the unit's affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain candidate diversity.**

The University's students come from Guam; the U.S. mainland; Northern Mariana Islands; Republic of Palau; the Federated States of Micronesia which include Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae, the Republic of the Marshall Islands; the Philippines; India; Korea; Japan; China; and Taiwan. The campus makes for an interesting ethnic mix. Students enroll in SOE courses from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds and speak a variety of first languages. The University enrolls both male and female students, and the latter are the majority. Through the curriculum and academic forums, SOE emphasizes that critical cultural consciousness is central to improving the educational opportunities and outcomes for candidates. SOE candidates in both initial and advanced programs are diverse and participate in educational experiences with candidates from a wide range of diversities. Meaningful field experiences support the expansion of knowledge and appreciation of candidates coming from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Faculty also model best practices in the classroom encouraging peer interaction and cooperative group work with peers from diverse backgrounds. Candidates work together in cohorts and projects related to course content areas. Additionally, candidates have opportunities to work with diverse candidates outside of the classroom in SOE student organizations such as Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Association for the Education of Young Children (AEYC), Future Educators Association Profesional (FEA Pro), and Gearing Education for Maximum Service (GEMS) performing service in the community with diverse populations.

The School of Education continues to collaborate and foster outreach relationships with our neighboring islands. There are two distinct programs. The first is the BAE Partnership in Elementary Education with the College of Micronesia/FSM in Pohnpei. Through this partnership, the SOE faculty teach required courses for Elementary Education during the year. Most students in the BAE Partnership program are on Pell grant but pay COM/FSM tuition/fees instead of UOG tuition/fees.

The second, Individualized Degree Plan (also known as IDP) is a partnership with the Lead Education Agency (i.e. Yap Department of Education, Chuuk Department of Education and Kosrae Department of Education) to provide university level courses to their in-service teachers to obtain their baccalaureate degree. The SOE faculty travel to these islands during the summer months to teach the in-service teachers. The funding for this program is secured by the Lead Education Agency, which is usually projected for staff development.

In Spring 2014, the division is initiating a peer mentoring program. The students will be trained in ED384: Student Academic Counselor Training to strengthen retention efforts. This program will provide opportunities for peer mentoring for candidates who have not yet been admitted to the SOE. The peer mentors will work with students in the ED110: Introduction to Teaching classes to help diverse candidates receive assistance and support for entrance into SOE. Candidates can also avail of tutoring services through the University's Americorps or TRIO programs. These aforementioned efforts and services are aimed at strengthening the division's retention efforts.

The University is committed to achieving equal opportunity and full participation of candidates with disabilities by providing for nondiscriminatory access to its services and facilities, through the American with Disabilities Act Office.

8000 character limit

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

**Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse students in P-12 schools; processes for the development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to**

**diversity; and outcomes based on key assessments during field experiences and clinical practice.**

Candidates work with diverse students in P-12 schools participating in field experiences throughout their degree programs. In ED192, candidates participate in their first practicum experience and complete 12 hours of classroom observation in elementary, middle, and high schools that include observation hours in ESL and SPED classrooms. Candidates engage in further field experiences in the P-12 schools in the methods and other courses for their respective degree programs. Candidates then complete capstone field experiences through student teaching and internship in the P-12 schools.

The majority of field experiences and clinical practices for pre-service students in SOE are conducted in the single public school district on the island, the Guam Department of Education (GDOE). The P-12 population in GDOE consists of a diverse group of 32,000 students that includes 1, 815 students with disabilities, 14,215 English language learners, and 82 % of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Additionally, 48% of the public school students are Chamorro, 22% are Filipino, 24% are Pacific Islanders, 2% are Asian, 1% from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1% are White, and 2% are other. Of those students 47% are female and 53% are male. Additional experiences include working in the Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) and private schools. Most private schools are affiliated with a specific religious organization. The SOE encourages candidates to work with exceptional students during their practicum and student teaching experiences.

8000 character limit

**4.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

**AFI 1 / AFI Rationale**

Diversity proficiencies for the unit were not identified.

The unit has a comprehensive definition of diversity but there are no diversity proficiencies identified. There are statements about diversity, courses where diversity concepts are covered are listed, and the unit has dispositions, but despite several requests, no expectations for what candidates should know and be able to do related to diversity were identified. The addendum includes some program matrices but they are aligned to the three key components of the conceptual framework (knowledgeable scholar, reflective decision-maker, and effective communicator). Unit members could not articulate how these are translated into specific diversity proficiencies for candidates to master.

**Response to AFI 1:**

SOE continues to take advantage of opportunities to provide experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Although diversity proficiencies have been embedded in SOE's Candidate Disposition Rubric, these diversity proficiencies have since been made explicit and, thus, articulated in a separate diversity matrix. The diversity proficiencies are defined relative to SOE's Conceptual Framework. These proficiencies target candidates' awareness of diversity in different domains (knowledgeable scholar), ability to establish communication patterns that incorporate diverse views (effective communicator), and exploration of diverse views and perspectives in drawing conclusions (reflective decision-maker). [See Exhibit 4.3.a]

**AFI 2 / AFI Rationale**

A clear correlation between diversity proficiencies, course content, and assessments was not articulated. When requested several programs included in the addendum for Standard 4, a chart listing the elements of the conceptual framework and assignments that had a diversity component. No assessment rubrics

were included in these charts and not all programs included a chart.

Response to AFI 2:

In Fall 2013, program faculty identified courses in their respective SOE programs that address the diversity proficiencies as defined in the diversity proficiencies matrix. For each of the courses, the program faculty also identified key artifacts assessing the candidates' attainment of these diversity proficiencies. These key artifacts are identified in Exhibit 4.3.c by program by course.

Faculty has also aligned their course syllabi with the new InTASC standards, the revised SOE Conceptual Framework, SPA, NBPTS, Guam Teacher Professional Standards. All of these standards include indicators of appreciation and competency in working with diverse populations. Alignment ensures that our candidates build upon cultural values and beliefs in all aspects of their instructional and assessment practices by utilizing a broad assortment of skills and tools, including technology, in their teaching and assessment that maximize the opportunities for P-12 students to demonstrate their competence in a variety of ways.

AFI 3 / AFI Rationale

The unit and the programs do not evaluate candidates' proficiencies related to diversity. There were no data on candidates' knowledge or skills related diversity outcomes.

Response to AFI 3:

As noted in our AFI 1 response, diversity proficiencies have been embedded in SOE's Candidate Disposition Rubric. Data from the candidates' disposition rubrics have been collected, aggregated, and reported annually in SOE's Annual Data Reports (ADRs); however, the data from these rubrics evaluating candidates' attainment of the specific diversity proficiencies were not represented in past ADRs (although the data were available for analysis). In Fall 2013, with the identification of specific program courses addressing diversity elements, the diversity proficiencies have been made more explicit and faculty are now able to gather and provide assessment data for diversity proficiencies as measured by key artifact assessments in courses addressing these proficiencies.

12000 character limit

**4.3 Exhibits for Standard 4**

4.3.a	Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning
4.3.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.3.c	Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.3.d	Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)
4.3.e	Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)
4.3.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)
4.3.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.3.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates

4.3.i Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

4.3.a Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning.pdf
4.3.b Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Administration and Supervision Diversity Proficiencies and Data.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Administration and Supervision Rubric_ED613_School Program and Budget Project.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Administration and Supervision Rubric_ED698_ELCC Portfolio_FA13.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Administration and Supervision Rubric_Key Artifact_ED610.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading Diversity Proficiencies and Data.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED640 Rubric for Schema Theory Paper.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED641 Rubric for Interdisciplinary Unit of Instruction.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED641 Rubric for Literacy Autobiography.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED643 Rubric for Diagnostic Case Report.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED644 Rubric for Literacy Lab Case Report.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED645 Rubric for Retelling as a Culturally Responsive Literacy Strategy for Pacific Islanders.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED646 Rubric for Professional Development Plan of Action.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED647 Rubric for Literature Review .pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED647 Rubric for Pacific Literature Website.pdf
4.3.c M.Ed. Reading ED649 Rubric for Capstone Portfolio.pdf
4.3.d Faculty Demographics.pdf
4.3.e SOE Candidates Demographics.pdf
4.3.f Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice.pdf
4.3.g Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty.pdf
4.3.h Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates.pdf
4.3.i Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

**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.*

**5.1 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

**5.1.a Qualified Faculty**

**Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty, school-based faculty, and university clinical faculty regarding faculty qualifications.**

To date, the School of Education has 14 full-time faculty members. All full-time faculty are terminal

degree holders. Most have experience in K-12 schools and clinical practice. Of the 14, three are on contract and one of the three is a Professor Emeritus. Eight faculty members are tenured and rank from Associate to Full-Professor. Three of the faculty members are tenure-track, one having served as a full professor in Fiji.

"Faculty qualifications" begins with the University's recruitment process. This process is initiated in the negotiated faculty agreement through the request of filling the vacancy and the formation of the search committee. The recruitment of qualified faculty continues through a process established by the Human Resource Office. The faculty search committee establishes the criteria, including the qualifications, in accordance with the University-wide standards. This committee reviews applications; establishes the short list; interviews the candidates; and prepares a final report listing strengths and weaknesses, rank order, and recommendations for hire. The recommendations are reviewed and approved by the Dean and forwarded to the Senior Vice President and President for review and approval.

Faculty searches are being conducted to fill the positions in the following programs:

1. Special Education/Early Childhood: one position Assistant - Associate Professor
2. Administration & Supervision: one position Assistant - Associate Professor
3. Physical Education: one position Assistant - Associate Professor
4. Counseling: one position Assistant – Associate Professor
5. Chamorro/MARC: one position Assistant – Associate Professor

There is a pool of 22 adjuncts in the School of Education for Spring 2014. Anywhere from eight to 15 are used each semester based on need. The Negotiated Agreement for faculty addresses a pool of part-time faculty, indicating their quality shall be evaluated using the CFES instructional and collegiality criteria. This means program coordinators seek qualified adjuncts through their experience and expertise. This experience and expertise are demonstrated through successful years in the P-12 environment, course work in the area of teaching, feedback from our candidates who have witnessed strengths during their field experiences, and local and national recognition/certification. Several of the adjuncts also have a terminal degree. These adjuncts are hired following the University requirements:

1. Submission of an application form that can be obtained from UOG the Human Resource Office
2. Three letters of reference
3. Curriculum vita
4. Transcript of records

The documents are reviewed by the program coordinator for which program the adjunct will serve.

The non-doctorate adjunct faculty who serve in the Master of Arts in Teaching program are required to have a Master's Degree and be a Guam Teacher of the Year or be a National Board Certified teacher. These adjuncts bring the practical, day-to-day classroom realities to the alternative path, initial program. Additionally, other adjuncts serving in foundations, elementary, special education, and physical education are non-terminal degree holders, but are highly qualified because of the substantial years of experience and graduate credits earned in their fields.

Additionally, the school-based faculty are typically the classroom supervisors for our student teachers. These school-based faculty (classroom supervisors) must possess a minimum of 5-years of teaching experience at the level, full certification, and demonstrate strong teaching skills. Principals nominate the Classroom Supervisor and the Program Coordinators along with the Field Experience Coordinator, approve or disapprove the nomination.

**Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in teaching.**

Faculty members model a variety of instructional strategies and assessments in their work with candidates. The following instructional strategies are commonly used in classes: cooperative learning, interactive lectures with technology integration, project work, workshop-type instruction, inquiry-based teaching, and learning and collaborative action research methodology. Candidates are required to engage in journal writing, case studies, social networking, oral presentations and demonstrations, literature search, service learning, research, school observations, critiques of research articles, microteaching, and field experience. One of the major initiatives in the School of Education has been the implementation of hybrid and distance education courses. The university has provided numerous workshops and one-on-one tutoring for all faculty to increase their skills in providing online instruction.

The School of Education surveyed faculty and examined syllabi to ensure current coursework and practicums reflect the best researched based educational strategies methods. Survey data and syllabi are available.

The Dean, in his annual CFES process, carefully evaluates each faculty's growth in professional practices in teaching. Documentation of each faculty's annual CFES goals in this area is available for examination with the Dean. Additionally, student evaluations may count up to 25% of a faculty member's total evaluation. The students have first-hand knowledge of what is happening in the classroom and their perceptions as noted through the student evaluation ratings and comments can directly affect a faculty's overall rating from the Dean. In Spring 2013, the SOE average on Faculty Evaluation by students was 3.6783 which was just above the overall University average of 3.6270. In Fall of 2013, the SOE average on Faculty Evaluation by students was 3.5394 which was just below the University average of 3.5863.

The use of the CFES by the dean is guided by the CFES document published in 1999 by the University and available on the Academic and Student Affairs web page under faculty forms. This excerpt is from the "Criteria for Roles" on pages 4 and 5.

In judging the effectiveness of teaching, the reviewers should consider such points as the following: Command of the subject; competence in oral and written communication; continuous growth in academic field; ability to organize material and to present it with conviction and logic; the linking of course objectives to student evaluation techniques; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; grasp of general education objectives; sensitivity to and ability to interact effectively with students from diverse cultural backgrounds; ability to foster critical thinking skills in students; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize learning; ability to provide student assignments which are relevant and which allow students to apply their knowledge; ability to facilitate progressive improvement in student class work; ability to arouse curiosity in the beginning and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal and professional attributes which advance teaching and demonstrate concerns for students; excellence in advising students; and skill and amount of participation in the general guidance and advising of students; and ability to lead and to assist students in extra-curricular activities.

The reviewers should pay due attention to the variety of demands required by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The reviewer should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching performance has been based. It is the responsibility of the reviewers to submit an evaluation, accompanied by evidence from a number of sources concerning the teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction, as

appropriate.

The basic areas of instruction that may be evaluated are 1) Course design and curriculum or program development; 2) Instructional delivery; including Instructional Technology development and use of technology in the classroom/distance education initiatives; 3) Content expertise; 4) Student and student club assistance and advisement. Certain elements or combinations of elements should be chosen for each area to provide evidence of accomplishments. Any particular element should be used only once and should receive reasonable weighting in the total evaluation. An over-reliance on any one element is to be avoided.

In judging the effectiveness of teaching, classroom visitations or other suitable observations are encouraged. Classroom visitations or other suitable observations must be coordinated between the faculty member and the evaluator.

---

6000 character limit

### **5.1.c Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship**

**Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in scholarship.**

All faculty members within the School of Education are actively engaged in the scholarship of research, application, and teaching. According to UOG's Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES), scholarly productivity is a requirement for reappointment, promotion and tenure. To produce scholarly work and engage in scholarly activities are expectations of all faculty members. Peer review committees and appropriate administrators evaluate the quality of their work, as well as the quality of professional activities they engage in.

At the intersection of research and teaching is the application of scholarship. This type of scholarship is based on the use of research results to improve teaching and learning. Faculty members of SOE who are engaged in research discuss the implications of their findings to enhance learning of K-12 students and develop new understanding in candidates that arises out of the process of application.

Candidates are also required to conduct classroom-based research and draw out applications of findings to improve their own teaching. They are expected to provide their research output to a wider audience through oral presentations. Preparing them to become teacher-researchers is an avenue towards becoming a knowledgeable scholar, reflective decision maker, and effective communicator.

As an example of participation in scholarly activities, the SOE faculty have attended the following special training programs conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton over the last few years. Faculty have been nominated through the Dean and the certification commission to attend standard setting workshops for the Praxis I, Core; Environmental Science; Middle School Science; and Special Education.

A greater emphasis to do more peer-reviewed research was encouraged by the Senior Vice President and the Graduate Programs. In addition to the research Faculty members were to present in scholarly productivity such as books and publications, position papers, refereed conference presentations and grant involvement.

Research is encouraged by the School of Education by releasing faculty members from one course of their four-course teaching load. The research proposal is carefully reviewed by the Dean for approval. As an example, some of the research studies conducted by SOE faculty have been submitted for

publication in The Micronesian Educator. This is a scholarly journal that SOE has supported since its inception in 1990. During Spring 2013 and Fall 2013, five SOE faculty members have published articles in this journal. In Spring of 2013, two SOE faculty members served on the editorial board and currently there are three SOE faculty members who serve. A School of Education professor has traditionally been appointed as the editor of this regional publication. Currently, Dr. Una Nabobo-Baba is the editor having just published Volume 18 for the Fall of 2013.

Additionally, the CFES Document provides guidance on the Criteria for Roles in Creative/Scholarly Activity or Research.

When published work, grant writing, or the creative activity is the product of joint effort, each author of the work shall make a written statement, when possible, concerning the contributions of other authors. It is the responsibility of the appropriate administrative supervisor to assess as clearly as possible the role of each contributor to the joint effort.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar materials, or contributions by candidates in the professional school faculties to professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or to professional education, may be put forward as creative or scholarly work for the purposes of this evaluation system. In such matters as developing new courses, performing research for teaching, etc., the applicant should present concrete evidence such as written texts, expanded syllabi, bibliographies, outlines, reports and similar original, material. Any materials or reports developed should have been disseminated to professionals and be permanently available to other professionals.

Concrete evidence of creation and/or performance is required in the areas of the visual arts (e.g., publicly exhibited paintings, ceramics, sculptures), music and dance (composition and public performance), drama (writing, performance, design, or direction), and literature (publication or readings). This will be judged by professionals competent in the respective field. Evidence of professional peer evaluation should be presented by the candidate.

Inevitably there will be cases in which the value of a creative or scholarly work cannot be measured by objective standards. In these cases, professional judgment and fairness must be the measure, subject to due process and review. Creative/scholarly activity or research outside ones field cannot be used exclusively to satisfy the requirements in this role.

The basic areas of creative/scholarly activity or research that may be evaluated are: 1) Normative, empirical, and applied research including classroom or extension research; 2) Creative activity; 3) General scholarship; and 4) Professional activities, including the development of proposed legislation, administrative rules, public notices, legal briefs, and technical reports used by public and private organizations; and 5) Publishing done by faculty in University-sponsored textbooks, journals, conference proceedings and related materials.

---

6000 character limit

#### **5.1.d Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service**

**Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in service.**

Service is a key component of the university's mission. The School of Education requires that all faculty be actively involved in service to the university and community as well as serve as a model for

candidates. Service is an integral part of SOE for both faculty in students. All teacher preparation programs require a practicum where students must participate in school and/or agency activities.

Service is one of the three areas where faculty members are evaluated for reappointment, promotion and tenure. Service involves engagement in university, college and school activities as well as involvement in a variety of work with the community. Most faculty members are involved in university committees, such as: Promotion and Tenure, Faculty Election Commission, Academic Committee on Research, and the Library and Technical Support Committee. Faculty in the School of Education are members of one or more of the following SOE Committees: Admissions Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Assessment Committee, Graduate Committee and the CAEP Standards Committee. The school is also expected to have representatives on the University-wide committees. These include: Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee, Graduate, Curriculum Review Committee, General Education Review Committee, University Assessment Committee, and Faculty Senate.

SOE faculty members are involved in various professional associations that contribute to the advancement of professional practices in their disciplines. They are members of 20 different professional associations. Participation in local chapters of these associations as well as participation in national or regional organizations include assistance in organizing workshops and seminars, chairing of meetings and seminar sessions and serving as board members. Faculty involvement in these associations is discussed in detail in the various faculty vita. SOE faculty members are also involved in service to the professional community. They provide in-service workshops to elementary, secondary and special education programs and agencies that request their services. The faculty also serve as judges in science fairs, resource persons in education fairs, facilitators in summer camps, hosts of educational events, and advisers to professional organizations, such as the Guam chapters of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Association for Childhood Early Intervention (ACEI ) and the SOE based FEA (Future Educators of Association).

Additionally, the CFES Document provides guidance on the Criteria for Roles in University and Community Service. Faculty are expected to contribute service both to the University and to the island and regional communities.

### University Service

All full-time faculty members are expected to participate in the operation of the University in such ways as formulating, revising, and enforcing policies. Recognition should be given to those faculty members who actively participate in governance of the University, the college, or the work unit. Similarly, faculty members' contributions to faculty or student welfare should be recognized.

Possible criteria for evaluating performance in University service are:

1. Regular attendance at UOG Graduations.
2. Regular attendance at and a substantial role in scheduled meetings.
3. Election, appointment, or voluntary service as an officer, representative, or advisor of a group.
4. Effective participation in-group discussions.
5. Imaginative recommendations and suggestions.
6. Support and completion of specific projects (e.g., program reviews, academic master plans, accreditation initiatives, etc.)

Service on committees at the University, the College, or the unit level shall be documented by reports, records, and evaluations.

Service to faculty and to students shall also be documented, as well as special assignments to service.

The basic areas of university service that may be evaluated include: 1) University, college, or unit

committees; 2) Responsibilities as unit chair; 3) Mentoring; 4) University policy and procedure development; 5) Special assignments; 6) Student recruitment; or 7) Assistance with proposal development or grant writing, and 8) University/college fundraising activities.

### Community Service

Faculty leadership and service by members of the faculty to community service programs, to various individuals, to cooperative programs with other institutions, and to agencies or units of business, industry, and government are recognized as community service.

The primary, and therefore most valued, community service activities shall be those in which the candidate uses his or her professional expertise to the benefit of the community. Appropriate weight should be given in the evaluation of such service when it contributes to one of the University's community or public service programs.

The basic areas of community service that may be evaluated include: 1) Instructional design and curriculum or program development for non-credit bearing instruction; 2) Instructional delivery for non-credit bearing instruction; 3) Content expertise; 4) Coordination or conferences involving non-credit bearing instruction; 5) Public surveys and questionnaires; 6) Service on government or community boards, committees or commissions; 7) Nonpolitical community fundraising; and 8) Development of professional training materials and the organizing and conducting of workshops seminars and conferences on behalf of the University or other local or regional bodies; 9) Development of special studies and research projects for public and private organizations; 10) Consulting for public and private organizations; 11) Policy and program development and evaluation of public and private organizations; and 12) Other community involvement such as competitions, coaching, or performances.

---

6000 character limit

### 5.1.e Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

**Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding faculty performance.**

The scholarship of teaching is anchored on the belief that all academic efforts to deliver content and pedagogy become meaningful only as they are well understood by others. Through the use of technology-mediated instruction and constructivist approaches, SOE faculty members have transformed their own knowledge to a form that candidates have accommodated into their own repertoire of knowledge. The evidence that assesses the scholarship of teaching by SOE faculty can be gathered from at least three sources: self-assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment. Student assessment results always indicate a high level of performance by the SOE faculty. The preponderance of positive faculty evaluation is a good indicator of excellent teaching.

Full-time faculty are evaluated by their peers, the Dean, and by students in accordance with the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES) as negotiated by the Board of Regents and the Faculty Union. Faculty evaluations consist of quality of instruction, scholarship, and service. This review happens annually and faculty are required to submit corroborative materials required during their CFES review.

Based on UOG's Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES), systematic and regular evaluations are conducted by the Dean. The Dean conducts an interview with each faculty member, by appointment, sometime during the last two weeks of the academic year. At each interview session, a review of the faculty's professional goals and the plans to carry them out is conducted. These goals and plans of action

by faculty are submitted at the beginning of the year. The extent of faculty accomplishments after one year is evaluated. Areas of strength and areas of perceived weakness are determined. Recommendations for improvement (e.g. greater productivity in terms of research, publications, and active participation in service learning endeavors) are arrived at collaboratively. For faculty seeking reappointment, the unit forms an evaluation committee composed of one member from the faculty's division elected by the division faculty, one member from any division selected by the faculty himself/herself, and a chair of the evaluation committee selected by the aforementioned members. The recommendation of the evaluation committee is forwarded to the Dean who reviews the faculty evaluation and makes his recommendation to the Senior Vice President of the University.

For faculty members applying for promotion and tenure, the guidelines set forth in the BOR Agreement are strictly followed. The faculty member notifies the Dean of his/her application and the latter provides a letter of recommendation to the University's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty effectiveness is also systematically evaluated in the following:

1. Through the teacher candidates' course evaluations conducted every semester
2. Through an exit survey on program effectiveness
3. Through feedback from the employers' survey.

The first one provides direct evidence of faculty performance in teaching while the last two represent indirect measures of faculty's involvement in program effectiveness.

There continues to be greater evidence on evaluating and documenting faculty performance as it relates to the quality of our candidates' education. The School of Education has made a commitment to improving the scores of the candidates on Praxis II examinations. This commitment has helped faculty to review their current teaching methods and curriculum to insure that candidates have the knowledge and skills to pass the required Praxis II examinations on the first attempt. Faculty have also been asked to reflect on key assessment data and their impact on student learning. This reflection will be a component of the annual CFES.

---

6000 character limit

### **5.1.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

**Summarize resources, opportunities, processes, and outcomes regarding unit facilitation of professional development.**

The School of Education embraces the concept of professional networks, much like our P-12 partners who conduct Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Periodic retreats for faculty are held to discuss the knowledge, skills and dispositions embodied in the Conceptual Framework and how they can be developed in the courses. Follow-up meetings at the program level on syllabi revisions to incorporate the institutional standards of the SOE Conceptual Framework and their alignment with program standards are conducted. The Unit also conducts meetings with faculty from other colleges to discuss the institutional standards in the SOE Conceptual Framework.

The policies and practices in SOE encourage faculty to be proactive in professional development. For example, financial assistance is available for faculty to attend at least one annual conference to enhance their knowledge and skills and keep abreast of emerging practices in their fields.

Travel to attend conferences is supported financially by university funds. The Dean endorses faculty applications for these travel grants.

The Dean has regularly communicated with faculty in the unit about local workshops and seminars, and other events of potential interest to teacher educators, and encourages faculty to conduct workshops on

current trends, particularly the use of computers in teaching and assessment. An in house example is the LiveText Workshop which is presented annually to assist all faculty in maximizing this assessment system. The LiveText coordinator, a faculty member, provided training on the use of this software for both faculty and students.

Moodle training for all SOE faculty is available by Telecommunication and Distance Education Operation (TADEO) office. Within the School, there are seminars and workshops for faculty initiated by some SOE faculty themselves.

Sabbatical leave is also available to work on a project, enhance competency as a scholar or pursue a terminal degree in a related field of study. Since 2011, three faculty members have been awarded sabbatical leave.

The success of any teacher education program lies in the qualifications, performance and development of its faculty. The School of Education of the University of Guam has seven undergraduate programs, an M.Ed. program with different specializations, and two Master of Arts degrees. These programs are supported by knowledgeable faculty who have many years of teaching experience in their fields, are high performing as evidenced by their assessments of instruction, scholarship and service, and are deeply committed to the institution's mission and student learning. They model best professional practices and collaborate with their colleagues in the professional community. Their accomplishments are partly attributed to the unit that continuously assesses its performance and provides feedback for improvement and a good support structure for professional development

---

6000 character limit

## 5.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

AFI 1 / AFI Rational

Adjunct faculty members are not evaluated.

Interviews with faculty and administrators indicated that, other than course evaluations completed by candidates, there is no process in place for the evaluation of adjunct faculty members. No materials related to adjunct faculty member evaluation were available.

Response to AFI 1:

Through the Academic Affairs Committee, two weeks were decided upon for Spring '14 as peer review weeks. Program Faculty are asked to observe adjunct faculty in their programs. Data from candidates and peers will be reviewed by the dean and included in an exit interview at the end of the year.

Additionally, full-time faculty are encouraged to ask a peer to observe their work in the classroom and provide feedback.

---

12000 character limit

**Exhibit 5.3.a - Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled below from data submitted in the Manage Faculty section of AIMS or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit.**

## 5.3 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.)
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.3.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.3.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 16, 2012, Pages 20-30.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 16, 2012, Pages 31-39.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 17, 2013, Pages 14-25.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 17, 2013, Pages 26-35.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 18, 2013, Pages 27-43.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 18, 2013, Pages 65-80.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 18, 2013, Pages 81-92.pdf
5.3.d	Micronesia Educator vol 18, 2013, Pages 197-202.pdf
5.3.d	Rules Regulations and Policies Manual.pdf
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

See **Attachment** panel below.

## 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.*

### 6.1 Unit Governance and Resources

#### 6.1.a Unit Leadership and Authority

**Summarize unit's leadership and authority in the design, delivery, operations of all programs at the**

**institution for the preparation of educators and other school professionals.**

The design of the School of Education's (SOE's) leadership and authority is structured to support an integrated, shared governance model that supports all SOE degree programs. The Dean of SOE operates as the functional head of the school. This office shares governance with 15 to 20 full and part-time faculty members and supported by a 7-member support staff team which includes: an Administrative Officer, 2 Division Secretaries, a Program Coordinator, a CAEP Extension Assistant, an Instructional Technology Extension Associate, and an Administrative Assistant. SOE is under the purview of the Senior Vice-President of Academic and Student Affairs, who in turn is responsible to the UOG President and Board of Regents.

Policies and procedures which govern all UOG employees are outlined in two major documents: The Master Employee Handbook (updated June 2011) and the University, Rules, Regulations, and Policies Manual, referred to as the RRPM. Both documents are available for review. On faculty-specific policies, procedures, and protocol the UOG Board of Regents and UOG Faculty Union Agreement (referred to as the Board-Union Agreement) provides the information and protocol for Faculty rights and responsibilities, faculty evaluations, working conditions, salaries and fringe benefits, leave, grievance procedures, disciplinary actions, recruitment, layoffs, recall of faculty, and a specific section that describes how the Board-Union Agreement integrates with the RRPM.

The new UOG Triton Portal makes information accessible and forms for processing both academic issues and professional issues easily available. Accessibility has facilitated the university community to understand academic procedures, to access official forms, and to provide clarity on the needed approval levels when making any changes to any academic program within SOE and across the UOG campus.

The SOE academic programs and the faculty that support them are divided into two major Divisions: (1) Teacher Education and Public Service (TEPS) and (2) Foundations, Educational Research, and Human Services (FERHS). Each Division is headed by an elected Division Chairperson who receives compensation each semester for his/her duties for a 2 year term. Shared governance is observed in the 4 SOE Standing Committees which include: (1) Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), (2) Graduate Committee, (3) Assessment Committee, and (4) Admissions Committee. This shared governance structure supports the 7 undergraduate degree programs, the 3 graduate programs (with the M.Ed. program having 5 program specializations), and the 2 regional programs: Partnership Program and Individualized Degree Program, offered by SOE. In addition, SOE regularly employs work-study participants through the University financial aid office. The support staff assists students in registration, disseminating course information, implementing security and safety procedures, managing utilization of facilities and resources, and convocation matters. Through its support personnel, the SOE ensures the smooth flow of business with faculty in such matters as book orders, load sheets, and schedules. The SOE organizational chart and description of the unit governance structure is included in the Exhibits for Standard 6.

The SOE AAC is composed of the two Division Chairs, along with two elected Division representatives, the Graduate Faculty Committee Chair, and the SOE Dean. The AAC makes recommendations to the Dean on all academic matters, as issues and needs emerge from faculty in each of the Divisions. The Graduate Committee is composed of the graduate program coordinators who make recommendations to the Dean on matters related to graduate studies. The Assessment Committee is composed 7 members, the 2 Division Chairs, the Graduate Committee Representative, the CAEP Coordinator, LiveText Coordinator, Dean's appointee, and the CAEP Administrative Assistant. The Chairperson is elected from within the Assessment Committee. A representative from the committee serves as a member of the University-wide Assessment Committee. The Admissions Committee is composed of 5 members, 2 faculty representatives from each of the Divisions and a Dean's appointee. The admissions committee monitors student applicants for entry into the SOE to insure potential candidates have met all criteria established by SOE for entry.

SOE participates actively through joint financial sponsorship of an annual regional conference. SOE and College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) collaborate in coordinating a UOG Annual Regional Language Arts Conference that draws educators and administrators from Guam and the region (i.e., Palau, Saipan, Chuuk, Pohnpei, Kosrae, Yap, the Republic of the Marshalls). The teacher candidates from both the initial teacher preparation and advanced programs participate as presenters. They present their theoretical and research papers, as well as numerous teaching strategies and approaches.

SOE supports two off-campus programs that serve the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) through a partnership program with the College of Micronesia (COM), the 2-year community college program in FSM and through the Individualized Degree Plan (IDP). The FSM has 4 individual states separated by hundreds of miles of ocean: Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae. COM's main campus is located in Pohnpei. The partnership program, the regional program for SOE, is a collaborative program leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education. Governance of the program is under SOE with collaboration among faculty from both institutions. The partnership program requires all teacher candidates to meet the same program student learning outcomes as the on-campus Elementary Education students. The off-campus program teacher candidates are subject to the same rigor and are guided by the SOE Conceptual Framework. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) spells out what each institution's duties and responsibilities are in supporting teacher candidates. A copy of the MOU is provided in the Exhibits for Standard 6. The IDP is designed for regional in-service teachers who wish to obtain an undergraduate degree in education from the University of Guam.

At this writing, the University of Guam President has initiated a "Good To Great" reform movement which has involved all members of the UOG community. The initiative is referred to as "G2G" and it is anticipated that a major restructuring will be completed over the next 5 years, that revitalizes, renovates, and streamlines all UOG degree programs. During academic year 2013-2014, the program faculty were directed to collect data and complete a report. Through a review team composed of a cross-section of professors from various disciplines each academic program or unit within UOG was evaluated. The findings of this report and its recommendations for the SOE were significant. If recommendations are followed, SOE could see changes to degree programs which could impact the governance structure. While UOG and SOE go through the transition period, the current governance structure of SOE will remain in place with the head of SOE being the Dean.

---

8000 character limit

### 6.1.b Unit Budget

**Summarize budget allocation and its sufficiency in supporting both campus and clinical work that are essential to the preparation of educators and other school professionals.**

SOE receives sufficient budgetary allocations to provide programs for candidates to meet professional standards. This is evidenced in Table 6.1 which shows the total UOG appropriated budget for 2014 and 2015 (currently awaiting approval from the Guam Legislature). SOE receives approximately 5% of the total UOG appropriated budget and this has remained relatively constant over the last 2 years.

Table 6.1. Comparison of UOG and SOE Operating Budget 2014 to 2015

Unit Fiscal Year-2014 Fiscal Year-2015

UOG Appropriated Budget 40,737,222 42,020,248 (Requested)

SOE Appropriated Budget 1,958,814(4.81%) 1,990,060(4.82%)

The budget allocations to SOE have been stable and are comparable to similar academic units of the University of Guam. Based on student enrollment and number of degree programs offered, SOE is comparable to the School of Business and Public Administration (SBPA) with approximately 790 undergrad and grad in SBPA and 540 in SOE undergrad and grad during academic year 2012/2013.. In Table 6.2 below the total budget allocations for SOE and SBPA are compared for 2013 and 2014.

Table 6.2: Budget Comparisons of SOE and Comparable Unit (SBPA)

Unit	2014 Budget	2015 Budget
SOE	1,958,814(4.81%)	1,990,060(4.82%)
SBPA	2,201,2013(5.40%)	2,252,095(5.45%)

The SOE also generates revenue through tuition, revenues from intersession and summer courses, regional contracts, and grants and other contracts. These revenues are considered non-appropriated funds and are a part of the operation budget of the unit. The budget adequately supports on-campus and clinical work essential for the preparation of professional educators. In Table 6.3 below, the breakdown of the SOE budget allocation is presented. SOE also has a non-appropriated fund budget to support professional development, accreditation, and additional support staff.

Table 6.3: SOE Budget Comparison 2014 and 2015

Budget Category	2014	2015
Personnel	1,893,014	1,899,260
Fringe Benefits		
Contractual	46,000	71,000
Travel		
Equipment		
Supplies	12,800	12,800
Miscellaneous	7,000	7,000
<b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL BUDGET</b>	<b>1,958,814</b>	<b>1,990,060</b>
Non-appropriated		
<b>TOTAL SOE BUDGET</b>		

6000 character limit

### 6.1.c Personnel

**Summarize policies, procedures, and practices of faculty workload; unit's use of faculty and personnel in ensuring coherency and integrity of programs and operations; and resources and opportunities for professional development.**

The policies, procedures, and practices governing faculty workload for the University and located in the Rules, Regulations, and Policies Manual and the UOG Board-Union Agreement, guide SOE. Every faculty member is given load allocations for teaching, research, and service and are required to give percentages allocated for each endeavor. The instructional load for a faculty member whose primary role is teaching is 12 credit hours of lecture per semester. Office hours shall be at least six hours over at least three business days per week. Changes in load allocations of .25 or more may be made in consultation with the faculty member and the dean for faculty assigned to routine activities such as committee chair, program coordinator, or other similar academic non-instructional support functions. The Dean can authorize 2 faculty overloads (.50), but no more than two. If the faculty member is given a "research allocation" to spend the semester conducting research, no overloads can be granted. The Dean also has the authority to compensate faculty for up to \$3,000 for various activities that support SOE programs, e.g. to update a handbook, develop online programs, grant writing, etc.

In the 2011 Board of Examiners Report one Area for Improvement (AFI) which stated "Most faculty workloads exceed the contractual requirement for 12 units of teaching per semester (4 courses), thus interfering with research and scholarly activity productivity." To address this AFI, SOE has taken a three-pronged approach: (1) SOE has increased the number of qualified adjunct faculty who can alleviate the teaching loads of regular full-time faculty, (2) SOE has proposed a policy to allow overloads only if the faculty member is involved in a research endeavor and can provide evidence of research or scholarly productivity, and (3) SOE has encouraged faculty to take research allocations which will limit the number of courses they teach and curtail other activities that would distract from research endeavors.

Program coordinators ensure coherency and integrity of academic programs through development, revisions, and upgrades guided by respective SPAs. The Dean's office makes requests of other faculty to step in to assist when there are gaps in programs. In the past year, a faculty member with background experience in TESOL had been asked to fill in with leading the program. In another case, a faculty member was hired with two content areas to fill the gaps (ECE/SPED). Current faculty searches are indicating a preference for faculty with multiple areas of certification and specialties.

SOE provides professional development support to its faculty through the Office of Dean. It augments the financial resources from university-wide travel grants by integrating into its budget a comprehensive plan for support of its faculty. An allocation of \$500/faculty/semester is provided for research and other professional development activities. Faculty development in the use of instructional technology is provided by the SOE through faculty workshops and individual tutorials.

The University recognizes the faculty's need for professional development. In the RRP, a section is designated for the policies, eligibility, procedures, criteria, and timelines for the Faculty Travel Grants. According to the RRP, faculty may apply for 75% of the cost of air travel, per diem, and registration not to exceed \$2,100 if presenting at a conference and for no more than 50% if attending the conference not to exceed \$1,050. In the Board Union Agreement, the Board and the Union recognize the need for increased funding of Faculty development. The administration and the Faculty shall endeavor to obtain an increase in funds. The funds shall be distributed in the fairest manner possible and shall take into consideration the goals and desires of individual faculty members, the needs of the College/School, and the needs of the University.

---

6000 character limit

#### **6.1.d Unit Facilities**

**Summarize campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards, including support for use of technology in teaching and learning.**

The Unit houses seven classrooms and two multi-use computer labs, a counseling suite and a reading lab. Equipment such as TVs, multimedia players, white boards, and bulletin boards are readily available. The Unit has an equipment room that houses laptop computers and multimedia projectors. Each full-time faculty has a computer and a projector available for use. SOE currently has two computer labs to supplement those provided by UOG through the University Computer Center. These labs, one featuring Windows-based PCs and the other with Mac OS X systems, provide students with exposure to the two most prevalent operating systems on the market. Additionally, both labs are equipped with state-of-the-art interactive whiteboards with the latest presentation software to provide our students with innovative learning experiences and novel ideas for class delivery. SOE has two photocopying rooms for faculty photocopying needs. The Unit has 24 offices equipped with telephones, laptop computers, projectors

and speakers for faculty, staff, and Dean. A lounge is also available on the second floor for staff and faculty.

In the Fall of 2013, 18 laptops running Windows 8, were purchased to support the needs of Faculty and staff. Two IMAC desktops were also purchased to support instruction and unit functions. Additionally, five projectors were purchased to support both full time and adjunct faculty and students. The unit continues to upgrade printers and switches within the building through financial support of the SVP. A Microsoft Office upgrade was recently purchased to support the student labs.

The Unit makes use of the library resources of the University for candidates' research. The library has updated the resources available to students primarily through online access to full text articles. The RFK Library recently received access to Academic Search Complete. This database includes access to curriculum, education, and multiple subject articles. There are approximately 12,000 abstracts and 8,000 full-text articles available to both faculty and students. Subscriptions to such databases are based on the annual budget and library faculty foresee increasing access in the future. All databases are available to the on-campus and off-campus students, faculty, and staff through an online server.

---

6000 character limit

### **6.1.e Unit Resources including Technology**

**Summarize resource allocations to support candidates in meeting standards, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable.**

While SOE resources have remained relatively constant over the last 2 years, significant improvement have been made in upgrading technological support for candidates to meet standards, with these upgrades largely due not only to SOE effort but also the university-wide effort to increase technological alternatives for on-campus and off-campus students. The UOG website was completely revised and made student-centered and user-friendly. Technical refinements were made by adding the WebAdvisor and Triton Portal options available on the UOG website. WebAdvisor provides 2 levels of access, one for students and one for faculty and administrators. Students can view their academic records, status of enrollment, financial aid, and other pertinent information for students. Faculty and Administrators can have access to their employment records, employment forms, employment status, and other relevant information. The Triton Portal is the other online improvement, which allows access only to UOG students and employees. Access to such information as the on-campus directory, official on-line fillable forms, data analysis programs, email access, and other UOG news and announcement are all accessible on the Triton Portal.

At the SOE level, technological upgrades were made in internet access, improved security systems, solar electricity, and energy-efficient air conditioning systems. In addition, SOE purchased new laptop computers for each faculty and staff member. The instructional technology options were also upgraded with the purchase of new software relevant to supporting teacher candidates in integrating online and/or computer-assisted instruction into classroom learning with all grade levels. Instructional technology courses require a lab fee, which keeps a specific revenue available for the purchase or maintenance of equipment and software.

The Reading Lab and Counseling Suite were renovated with new flooring and interior paint. The SOE Mac lab was upgraded with new computers and expanded educational software to help teacher candidates develop competency in the use of technological options for classroom instruction and organization. The Unit also purchased athletic equipment for the PE courses in the Elementary and Secondary Education Programs. All faculty are provided with a multimedia projector and thumb drives to support teaching and research endeavors. American Resource Recovery Act (ARRA) funds supported purchasing equipment for classroom use, such as video screens, interactive whiteboards and bulletin

boards. Air-conditioning units have been upgraded and regularly maintained to minimize the effects of the tropical conditions. The ongoing purchase of hardware, software and current curriculum materials allows for continued upgrades. A mechanism for tracking faculty advising assignments and activities is now possible with WebAdvisor and the Triton Portal option on the UOG website.

6000 character limit

### 6.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

**Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.**

#### AFI 1 / AFI Rationale

Most faculty workloads exceed the contractual requirement for 12 units of teaching per semester (4 courses), thus interfering with research and scholarly activity productivity. Data indicate that almost every tenured and tenure-track faculty member teaches in overload (typically 5-6 courses per semester) on a regular basis. Program coordination and advisement, activities undertaken by almost all faculty members, are contractually counted as service, yet this results in an excessive workload that negatively impacts scholarly productivity and some required faculty duties (e.g., SPA data and reporting).

#### Response to AFI 1:

To address this AFI, SOE has taken a three-pronged approach: (1) SOE has increased the number of qualified adjunct faculty who can alleviate the teaching loads of regular full-time faculty, (2) SOE has proposed a policy to allow overloads only if the faculty member is involved in a research endeavor and can provide evidence of research or scholarly productivity, and (3) SOE has encouraged faculty to take research allocations which will limit the number of courses they teach and curtail other activities that would distract from research endeavors.

12000 character limit

### 6.3 Exhibits for Standard 6

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable

6.3.a Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.a FACULTY HANDBOOK.pdf
6.3.a Rules Regulations and Policies Manual.pdf
6.3.a UOG BOR.pdf
6.3.b Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.3.b UOG Organizational Chart.pdf
6.3.c Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.c new_s_t_handbook_2011_12.pdf
6.3.c UOG-Student-Handbook Pages 65-68.pdf
6.3.d Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.3.d UOG Academic Master Plan.pdf
6.3.e 2013-2014-undergraduate-catalog.pdf
6.3.e 2013-2014-graduate-bulletin_opt.pdf
6.3.e Micronesian Educator Vol. 18.pdf
6.3.e UOG Academic Five-Year Calendar [2 July 2014].pdf
6.3.f Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.h UOGBOR contract Pages 35-37-1.pdf
6.3.i Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable

See **Attachment** panel below.

**Please click "Next"**

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.