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Background from Simpson Institutional Report:

In 1860, pioneer settlers of Indianola, Iowa, and the first session of the Western Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, united to establish the Indianola Seminary. A building was erected and classes began in the fall of 1860. The institution was renamed Simpson Centenary College in 1866 to honor Bishop Matthew Simpson, one of the best known and most influential religious leaders of his day. Bishop Simpson was president of Indiana Asbury University (now DePauw University) for nine years and was an adviser and friend of Abraham Lincoln. Bishop Simpson delivered the eulogy at Lincoln’s burial in Springfield, Illinois. Conference clergy made the final decision to call the institution simply “Simpson College” in 1885.

George Washington Carver, one of Simpson’s most famous former students, reminisced in his elder years about Simpson and “the kind of people there [who] made me believe I was a human being.”

Throughout the past century, Simpson College has grown from “one building and a few students” to an institution which today has 44 major buildings and 1,304 students. The mission of the Simpson College Teacher Education Program is to ensure that each program graduate C.A.R.E.S. about students and families, knowledge and learning, pedagogy and teaching, critical and reflective thinking, ethical and professional behavior, and serving the greater good of humanity. Simpson Education Program graduates:

- Care about and respect students as unique human beings while nurturing their participation in our diverse democratic community within a larger global context.
- Apply knowledge of the historical, philosophical, and sociological foundations of education; child and adolescent development and learning; subject matter content; and research-based pedagogy to the teaching and learning process.
- Reflect critically upon what is, envision what could be, and act in a purposeful and humane manner.
- Are ethical and professional.
- Serve the greater good of humanity.

The Simpson Teacher Education program prepares teacher candidates in a number of endorsement areas at the elementary and secondary levels, including Art, Music and PE. In addition to the Simpson undergraduate program, Simpson's Masters of Arts in Education (MAT) and Transitions to Teaching (TtoT) offer coursework at the graduate level leading to an initial teaching license with secondary education endorsements.
GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

281—79.10(256) Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.

79.10(1) A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.

79.10(2) The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.

79.10(3) The unit’s conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.

79.10(4) The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with ISSL standards.

79.10(5) The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.

79.10(6) When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.

79.10(7) The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:

a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;

b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;

c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;

d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and

e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.

79.10(8) The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.

79.10(9) The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.

79.10(10) Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- New facilities for the Education Department is a central plank of the new capital campaign, with several major gifts already committed. The plans reviewed by the team for the new classrooms, offices, and collaboration spaces will dramatically improve the facilities and resources for the program and make a strong statement of support for the
program on the part of the institution and external donors. The team applauds the institution for making this investment in teacher education.

- An endowment fund makes professional development funding available to supplement the funding provided each faculty member.
- The team cites the strong organizational management, commitment, and professionalism of Holly Johanson.
- The team found evidence from a number of sources of strong support and commitment to the unit from college administration.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.10(1)** In interviews with faculty and administration, the team found a widespread, inconsistent understanding of the role of the division head. This role appears to function mainly as a communication vehicle, but it is unclear how the division head interfaces with department chairs and the exact role the division head plays in program governance. The inconsistency is not limited to this division. The team recommends the unit and the institution examine, clarify and communicate the role of the division head.

2. **79.10(2)** In both the IR and interviews with faculty and administrators, the team found that the Teacher Education Program unit is defined as the Education Department, with other areas such as music, sports science/physical education as separate from the unit but contributing to it. Non-Education Department faculty play an important checks and balancing role on the Teacher Education Committee, understanding their role as a form of external oversight, not a part of the unit itself. The team recommends that the unit be redefined across department to include all faculty and courses that contribute to the Teacher Education Program and that the program develop governance structures that directly include these faculty in oversight and program decision-making.

3. **79.10(7)** The institution provides $500 to each faculty member each year for professional development. The institution also has an endowed fund to supplement professional development expenses. The unit has several faculty members who are active in their professional fields nationally, requiring resources for travel. The institution currently invests in professional development travel for these faculty members, but only $500 is assured. The team recommends the unit include sufficient professional development in the budget development process it will engage in with the institution in the coming year.

4. **79.10(7)a** The team examined faculty load for the past several years and planned load for the next academic year. The team found evidence of consistent overload in the past and in future planning. The team understands there have been a number of faculty vacancies in the past several years contributing to overload. The unit is expected to be fully staffed next year, but will be overloaded as a unit by 7.5 credits. Some of this overload is situational for next year, while some is consistent, and much of it is voluntary. There is no evidence of a negative impact on teaching quality due to overload. The team is concerned that there are potential useful functions precluded (particularly in assessment)
because of a lack of load capacity. The team recommends the unit monitor human
resources and work (current and potential) to maximize program efficiency and maintain
quality.

5. **79.10(7a)** The team found evidence of good resource support for the program in many
areas, however the curriculum library materials are outdated and appear underutilized. As
the program moves into new facilities, the team recommends the unit take this
opportunity to review and update the materials in the curriculum library to reflect
curricula and materials most used in partner schools.

6. **79.10(7d)** The stipend for cooperating teachers for student teachers is described as low by
the unit faculty and cooperating teachers compared to other institutions and to the
increasing work required. Cooperating teachers interviewed stated that they feel
supported and appreciated by the institution in many ways, but not in a monetary sense.
While this standard does not require a specific level of remuneration, it does require
adequate resources to operate a quality program. The team is concerned that Simpson
may fail to attract and retain quality cooperating teachers. The team recommends the unit
examine resources for potential adjustments to cooperating teacher stipends.

7. **79.10(9)** The team found inconsistent evidence of support for, and communication with,
adjunct faculty. Some reported good communication about program expectations and
standards and others did not. Some reported that their performance was evaluated, others
did not. The team also heard inconsistent feedback from students and graduates about the
quality of adjunct instructors. The team recommends the unit examine and adjust policies
for communication with adjunct faculty.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the
program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.10(4)** The team reviewed the unit standards and alignment chart to InTASC but is
concerned that some unit standards do not appear to reflect the updated (2011) InTASC
standards. In addition, syllabi reviewed by the team are inconsistent as to whether they
align to the old or new InTASC standards. The team also notes that the unit standards do
not reflect many of the more recent changes to curriculum and pedagogy in the program
(e.g., PLC). The team requires that unit to review and update their standards, curriculum
and syllabi in alignment with the 2011 InTASC standards.

**Resolution of Concern #1.** The unit reviewed 79 syllabi. Seventy three of them do not
identify InTASC standards. Six do identify InTASC standards. Three of the six correctly
identified the updated 2011 standards, while three were out of date. The unit updated the
three out of date syllabi. **The team considers this standard MET.**

NOTE: The Iowa Department of Education consultants will conduct a follow up visit one year
from the time of Board action to ensure plans were properly implemented.
Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- President
- Vice President (VP) for Academic Affairs
- VP for Finance
- VP for Advancement
- Advisory Council members
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty
- Library personnel

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIVERSITY

281—79.11(256) Diversity standard. The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.11(1) The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.

79.11(2) The institution’s and unit’s plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- The College has several initiatives to increase diversity among students. Including:
  Admissions has identified a multicultural admissions position. The incumbent in this position works with other admissions counselors to help them identify and recruit diverse students.
Enrollment management has identified a plan for Simpson to become a Hispanic Serving Institution, which requires that 25% of students are Hispanic. This long range plan is designed to incrementally increase student diversity.

- The Simpson Promise initiative provides tuition support for Iowa students. This initiative has resulted in increased diversity among students.
- The EDU 321/521 course syllabus includes an in-depth examination of a wide range of topics and assignments associated with diversity education. There is intentionality in the design of the lessons in the course to prepare teacher candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds in PK-12 school settings.

**Recommendations:**
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.11(gen)** The diversity among students in the unit is much less than that of the College. Initiatives to increase diversity are at the College level. The team recommends the unit develop initiatives or identify initiatives for specific collaboration with the College to increase diversity among Teacher Education Program (TEP) students.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- President
- VP for Academic Affairs
- VP for Enrollment
- VP for Finance
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Unit policies
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators
Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FACULTY

281—79.12(256) Faculty standard. Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions. 79.12(1) The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined. 79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member’s preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills. 79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement. 79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit. 79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:

a. Colleagues in the unit;
b. Colleagues across the institution;
c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- High emphasis is placed on teaching during faculty evaluations.
- Faculty are observed yearly by colleagues in and outside of their department and feedback is provided.
- Quality PD is provided on campus at frequent intervals: e.g. GIFT Sessions
- Faculty development mirroring local school district PD is made available to help faculty stay abreast of state initiatives.
- Students identified beneficial relationships with faculty members. In particular, the student cited the accessibility of faculty.
- Past, present, and past students reported a high level of efficiency in and appreciation for the advising model in the TEP.
**Recommendations:**
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

None

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.12(2)** The team does not find documented evidence to verify the alignment of teaching assignments with knowledge, preparation and experience for two faculty members. The team requires the unit to examine faculty qualifications and teaching assignments and make adjustments to resolve concerns by documenting a plan for faculty to gain experience to align with teaching assignments.

2. **79.12(5c)** The team found no evidence that 19 faculty members have met the 40 hour requirement. The team requires the unit to document 40 hours of team teaching in a five year period for all faculty teaching in the professional program.

**Resolution of Concern #1.**

The unit has identified experiences and plans for the two faculty members that provide evidence they meet qualifications requirements and will continue to develop professionally to enhance their teaching. **The team considers this standard MET.**

**Resolution of Concern #2.**

The unit identified nine faculty members who no longer work at Simpson. The unit also provided additional documentation for eight faculty members that provided evidence that they have met the 40 hour requirement. Two faculty members do not have 40 hours of team teaching. The unit has determined a plan for the two faculty members to meet this requirement. Department consultants will monitor their progress. **The team considers this standard MET.**

NOTE: The Iowa Department of Education consultants will conduct a follow up visit one year from the time of Board action to ensure plans were properly implemented.

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- President
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty
Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ASSESSMENT

281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. The unit’s assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.

79.13(1) The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.
79.13(2) The assessment system is based on unit standards.
79.13(3) The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.
79.13(4) Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:
   a. Entrance into the program (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16).
   b. Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.
   c. Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).
   d. Program completion (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16; see subrule 79.15(5) for required teacher candidate assessment).
79.13(5) Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.
   b. Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.
   c. Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.
   d. Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.
   e. Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.
   f. Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.
   g. Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.
79.13(6) Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.
   b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.
c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.
d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.
e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle.

79.13(7) The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.
79.13(8) The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.
79.13(9) The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- Student records are being kept in a well-organized fashion by Holly Johansen. All record components are easily accessible.
- The unit appears to have a strong commitment to using data to inform decisions.
- The unit is making a determined effort to connect their internal assessment data and analysis with College reporting requirements.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.13(3)** The team is concerned that there are a number of different systems in which data are kept, most of which do not talk with each other. Many documents are paper based, and there are at least three different software applications for collecting and/or storing assessment data. There does not seem to be a central repository for efficient collection, aggregation and use of programmatic data. The team recommends the unit develop a coherent and integrated system that makes information more useful and accessible.

2. **79.13(5)** The team finds in the candidate e-portfolios that demonstration of competency and provision of candidate feedback is significantly inconsistent among various faculty. Examination of e-portfolios illustrated different levels of student artifacts with similar assessment, and similar levels of artifacts with varied assessments. Additionally, a number of e-portfolios had artifacts that had not been assessed. The team recommends the unit examine and adjust e-portfolio assessment requirements and procedures and work toward reliability in evaluation and feedback.

3. **79.13(5f)** The team examined the structure and use of the e-portfolio. Students cannot describe a use of the e-portfolio to monitor or measure their progress. When artifacts do not receive a score of meeting the standard, there is no evident requirement for
The e-portfolio appears to be a repository for artifacts with little use to inform candidate or program evaluation. The team recommends the unit examine and restructure or replace the e-portfolio to provide useful information to inform candidate progress and program assessment.

4. **79.13(6d)** The team finds evidence that content methods faculty and other adjunct faculty desire, but do not have access to, candidate program completion test data. The team recommends the unit ensure useful data is shared with all faculty.

5. **79.13(8)** The team found evidence that specific instruments within the assessment system are reviewed regularly (also part of the college-level assessment requirements), but there is no evidence of cyclical examination of the system as a whole. Several faculty members believe it necessary to do another major work-through of the system to involve the new faculty and new ideas. The team recommends the unit conduct a complete review of the assessment system and make adjustments as necessary.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.13(5)** Candidate progress is not assessed as attainment of standards. Unit faculty approve candidates’ progress through checkpoints, but the assessments are generally a checklist of completed actions rather than an assessment of candidates’ attainment of standards. The team requires the unit to examine and update the assessment measures of student progress and adjust as needed to ensure evaluation of candidate progress toward attainment of unit standards. The work must include examination of rubrics to clearly define developmental stages and to determine validity and reliability of assessments.

2. **79.13(6c)** Evidence indicates the direction for program assessment is not driven by candidate performance assessment data on unit standards as required. The team requires the unit to examine program assessment data and systems and adjust to ensure program assessment is based on the needs of the unit.

**Resolution of Concern #1:**

The unit has provided information on alignment of assessment of course assignments with standards. Assessment information is than placed in the e-Portfolio. While candidate attainment of standards is being assessed, the progress through the program, including clinical experiences is not a component of the e-Portfolio or assessment system. The team considers this standard MET, but suggests the unit expand the use of the e-Portfolio or other structure to measure student progress through the program.
Resolution of Concern #2:

The unit describes an annual program review process that uses data from multiple assessments from a variety of courses and clinical experiences. The annual program review is centered on a half-day faculty retreat focused on assessment. The team considers this standard MET.

NOTE: The Iowa Department of Education consultants will conduct a follow up visit one year from the time of Board action to ensure plans were properly implemented.

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Assessment Director
- Chair of Education Department
- Teacher Advisory Council members (local principals, adjuncts, current candidates, alumni)
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty
- Recent graduates

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records (including Chalk and Wire)
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL

281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.

79.14(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequence, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

79.14(2) PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and
b. High-quality cooperating teachers.

79.14(3) Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates’ achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ attainment of unit standards.

79.14(4) Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.

79.14(5) Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.

79.14(6) Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:

a. High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.

b. Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.

c. The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment.

79.14(7) The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:

a. Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 consecutive weeks in duration during the teacher candidate’s final year of the teacher preparation program.

b. Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.

c. Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.

d. Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate’s classroom.

e. Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.

f. Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.

g. Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).

h. Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate’s permanent record.

79.14(8) The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.

9.14(9) The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.
Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- Linda Jermeland maintains extensive, current records of placements past and present to inform the diverse placement of candidates in clinical experiences.
- The unit has developed positive, working relationships with several schools in the surrounding area.
- Students have clinical placements in at least 7 of 11 diverse clinical sites through the course of their program at Simpson.
- Student teaching workshop and materials provided for teachers, including video, were reported by cooperating teachers and student teachers as a useful resource.
- Cooperating teachers report the communication between them and the unit is timely and useful.
- Student teachers and cooperating teachers indicate expectations as to their role as being clearly outlined, consistent, and reasonable.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.14(6)** The team finds evidence that Physical Education students in the EDUC 222 and 321 courses attend associated clinical experiences that do not provide meaningful practice. The students are required to develop and teach a lesson plan, but not in PE. The team recommends the unit differentiate clinical experience requirements and opportunities to meet the content needs of all candidates.

2. **79.14(6)** The team found students, especially students in secondary content majors, questioning the value of placements in areas they will not be teaching (e.g. secondary majors in elementary classrooms.) The team recommends examination of this practice and/or clearly articulating reasons to students so they understand the value of placements in other grade level/content areas.

3. **79.14(6)b** The team finds that students are offered multiple placements in diverse settings, however, students report lack of opportunities to teach in these settings. Students report spending time in observation rather than practice. The team recommends the unit update curriculum and clinical policies to provide candidates with greater opportunities to actively engage in planning, instruction, and assessment.

4. **79.14(7):** Particular candidates in the Simpson program are earning up to four endorsements, while still student teaching only 15 weeks. To accommodate earning many endorsements, the program includes three week student teaching placements. The team is concerned that minimal student teaching, or no student teaching, in each of the multiple
endorsements may not prepare candidates well to teach in each earned endorsement. The team strongly recommends the unit examine their clinical practices in preparing candidates for multiple endorsements.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.14(1)** The May term provides candidates the opportunity for 90 hours of classroom experience. It is completed the May before fall semester student teaching, negating an opportunity for feedback, remediation or additional learning based on clinical experience assessments and feedback. Additionally, it may be the only opportunity for candidates to practice teaching in their content field after the 10 hour field experience as freshmen or sophomores. The team is concerned about the all-at-once nature of the May term as the sole practicum experience. The team requires the unit to examine clinical experience sequence requirements and adjust to ensure adequate candidate experience, feedback, assessment and growth opportunities.

Resolution of Concern #1:

The unit has provided additional information on May term clinical experience. This opportunity is limited to candidates in only two fields, music and physical education. The unit has further identified the practice of reviewing clinical experience assessments and providing remediation or dismissal for candidates not successful in the May term clinical experience. **The team considers this standard MET**, however, the team suggests the unit develop and document policy for this practice to ensure a fair and equitable process.

NOTE: The Iowa Department of Education consultants will conduct a follow up visit one year from the time of Board action to ensure plans were properly implemented.

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Student teachers
- Cooperating teachers
- Unit faculty
- Candidates
- Advisory Committee

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators
Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Not Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

281—79.15(256) Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Teacher candidates demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.  
79.15(1) Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge including but not limited to English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.  
79.15(2) Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:  
a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.  
b. Students with disabilities.  
c. Students who are gifted and talented.  
d. English language learners.  
e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.  
79.15(3) Each teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge about literacy and receives preparation in literacy. Each candidate also develops and demonstrates the ability to integrate reading strategies into content area coursework. Each teacher candidate in elementary education demonstrates knowledge related to the acquisition of literacy skills and receives preparation in a variety of instructional approaches to reading programs, including but not limited to reading recovery.  
79.15(4) Each unit defines unit standards (aligned with InTASC standards) and embeds them in courses and field experiences.  
79.15(5) Each teacher candidate exhibits competency in all of the following professional core curricula:  
a. Content/subject matter specialization. The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the discipline(s) the candidate teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the subject matter meaningful for students. This specialization is evidenced by a completion of a 30-semester-hour teaching major which must minimally include the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements, or secondary level occupational endorsements. The teacher candidate must either meet or exceed a score above the 25th percentile nationally on subject assessments designed by a nationally recognized testing service that measure pedagogy and knowledge of at least one subject area as approved by the director of the department of education, or the teacher candidate must meet or exceed the equivalent of a score above the 25th percentile nationally on an alternate assessment also approved by the director. The alternate assessment must be a valid and reliable subject-area-specific, performance-based assessment for preservice teacher candidates that is centered on student learning. Additionally, each elementary
teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours.

b. **Student learning.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of human growth and development and of how students learn and participates in learning opportunities that support intellectual, career, social and personal development.

c. **Diverse learners.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners.

d. **Instructional planning.** The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, curriculum goals, and state curriculum models.

e. **Instructional strategies.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of and an ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.

f. **Learning environment/classroom management.** The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior; creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; maintains effective classroom management; and is prepared to address behaviors related to substance abuse and other high-risk behaviors.

g. **Communication.** The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, and other forms of symbolic representation, to foster active inquiry and collaboration and to support interaction in the classroom.

h. **Assessment.** The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student, and effectively uses both formative and summative assessment of students, including student achievement data, to determine appropriate instruction.

i. **Foundations, reflective practice and professional development.** The teacher candidate develops knowledge of the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education. The teacher candidate continually evaluates the effects of the candidate’s choices and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community; actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally; and demonstrates an understanding of teachers as consumers of research and as researchers in the classroom.

j. **Collaboration, ethics and relationships.** The teacher candidate fosters relationships with parents, school colleagues, and organizations in the larger community to support student learning and development; demonstrates an understanding of educational law and policy, ethics, and the profession of teaching, including the role of boards of education and education agencies; and demonstrates knowledge of and dispositions for cooperation with other educators, especially in collaborative/co-teaching as well as in other educational team situations.

k. **Technology.** The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.

l. **Methods of teaching.** Methods of teaching have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level endorsement desired.

79.15(6) Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in content coursework directly related to the Iowa core.

79.15(7) Each teacher candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended.
79.15(8) Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- Literacy is incorporated well into secondary methods coursework.
- Candidate coursework clearly address the area of human relations and an awareness of diverse learners.
- Many candidates articulated an understanding of lesson planning, including differentiation.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. 79.15(2) The team finds in syllabi and student teacher interviews that there is inconsistency in candidate preparation for addressing diverse learners, especially in the areas of gifted and talented and English language learners. The team recommends the unit work to establish and ensure coursework and instructors are more consistent in curriculum presentation. Additionally, the team recommends the unit examine curriculum for ways to provide candidates with opportunities for more practice incorporating strategies specifically related to ELL and gifted and talented students.

2. 79.15(5) The team finds in syllabi and candidate e-portfolios that candidates are inconsistently prepared to meet the technological demands of teaching in Iowa schools. The team recommends that the unit explore updated applications of technology and assign specific courses to address specific areas of technology (for instance, preparing candidates for 1to1 initiatives.)

3. 79.15(7) the team finds through student interviews and program documentation that although required content is addressed through coursework, there is significant overlap with courses and candidate practice in the K-8 Reading and K-8 English Language Arts (ELA) endorsements. The team is concerned that the use of courses in different fields to count for multiple endorsements may not provide a depth of preparation for either endorsement. The team recommends the unit examine the curriculum for K-8 ELA and the reading endorsement to ensure each endorsement provides adequate content for quality preparation.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)
1. **79.15(3)** The team interviewed a large number of elementary level student teachers. The student teachers consistently described a lack of adequate preparation in literacy. The student teachers described their preparation as not current, and inadequate for the variety of reading concerns faced in classrooms. The team requires the unit to examine and revise literacy preparation curriculum and clinical experiences to better prepare candidates to teach reading in current Iowa classrooms.

**Resolution of Concern #1:**
The unit has surveyed a number of recent graduates and cooperating teachers to augment the data from the student teachers interviewed for this finding. The unit is planning changes to curriculum for literacy, including adding instruction to elementary literacy courses and adding instruction to the linguistics course provided by the English department for elementary education majors. **The team considers this standard MET.**

NOTE: The Iowa Department of Education consultants will conduct a follow up visit one year from the time of Board action to ensure plans were properly implemented.

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- Licensure and placement officer
- Registrar
- Administrative assistant
- Unit Faculty

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Curriculum exhibits
- Endorsement plans
- E-portfolios
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

281—79.10(256) Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.

79.10(1) A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.

79.10(2) The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.

79.10(3) The unit’s conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.

79.10(4) The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with ISSL standards.

79.10(5) The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.

79.10(6) When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.

79.10(7) The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:

a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;

b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;

c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;

d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and

e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.

79.10(8) The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.

79.10(9) The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.

79.10(10) Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- New facilities for the Education Department is a central plank of the new capital campaign, with several major gifts already committed. The plans reviewed by the team for the new classrooms, offices, and collaboration spaces will dramatically improve the facilities and resources for the program and make a strong statement of support for the
program on the part of the institution and external donors. The team applauds the institution for making this investment in teacher education.

- An endowment fund makes professional development funding available to supplement the funding provided each faculty member.
- The team cites the strong organizational management, commitment, and professionalism of Holly Johanson.
- The team found evidence from a number of sources of strong support and commitment to the unit from college administration.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

8. **79.10(1)** In interviews with faculty and administration, the team found a widespread, inconsistent understanding of the role of the division head. This role appears to function mainly as a communication vehicle, but it is unclear how the division head interfaces with department chairs and the exact role the division head plays in program governance. The inconsistency is not limited to this division. The team recommends the unit and the institution examine, clarify and communicate the role of the division head.

Simpson Response:

After meeting with Dean Kent Eaton in the summer of 2018, he is aware of this concern. There is a campus-wide awareness for addressing this issue.

9. **79.10(2)** In both the IR and interviews with faculty and administrators, the team found that the Teacher Education Program unit is defined as the Education Department, with other areas such as music, sports science/physical education as separate from the unit but contributing to it. Non-Education Department faculty play an important checks and balancing role on the Teacher Education Committee, understanding their role as a form of external oversight, not a part of the unit itself. The team recommends that the unit be redefined across department to include all faculty and courses that contribute to the Teacher Education Program and that the program develop governance structures that directly include these faculty in oversight and program decision-making.

Simpson Response:

The Education Department will continue to include non-education department faculty to participate in external oversight. In addition, the Teacher Education Committee will continue to serve in their role of external oversight and governance. This committee is elected and has divisional representation.

10. **79.10(7)** The institution provides $500 to each faculty member each year for professional development. The institution also has an endowed fund to supplement professional development expenses. The unit has several faculty members who are active in their professional fields nationally, requiring resources for travel. The institution currently invests in professional development travel for these faculty members, but only $500 is
assured. The team recommends the unit include sufficient professional development in the budget development process it will engage in with the institution in the coming year.

**Simpson Response:**

This recommendation has been shared with Dean Kent Eaton and Sal Meyers, director of faculty development. With the current overall financial situation of the college, it is unlikely that this funding will increase at this time.

11. 79.10(7a) The team examined faculty load for the past several years and planned load for the next academic year. The team found evidence of consistent overload in the past and in future planning. The team understands there have been a number of faculty vacancies in the past several years contributing to overload. The unit is expected to be fully staffed next year, but will be overloaded as a unit by 7.5 credits. Some of this overload is situational for next year, while some is consistent, and much of it is voluntary. There is no evidence of a negative impact on teaching quality due to overload. The team is concerned that there are potential useful functions precluded (particularly in assessment) because of a lack of load capacity. The team recommends the unit monitor human resources and work (current and potential) to maximize program efficiency and maintain quality.

**Simpson Response:**

Recent increases in faculty overload have been due to sabbatical coverage and family medical leave coverage. Faculty rely on overload to supplement their salary. The department chair and dean review overloads each semester. Faculty overload is not supported when it is felt that teaching quality would be negatively impacted.

12. 79.10(7a) The team found evidence of good resource support for the program in many areas, however the curriculum library materials are outdated and appear underutilized. As the program moves into new facilities, the team recommends the unit take this opportunity to review and update the materials in the curriculum library to reflect curricula and materials most used in partner schools.

**Simpson Response:** The department chair has met with the Vice President of Development and confirmed that the fundraising and planning of the education facility includes the purchase of needed curriculum lab materials. With the new education facility, which places faculty office, classrooms, and the curriculum lab all in one location, we expect usage of the lab will increase. In addition, having a curriculum lab that is an inviting space and large enough to hold an entire class will increase usage.

We will inventory the items that we currently have. Outdated materials will be removed. Methods professors are aware of current curricula and strategies being used in the field, and they will be integral in making selections. We will also visit with teachers, curriculum directors, and partner schools for input. Our advisory council will also be consulted.
13. **79.10(7d)** The stipend for cooperating teachers for student teachers is described as low by the unit faculty and cooperating teachers compared to other institutions and to the increasing work required. Cooperating teachers interviewed stated that they feel supported and appreciated by the institution in many ways, but not in a monetary sense. While this standard does not require a specific level of remuneration, it does require adequate resources to operate a quality program. The team is concerned that Simpson may fail to attract and retain quality cooperating teachers. The team recommends the unit examine resources for potential adjustments to cooperating teacher stipends.

**Simpson Response:**

We are grateful that we continue to attract quality mentor teachers and appreciate their impact on our candidates. In addition to pay, we also offer one free graduate credit for completing a course on mentoring which mentors use toward license renewal. This has proved to be successful. Our budget is reviewed annually.

14. **79.10(9)** The team found inconsistent evidence of support for, and communication with, adjunct faculty. Some reported good communication about program expectations and standards and others did not. Some reported that their performance was evaluated, others did not. The team also heard inconsistent feedback from students and graduates about the quality of adjunct instructors. The team recommends the unit examine and adjust policies for communication with adjunct faculty.

**Simpson Response:**

The department chair meets with new adjuncts to share program information and provide an orientation to the college. The Division of Continuing and Graduate Programs has implemented a new process for evaluating adjuncts. Student course evaluations are reviewed each semester and considered in the rehiring of adjuncts. Full-time faculty and the department chair are available to adjuncts at all times.

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

2. **79.10(4)** The team reviewed the unit standards and alignment chart to InTASC but is concerned that some unit standards do not appear to reflect the updated (2011) InTASC standards. In addition, syllabi reviewed by the team are inconsistent as to whether they align to the old or new InTASC standards. The team also notes that the unit standards do not reflect many of the more recent changes to curriculum and pedagogy in the program (e.g., PLC). The team requires that unit to review and update their standards, curriculum and syllabi in alignment with the 2011 InTASC standards.

**Simpson Response:** While the team recognized that our institutional report utilized the current InTASC standards, and that our program standards were properly aligned with these standards, some syllabi mentioned the outdated standards. During the summer of 2018, all syllabi from the 2017-18 academic year were reviewed. Out of 79 syllabi reviewed, 73 only mentioned program standards which are properly aligned with InTASC. Six mentioned the InTASC standards. Three
syllabi correctly used the new 2011 standards. Three syllabi, Educ 316 (Timm), Educ 316 (Hahn), and Educ 305 (Timm), were revised.

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- President
- Vice President (VP) for Academic Affairs
- VP for Finance
- VP for Advancement
- Advisory Council members
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty
- Library personnel

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIVERSITY

281—79.11(256) Diversity standard. The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.11(1) The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.
79.11(2) The institution’s and unit’s plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- The College has several initiatives to increase diversity among students. Including:
Admissions has identified a multicultural admissions position. The incumbent in this position works with other admissions counselors to help them identify and recruit diverse students.

Enrollment management has identified a plan for Simpson to become a Hispanic Serving Institution, which requires that 25% of students are Hispanic. This long range plan is designed to incrementally increase student diversity.

- The Simpson Promise initiative provides tuition support for Iowa students. This initiative has resulted in increased diversity among students.
- The EDU 321/521 course syllabus includes an in-depth examination of a wide range of topics and assignments associated with diversity education. There is intentionality in the design of the lessons in the course to prepare teacher candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds in PK-12 school settings.

**Recommendations:**
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

2. **79.11(gen)** The diversity among students in the unit is much less than that of the College. Initiatives to increase diversity are at the College level. The team recommends the unit develop initiatives or identify initiatives for specific collaboration with the College to increase diversity among Teacher Education Program (TEP) students.

**Simpson Response:**

The Simpson Promise has had a direct impact on the diversity of all college students. This has increased the diversity in our courses. Our department has taken advantage of faculty development funding for initiatives related to diversity and inclusion. We are participating in book studies each semester to improve our cultural competence and our practices within the program.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- President
- VP for Academic Affairs
- VP for Enrollment
- VP for Finance
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty

Review of:
• Course syllabi
• Student records
• Unit policies
• Institutional Report
• Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY**

**281—79.12(256) Faculty standard.** Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.

79.12(1) The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.

79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member’s preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.

79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.

79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.

79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:

a. Colleagues in the unit;

b. Colleagues across the institution;

c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

**Initial Team Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commendations/Strengths:**

- High emphasis is placed on teaching during faculty evaluations.
- Faculty are observed yearly by colleagues in and outside of their department and feedback is provided.
- Quality PD is provided on campus at frequent intervals: e.g. GIFT Sessions
• Faculty development mirroring local school district PD is made available to help faculty stay abreast of state initiatives.
• Students identified beneficial relationships with faculty members. In particular, the student cited the accessibility of faculty.
• Past, present, and past students reported a high level of efficiency in and appreciation for the advising model in the TEP.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)
None

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

3. 79.12(2) The team does not find documented evidence to verify the alignment of teaching assignments with knowledge, preparation and experience for the following faculty members. The team requires the unit to examine faculty qualifications and teaching assignments and make adjustments to resolve concerns by documenting a plan for faculty to gain experience to align with teaching assignments.
• KC
• CT

Simpson Response: KC earned a Ph.D. from University of North Carolina at Greensboro in special education-early childhood, a M.A. from North Carolina Central University in agency counseling, and a B.A. from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in child development and family studies. KC holds a Birth to Kindergarten Teaching License in North Carolina. She taught children ages six months through five years at Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute during the summer of 2003. She taught in an inclusive Head Start setting at the Fairview Childcare Center during the summer of 2004. In addition, KC has experience as an Inclusion Specialist II, Early Intervention Coordinator, and as a mental health professional including experience as an Intensive In-Home Mental Health Counselor and a Multisystemic Therapist. These experiences are especially important as she teaches Educ 350: Early Intervention Collaboration and Methods and Educ 351: Special Health Considerations in Early Childhood. KC joined the Simpson Teacher Education Program in August of 2017, and will co-teach in early childhood classrooms over the next five years for a minimum of 40 hours.

KC has plans to complete more than the required co-teaching hours in preschool classrooms. She will do 15 hours over the next 4 years, starting Spring semester for a total of 60 hours over 5 years. She plans to get experience in early intervention, an inclusive preschool, K-3, and a special education setting or specialty school/approach (e.g., Montessori, IB, project approach). She has already completed hours this academic year. This ensures ongoing and continuous growth and development as a teacher.
**Simpson Response:** During May Term of 2018, CT rounded out his teaching experience, completing 30 hours of co-teaching at the elementary level with ST at Holy Trinity School and SG at Brookview Elementary School. He completed another 30 hours at the middle school level in Adel. In the fall of 2018, he plans to continue his elementary co-teaching in 3rd grade in Waukee. His focus during these teaching experiences was social studies instruction and the developmental needs of elementary students. He has shared his experiences with the education department. This is sufficient for him to meet the needs of elementary teacher candidates.

4. **79.12(5)c.** The team found no evidence that the following faculty members have met the 40 hour requirement. The team requires the unit to document 40 hours of team teaching in a five year period for all faculty teaching in the professional program.

**Part-time Faculty**
3 faculty members with no documentation provided.

**Adjunct Faculty**
16 faculty members with inadequate documentation.

**Simpson Response:** Nine faculty members are no longer employed by the Simpson College Teacher Education Program, and there is no expectation that they would return to Simpson. The documentation of 40 hours for the others on this list are noted below. Two members do not have documentation for 40 hours, but have provided a plan for completing their hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tim McMillin (all hours in music classrooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicci Whalen: These hours were completed during her sabbatical focused on physical activities and nutrition. She co-taught these lessons at Irving Elementary in Indianola.

Michael Patterson
* Michael will work with Kiersten Johnson at Irving Elementary in Indianola on Monday, August 27th, 2018 for 8 hours, and for 8 hours over Simpson’s fall break. He will also work with her one 8 hour day in January, 2019. He will complete the remaining during Simpson’s May term 2019.

Mary Bogs
Mary retired from full time teaching in 2015.

### Nicci Whalen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Oct 2015- Dec 2015</td>
<td>2 4 5</td>
<td>Indianola Community Schools</td>
<td>Metzger Kampf Redding</td>
<td>Physical activities and nutrition lesson plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Michael Patterson

* Michael will work with Kiersten Johnson at Irving Elementary in Indianola on Monday, August 27th, 2018 for 8 hours, and for 8 hours over Simpson’s fall break. He will also work with her one 8 hour day in January, 2019. He will complete the remaining during Simpson’s May term 2019.

### Mary Bogs
Mary retired from full time teaching in 2015.

### Eileen Boldon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8/29/12 9/1/12 9/2/12</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Clarke Community</td>
<td>Freed</td>
<td>Literacy Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/25/13-8/26/13</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>Clarke Community</td>
<td>Freed</td>
<td>Guided Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3/12/13</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Science-technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3/13/13</td>
<td>K 4</td>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Dryer</td>
<td>Sound blending/word patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/7/13</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>Clarke Community</td>
<td>Freed</td>
<td>Reader’s Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8/13</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>Clarke Community</td>
<td>Freed</td>
<td>Reader’s Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/6/13</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Read A Loud/Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/7/13</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Reading/Phonems and Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10/7/13</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Nisren</td>
<td>Social Studies-Mid Atlantic States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10/17/14</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>Creston Community</td>
<td>Criger</td>
<td>Social Studies-Colonial Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eileen Boldon: Eileen co-taught each of these lessons in the district indicated with the teacher listed.

**John Hansen**
John taught part time at Martensdale-St Marys in the 2016-2017 school year.

### Mary Kay Johnson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mar 24-April 14, 2017</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Norwalk Community, Lakewood Elementary</td>
<td>Shelly Vroegh</td>
<td>Developed Unit, lesson plans, materials and evaluation for interdisciplinary, project-based unit on Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bob Kling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Pella High School</td>
<td>Julie Stratton</td>
<td>Critiqued and judged work and was speaker at the high school art festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Indianola Middle School</td>
<td>Monica Weinman</td>
<td>Taught students how to use a potter’s wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Indianola Middle School</td>
<td>Monica Weinman</td>
<td>Taught students how to use a potter’s wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Indianola Middle School</td>
<td>Monica Weinman</td>
<td>Taught students how to use a potter’s wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9/13/13</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Indianola Elementary Schools: Wilder, Irving, Emerson, Whittier</td>
<td>Monica Weinman, Stacy Evans, Jeff Tadsen, Jared Creason</td>
<td>Worked with these teachers for a special American Gothic Day for 300 elem. Students held in Buxton Park, next to the 30,000 lbs. sculpture of Am. Gothic on the Simpson College Campus. I helped create and coordinated students to make Am. Gothic masks and helped photograph students and the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Indianola Middle School</td>
<td>Lisa Smith</td>
<td>“What’s it like to be an Artist,” Brought the middle schoolers to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
my studio and gallery for a talk and question and answer session.

* Bob will team teach with Monica Weinman at Indianola High School for two days this fall, with Lisa Smith at Indianola Middle School one day this fall, and with one or more of the Elementary Art teachers in the Indianola district to complete his 40 hours.

## Morgan Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>10-2014</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with 4 different Honors Science classes helping students select science research projects. (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>11-2014</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with 16 different groups of students helping to make final decisions on project possibilities and begin collecting materials. (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12-2014</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with student groups understanding dependent and independent variables along with controls and forming their hypotheses. (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>01-2015</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Encouraging students to keep collecting and recording data along with all other organizational responsibilities. (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>02-2015</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with students on how to interpret and display the data from their research. (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>03-2015</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with students on finalizing all aspects of their research and how best to display their findings for their local Science Research Fair next month (May). (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hrs</td>
<td>04-2015</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Prairie Ridge MS Ankeny Community Schools</td>
<td>Evelyn Wandry</td>
<td>Worked with students putting final touches on projects as well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christina Hill as helping to evaluate and judge their final projects.

I also connected directly with all of my student groups via google docs during the entire year. This provided my groups of students with the opportunity to ask questions and provide suggestions and alternative solutions to their research. I estimate this as at least 30 hours over the course of the research. (Via Google Docs conversation.)

Julie Schneiders
Julie retired from full time teaching in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>District/School</th>
<th>Co-Teacher</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/25/17</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Valley HS/West DSM</td>
<td>C Young</td>
<td>Subbing in Business/Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9/20/17-9/22/17</td>
<td>9 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Waukee High School</td>
<td>A Bechtum</td>
<td>Subbing in Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/19/17-10/20/17</td>
<td>9 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Urbandale HS</td>
<td>J Goldman</td>
<td>Subbing in Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11/8/17-11/9/17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waukee South Middle School</td>
<td>C Fetters</td>
<td>Subbing in Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12/7/17</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Urbandale HS</td>
<td>S Jacques</td>
<td>Subbing in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- President
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report
Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ASSESSMENT

281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. The unit’s assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.

79.13(1) The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.
79.13(2) The assessment system is based on unit standards.
79.13(3) The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.
79.13(4) Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:
   a. Entrance into the program (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16).
   b. Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.
   c. Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).
   d. Program completion (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16; see subrule 79.15(5) for required teacher candidate assessment).
79.13(5) Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.
   b. Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.
   c. Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.
   d. Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.
   e. Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.
   f. Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.
   g. Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.
79.13(6) Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.
   b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.
   c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.
   d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.
   e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle.
79.13(7) The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.

79.13(8) The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.

79.13(9) The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted Below | Not Met |

Commendations/Strengths:

- Student records are being kept in a well-organized fashion by Holly Johansen. All record components are easily accessible.
- The unit appears to have a strong commitment to using data to inform decisions.
- The unit is making a determined effort to connect their internal assessment data and analysis with College reporting requirements.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

6. **79.13(3)** The team is concerned that there are a number of different systems in which data are kept, most of which do not talk with each other. Many documents are paper based, and there are at least three different software applications for collecting and/or storing assessment data. There does not seem to be a central repository for efficient collection, aggregation and use of programmatic data. The team recommends the unit develop a coherent and integrated system that makes information more useful and accessible.

Simpson Response: Each May the department has a half-day assessment retreat. The team reviews all assessment data. The artifacts that are collected in the e-Portfolio are summarized in reports and reviewed. The evaluations from practica and student teaching are gathered in SurveyMonkey and reports summarizing this data is reviewed. In addition, the graduate and employer survey data provided by the Iowa Department of Education is considered. The following statements from our 2018 annual report to the Iowa Department of Education indicates how we utilize data to inform our program:

While our data indicates that our students are performing at a high level, one relative weakness seems to be using data to inform instruction. When teaching this, it is necessary to use artificial data and during practicum it is usually difficult for candidates to schedule back-to-back lessons so that real data can be collected and used to inform the following lesson. Student teaching seems to be the first time that students use data to inform instruction in a genuine manner. Using data to inform instruction is often listed as “not observed” on practicum evaluations. This was scored at 20% below state and national averages by graduates. However, employers rated our graduates at 10% higher that state and national averages. With the mixed results of the graduate and employer survey, we discussed whether or not this may be a confidence issue for our graduates. They are able to use data to inform instruction, but do not feel as confident in this area as others. Methods instructors will be sure to include data collection and analysis in their assignments and lesson plans, as well as the lessons taught in the field. If our students will not be teaching the next lesson, they will at least be required to reflect on the data...
and discuss how it would be informing the next lesson if they were to teach it. Students will also be asked to participate in PLC meetings during practicum and student teaching to further their practice of using data to inform instruction.

The paper-based documents are checklists to confirm that candidates have completed all required submissions at an acceptable level. These serve as documentation in the candidates’ education files. Many of the other paper forms require a signature for legal purposes and serve to confirm the candidates’ knowledge of a program expectation. The information collected on these forms are not considered data for program review.

In August, following the accreditation team’s site visit, the department participated in a retreat to examine our program as a whole. We examined our mission statement and standards, as well as creating several subcommittees to further explore portions of our program. One subcommittee is examining the assessment system over the course of this academic year. This includes the collection of information in a more efficient manner.

7. **79.13(5)** The team finds in the candidate e-portfolios that demonstration of competency and provision of candidate feedback is significantly inconsistent among various faculty. Examination of e-portfolios illustrated different levels of student artifacts with similar assessment, and similar levels of artifacts with varied assessments. Additionally, a number of e-portfolios had artifacts that had not been assessed. The team recommends the unit examine and adjust e-portfolio assessment requirements and procedures and work toward reliability in evaluation and feedback.

**Simpson Response:**

In August, following the accreditation team’s site visit, the department participated in a retreat to examine our program as a whole. We examined our mission statement and standards, as well as creating several subcommittees to further explore portions of our program. One subcommittee is examining the assessment system over the course of this academic year. This includes inter-rater reliability. At any given time, there are artifacts that are submitted and waiting for assessment because artifacts are submitted throughout the semester. This is intentionally designed so that professors are not getting all submissions at one time.

8. **79.13(5)f.** The team examined the structure and use of the e-portfolio. Students cannot describe a use of the e-portfolio to monitor or measure their progress. When artifacts do not receive a score of meeting the standard, there is no evident requirement for remediation or resubmission. The e-portfolio appears to be a repository for artifacts with little use to inform candidate or program evaluation. The team recommends the unit examine and restructure or replace the e-portfolio to provide useful information to inform candidate progress and program assessment.

**Simpson Response:**

As stated in previous responses, the assessment system is under review. The purpose and communicating this with candidates will be considered.
9. **79.13(6)d**. The team finds evidence that content methods faculty and other adjunct faculty desire, but do not have access to, candidate program completion test data. The team recommends the unit ensure useful data is shared with all faculty.

**Simpson Response:**

We will continue to share this at the May assessment retreat.

10. **79.13(8)** The team found evidence that specific instruments within the assessment system are reviewed regularly (also part of the college-level assessment requirements), but there is no evidence of cyclical examination of the system as a whole. Several faculty members believe it necessary to do another major work-through of the system to involve the new faculty and new ideas. The team recommends the unit conduct a complete review of the assessment system and make adjustments as necessary.

**Simpson Response:** In August, following the accreditation team’s site visit, the department participated in a retreat to examine our program as a whole. We examined our mission statement and standards, as well as creating several subcommittees to further explore portions of our program. One subcommittee is examining the assessment system over the course of this academic year.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

3. **79.13(5)** Candidate progress is not assessed as attainment of standards. Unit faculty approve candidates’ progress through checkpoints, but the assessments are generally a checklist of completed actions rather than an assessment of candidates’ attainment of standards. The team requires the unit to examine and update the assessment measures of student progress and adjust as needed to ensure evaluation of candidate progress toward attainment of unit standards. The work must include examination of rubrics to clearly define developmental stages and to determine validity and reliability of assessments.

**Simpson Response:**

Unit faculty approve candidate progress toward demonstration of competency of standards within courses. Standards are intentionally attached to courses, and unit faculty design instruction and assignments related to each standard. These assignments are initially assessed in the course. This is where faculty examine candidate performance toward standards. The assignment is once again assessed when it is uploaded to the e-Portfolio (Chalk and Wire). The rubrics within the e-Portfolio are used for this assessment. The e-Portfolio serves as a holistic examination of the candidate’s preparedness.

Course assignments are designed to assess candidates’ progress toward program standards. The alignment of artifacts and program standards is located in our institution report under unit
assessment map. These course assignments are uploaded to the e-Portfolio (Chalk and Wire). The professor for the course assesses the artifact in light of the standard. While a professor may use their own assessment for the course (lowering the grade for turning it in late, assessing writing skills, etc.), when the professor assesses the artifact for the e-Portfolio only the assessment rubric within Chalk and Wire is utilized. These criteria can also be found in the institutional report under unit assessment map. The candidate receives feedback on the course assignment and via the assessment in the e-Portfolio. At each Gateway, a checklist is used to determine whether or not the candidate has uploaded the appropriate artifacts and whether or not progress is being made toward program standards. Prior to recommendation for licensure, the e-Portfolio is again reviewed in total to assure that all program standards have been met. The department annually reviews data gathered from the e-Portfolio, practica evaluations, student teaching evaluations, graduate surveys and employer surveys. When the data has been analyzed by standard, it is clear that as candidates progress through our teacher education program, scores on each standard increase. This indicates development throughout the program.

4. **79.13(6)c.** Evidence indicates the direction for program assessment is not driven by candidate performance assessment data on unit standards as required. The team requires the unit to examine program assessment data and systems and adjust to ensure program assessment is based on the needs of the unit.

**Simpson Response:**

Annually, the department has a half-day assessment retreat. The team reviews all assessment data. The artifacts that are collected in the e-Portfolio are summarized in reports and reviewed. The evaluations from practica and student teaching are gathered in SurveyMonkey and reports summarizing this data is reviewed. In addition, the graduate and employer survey data provided by the Iowa Department of Education is considered.

The following statements from our 2018 annual report to the Iowa Department of Education indicates how we utilize data to inform our program:

While our data indicates that our students are performing at a high level, one relative weakness seems to be using data to inform instruction. When teaching this, it is necessary to use artificial data and during practicum it is usually difficult for candidates to schedule back-to-back lessons so that real data can be collected and used to inform the following lesson. Student teaching seems to be the first time that students use data to inform instruction in a genuine manner. Using data to inform instruction is often listed as “not observed” on practicum evaluations. This was scored at 20% below state and national averages by graduates. However, employers rated our graduates at 10% higher that state and national averages. With the mixed results of the graduate and employer survey, we discussed whether or not this may be a confidence issue for our graduates. They are able to use data to inform instruction, but do not feel as confident in this area as others. Methods instructors will be sure to include data collection and analysis in their assignments and lesson plans, as well as the lessons taught in the field. If our students will not be teaching the next lesson, they will at least be required to reflect on the data and discuss how it would be informing the next lesson if they were to teach it. Students will also be asked to participate in PLC meetings during practicum and student teaching to further their practice of using data to inform instruction.

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- Assessment Director
- Chair of Education Department
- Teacher Advisory Council members (local principals, adjuncts, current candidates, alumni)
- Candidates
- Unit Faculty
- Recent graduates

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records (including Chalk and Wire)
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL**

281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.

79.14(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

79.14(2) PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and

b. High-quality cooperating teachers.

79.14(3) Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates’ achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ attainment of unit standards.

79.14(4) Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.

79.14(5) Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.

79.14(6) Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:
a. High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.
b. Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.
c. The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment. 

79.14(7) The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:

a. Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 consecutive weeks in duration during the teacher candidate’s final year of the teacher preparation program.
b. Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.
c. Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.
d. Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate’s classroom.
e. Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.
f. Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.
g. Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).
h. Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate’s permanent record.

79.14(8) The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.

9.14(9) The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.

### Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
<th>Met with Strength</th>
<th>Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commendations/Strengths:

- Linda Jermeland maintains extensive, current records of placements past and present to inform the diverse placement of candidates in clinical experiences.
- The unit has developed positive, working relationships with several schools in the surrounding area.
- Students have clinical placements in at least 7 of 11 diverse clinical sites through the course of their program at Simpson.
• Student teaching workshop and materials provided for teachers, including video, were reported by cooperating teachers and student teachers as a useful resource.
• Cooperating teachers report the communication between them and the unit is timely and useful.
• Student teachers and cooperating teachers indicate expectations as to their role as being clearly outlined, consistent, and reasonable.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

5. 79.14(6) The team finds evidence that Physical Education students in the EDUC 222 and 321 courses attend associated clinical experiences that do not provide meaningful practice. The students are required to develop and teach a lesson plan, but not in PE. The team recommends the unit differentiate clinical experience requirements and opportunities to meet the content needs of all candidates.

Simpson Response: Physical education candidates have their practicum experience during SpSc 241. This experience includes creating lesson plans, teaching, and at least one observation with feedback from Sports Science faculty.

The course description of SpSc 241:
SpSc 241 Advanced Practicum in PE/Health Students will explore the teaching profession as they work with large or small groups of students, teach lessons, and assist the physical education/health teacher in a broad variety of authentic educational tasks. Students will have the opportunity to relate their study of human development, methods, teaching strategies and foundations of education to authentic physical education and classroom experiences. Prerequisite: One required, two preferred, of the following methods courses: SpSc 208, 308, 321 or permission of the instructor. Four credits. Offered every May term.

6. 79.14(6) The team found students, especially students in secondary content majors, questioning the value of placements in areas they will not be teaching (e.g. secondary majors in elementary classrooms.) The team recommends examination of this practice and/or clearly articulating reasons to students so they understand the value of placements in other grade level/content areas.

Simpson Response: All teacher education candidates participate in two field observation experiences. The first is in conjunction with Educ 114: Foundations of Education. This field observation includes ten hours in an elementary setting. Some of the big questions that students ponder include: What does it mean to be educated? What is the purpose of education? What is my philosophy of education? How has history impacted education today? What is the current state of education? Is teaching my passion? This field experience allows students to explore issues and ideas discussed in class in a “real world” setting. The second field observation is in conjunction with Educ 222: Assessment, Planning, and Teaching. This field observation includes ten hours in a middle or high school. The focus of this experience is to see a variety of teaching models in use in a real classroom, as well as a variety of formative and summative assessments. The combination of these experiences allow candidates to have an understanding
7. **79.14(6)b** The team finds that students are offered multiple placements in diverse settings, however, students report lack of opportunities to teach in these settings. Students report spending time in observation rather than practice. The team recommends the unit update curriculum and clinical policies to provide candidates with greater opportunities to actively engage in planning, instruction, and assessment.

**Simpson Response:**

Initial field placements (in Educ 114 and Educ 222) are designed to expose candidates to the responsibilities and rigor of teaching. They would not be prepared for or expected to teach at these levels. They are expected to observe and engage in assisting the teacher, as directed. During advanced practica and student teaching, students are expected to write and teach from lesson plans in their discipline.

8. **79.14(7):** Particular candidates in the Simpson program are earning up to four endorsements, while still student teaching only 15 weeks. To accommodate earning many endorsements, the program includes three week student teaching placements. The team is concerned that minimal student teaching, or no student teaching, in each of the multiple endorsements may not prepare candidates well to teach in each earned endorsement. The team strongly recommends the unit examine their clinical practices in preparing candidates for multiple endorsements.

**Simpson Response:**

All student teaching placements meet the requirements of the Iowa Department of Education. In the situations mentioned above, most placements are a total of 18 weeks instead of the required 14 weeks. Some placements within the 18 weeks of student teaching are three weeks so that the combined experience provides candidates professional practice in all endorsement areas.

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

2. **79.14(1)** The May term provides candidates the opportunity for 90 hours of classroom experience. It is completed the May before fall semester student teaching, negating an opportunity for feedback, remediation or additional learning based on clinical experience assessments and feedback. Additionally, it may be the only opportunity for candidates to practice teaching in their content field after the 10 hour field experience as freshmen or sophomores. The team is concerned about the all-at-once nature of the May term as the sole practicum experience. The team requires the unit to examine clinical experience sequence requirements and adjust to ensure adequate candidate experience, feedback, assessment and growth opportunities.
**Simpson Response:** Only physical education and music education candidates participate in advanced practicum during May Term. Other candidates complete advanced practica during two semesters. The May Term placement for physical education and music education allows for full days in the schools over the course of three weeks. It also allows music and sports science full-time faculty to supervise the experiences. In rare cases, this advanced practicum is immediately prior to student teaching in the fall. When reviewing all students taking May Term practicum in the past two years, only 14.7% completed student teaching in the following fall. The chart that follows indicates those students.

Policy states that candidates much pass advanced practicum for approval to student teach. The education records manager reviews grades for courses taken during the semester prior to student teaching. Any grade lower than a C- is reported to the department chair. Student teaching would then be delayed until a grade of C- or higher is recorded. In addition, every May Term practicum evaluation is reviewed by the education records manager. If any low scores or concerning comments are noted, the evaluation is forwarded to the department chair. The department chair reviews the evaluation, consults with the college supervisor, and may contact the mentor teacher and/or candidate. If it is determined that the candidate will likely be successful in student teaching with careful supervision and specific goals for student teaching, the student teaching coordinator creates a student teaching contract which outlines very specific goals for the candidate. The candidate will also be supervised by a full-time faculty member, or very experienced adjunct supervisor. If it is determined that the candidate is not ready for student teaching, the candidate may be required to complete an additional practicum, or be dismissed from the program. If the candidate was planning to student teach in the Fall following May Term, student teaching would be delayed until the candidate had successfully completed practicum. The candidate would repeat the practicum with additional supervision and support. A contract with explicit areas for growth focuses the repeated experience. This can be offered as a course by arrangement during any semester. The same expectations apply, and a passing grade in necessary to be recommended to student teaching. Additional courses would be recommended by the advisor, in consultation with the department chair and faculty, to ensure full-time status.

**May Term Practicum Followed by Fall Student Teaching**
Highlighted in Yellow (14.7% of total)

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- Student teachers
- Cooperating teachers
- Unit faculty
- Candidates
- Advisory Committee

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report
Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)**

**281—79.15(256) Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard.** Teacher candidates demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

- **79.15(1)** Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge including but not limited to English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
- **79.15(2)** Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:
  - a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
  - b. Students with disabilities.
  - c. Students who are gifted and talented.
  - d. English language learners.
  - e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.
- **79.15(3)** Each teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge about literacy and receives preparation in literacy. Each candidate also develops and demonstrates the ability to integrate reading strategies into content area coursework. Each teacher candidate in elementary education demonstrates knowledge related to the acquisition of literacy skills and receives preparation in a variety of instructional approaches to reading programs, including but not limited to reading recovery.
- **79.15(4)** Each unit defines unit standards (aligned with InTASC standards) and embeds them in courses and field experiences.
- **79.15(5)** Each teacher candidate exhibits competency in all of the following professional core curricula:
  - a. **Content/subject matter specialization.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the discipline(s) the candidate teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the subject matter meaningful for students. This specialization is evidenced by a completion of a 30-semester-hour teaching major which must minimally include the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements, or secondary level occupational endorsements. The teacher candidate must either meet or exceed a score above the 25th percentile nationally on
subject assessments designed by a nationally recognized testing service that measure pedagogy and knowledge of at least one subject area as approved by the director of the department of education, or the teacher candidate must meet or exceed the equivalent of a score above the 25th percentile nationally on an alternate assessment also approved by the director. The alternate assessment must be a valid and reliable subject-area-specific, performance-based assessment for preservice teacher candidates that is centered on student learning. Additionally, each elementary teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours.

b. Student learning. The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of human growth and development and of how students learn and participates in learning opportunities that support intellectual, career, social and personal development.

c. Diverse learners. The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners.

d. Instructional planning. The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, curriculum goals, and state curriculum models.

e. Instructional strategies. The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of and an ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.

f. Learning environment/classroom management. The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior; creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; maintains effective classroom management; and is prepared to address behaviors related to substance abuse and other high-risk behaviors.

g. Communication. The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, and other forms of symbolic representation, to foster active inquiry and collaboration and to support interaction in the classroom.

h. Assessment. The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student, and effectively uses both formative and summative assessment of students, including student achievement data, to determine appropriate instruction.

i. Foundations, reflective practice and professional development. The teacher candidate develops knowledge of the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education. The teacher candidate continually evaluates the effects of the candidate’s choices and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community; actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally; and demonstrates an understanding of teachers as consumers of research and as researchers in the classroom.

j. Collaboration, ethics and relationships. The teacher candidate fosters relationships with parents, school colleagues, and organizations in the larger community to support student learning and development; demonstrates an understanding of educational law and policy, ethics, and the profession of teaching, including the role of boards of education and education agencies; and demonstrates knowledge of and dispositions for cooperation with other educators, especially in collaborative/co-teaching as well as in other educational team situations.

k. Technology. The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.

l. Methods of teaching. Methods of teaching have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level
endorsement desired.  
79.15(6) Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in content coursework directly related to the Iowa core.  
79.15(7) Each teacher candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended.  
79.15(8) Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- Literacy is incorporated well into secondary methods coursework.
- Candidate coursework clearly address the area of human relations and an awareness of diverse learners.
- Many candidates articulated an understanding of lesson planning, including differentiation.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

4. 79.15(2) The team finds in syllabi and student teacher interviews that there is inconsistency in candidate preparation for addressing diverse learners, especially in the areas of gifted and talented and English language learners. The team recommends the unit work to establish and ensure coursework and instructors are more consistent in curriculum presentation. Additionally, the team recommends the unit examine curriculum for ways to provide candidates with opportunities for more practice incorporating strategies specifically related to ELL and gifted and talented students.

Simpson Response:

In the process of curriculum and program review, emphasis will be given to the curriculum and courses most suited to address this issue.

5. 79.15(5) The team finds in syllabi and candidate e-portfolios that candidates are inconsistently prepared to meet the technological demands of teaching in Iowa schools. The team recommends that the unit explore updated applications of technology and assign specific courses to address specific areas of technology (for instance, preparing candidates for 1to1 initiatives.)

Simpson Response:

With our recent hire of a faculty member with expertise in STEM and the use of technology in the classroom, it is expected that this new faculty member will assist all
other faculty with strategies for incorporating technology into their teaching and curriculum.

6. **79.15(7)** the team finds through student interviews and program documentation that although required content is addressed through coursework, there is significant overlap with courses and candidate practice in the K-8 Reading and K-8 English Language Arts (ELA) endorsements. The team is concerned that the use of courses in different fields to count for multiple endorsements may not provide a depth of preparation for either endorsement. The team recommends the unit examine the curriculum for K-8 ELA and the reading endorsement to ensure each endorsement provides adequate content for quality preparation.

**Simpson Response:**

Although there is overlap in these closely related endorsements, candidates are fully prepared in the content required of each endorsement. Our review finds no evidence of gaps in instruction or preparation.

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

2. **79.15(3)** The team interviewed a large number of elementary level student teachers. The student teachers consistently described a lack of adequate preparation in literacy. The student teachers described their preparation as not current, and inadequate for the variety of reading concerns faced in classrooms. The team requires the unit to examine and revise literacy preparation curriculum and clinical experiences to better prepare candidates to teach reading in current Iowa classrooms.

**Simpson Response:** In August 2018, the Simpson College Teacher Education Program surveyed the elementary education student teachers and their mentors from the past two years. The mentors had a response rate of 34.9%, returning 37 of 106 surveys. The elementary student teachers had a response rate of 23.3%, returning 14 of 60 surveys. The mentors reported that their student teacher was adequately prepared to teach literacy during student teaching (91.89%, 34/37). The majority of student teachers (57.14%, 8/14) believed that they were adequately prepared to teach literacy, while 42.86% (6/14) believed that they were not adequately prepared. Those who indicated that they were not adequately prepared included one student who did not earn a reading endorsement, against the recommendation of faculty. These results may indicate that while veteran teachers believe our candidates are prepared, our student teachers may lack confidence in teaching literacy.

The open-ended responses indicated that student teachers would like additional preparation in teaching literacy in grades 4-8. Student teachers and mentors indicated that additional preparation in grouping and phonics would be useful. The Simpson College literacy faculty, Dr. Sharon Jensen and Dr. Kate Lerseth, are making plans to implement additional instruction in grouping and teaching literacy in grades 4-8. They will also meet with Dr. Coryanne Harringan, professor of English, who teaches Eng 108: Linguistics and Writing, to map phonics instruction
and determine appropriate revisions to curriculum. These plans will be fully developed over the next year.

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Licensure and placement officer
- Registrar
- Administrative assistant
- Unit Faculty

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Curriculum exhibits
- Endorsement plans
- E-portfolios
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program Background from the University of Iowa Institutional Report:

Founded in 1847, the University of Iowa is Iowa's flagship university and a world-class teaching and research institution. A member of the Association of American Universities since 1909 and the Big Ten Conference since 1899, the University has business, dental, education, engineering, law, liberal arts and sciences, medical, nursing, pharmacy, public health, and graduate colleges. It is also tremendously proud of its more than 31,000 students and hundreds of thousands of loyal alumni.

The University boasts one of the nation's largest and most prestigious academic medical centers, including the Carver College of Medicine and University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics (UIHC). The University is a leader in innovation and entrepreneurship. With the dynamic Tippie College of Business, a growing College of Engineering, and an expanding research park, the University is poised to transform today's nascent ideas into tomorrow's successful companies. A pioneer in higher education, the University was the first public university in the United States to admit men and women on an equal basis and regardless of race. It also led the country in inventing the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree. The renowned Iowa Writers' Workshop and International Writing Program remain the most respected and competitive in the world. In addition, the University is the proud recipient of the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, the gold standard of recognition for community engagement efforts at institutions of higher education.

The University of Iowa values teaching and research excellence, academic freedom, diversity, and shared governance. Central to the University's mission is a distinguished faculty of more than 1,600 tenured and tenure-track faculty and 1,100 clinical-track and other faculty across all colleges. Expert staff, including more than 12,600 in the University and 11,000 in the hospital and UI Health Care, provide outstanding support services. Situated in Iowa City, on the picturesque Iowa River, the campus spans 1,700 acres and more than 500 major buildings.

In pursuing its missions of teaching, research, and service, the University of Iowa seeks to advance scholarly and creative endeavor through leading-edge research and artistic production; to use this research and creativity to enhance undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, health care, and other services provided to the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world; and to educate students for success and personal fulfillment in a diverse world. The University of Iowa carries out its academic mission primarily through its 12 colleges, which offer undergraduate and graduate education, professional education, and education and training in the health sciences.

The University of Iowa has a long history of innovation when it comes to teaching and research in education. Five of the University’s first six graduates in 1858 were in teacher education, and the University of Iowa created the nation’s first college-level department of education in 1872. The University’s most successful and visible spin-off, ACT, was the product of Iowa Testing Programs’ (ITP) work and the entrepreneurialism of E.F. Lindquist. Lindquist’s invention of the optical scanner revolutionized the practice of standardized testing and led to the creation of companies that are now a part of Pearson.
Foreword from the University of Iowa Institutional Report:

As we carried out the self-study of our University of Iowa Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in conjunction with the Iowa Department of Education approval process, our goal throughout the self-study was to continue to promote and model a continuous improvement mindset relative to the self-study and the review process; “improve” as the operative word, rather than “prove.” The goal has not been to “stop what we’re doing” because a self-study in conjunction with the state approval process is underway, but rather, to continue moving the unit forward while at the same time providing an accurate snapshot of where we are, as well as where we have been since the last review.

Our goal has been to prepare and to be putting forward an institutional report that accurately reflects the University of Iowa EPPs in a format that demonstrates both brevity and clarity. This has been our intent in order to support a productive review that will yield formative feedback from colleagues from other EPPs that will contribute to our continuous improvement efforts for candidates in our programs and, in turn, their work with K-12 students across the state, nation, and world.
GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

281—79.10(256) Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.

79.10(1) A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.

79.10(2) The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.

79.10(3) The unit’s conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.

79.10(4) The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with ISSL standards.

79.10(5) The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.

79.10(6) When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.

79.10(7) The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:

a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;

b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;

c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;

d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and

e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.

79.10(8) The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.

79.10(9) The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.

79.10(10) Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- The Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services is a conduit to support academic units within the College of Education and across secondary levels in Colleges across the university, and advanced educator preparation programs.
• The transition of the elementary education program to the College of Education provides more direct oversight of the preparation of pre-service elementary teachers.
• Advisory groups within COE at the program, departmental, and college level provide multiple perspectives from stakeholders within and outside the college to enhance and support educator preparation.
• For teacher preparation, the conceptual framework (CF) is well developed and supported by research; CF guides unit assessment for continuous program improvement.
• Strong support for teaching is provided for faculty through the Center for Teaching. The University provides programs to support research for new faculty through connections to larger projects university wide.
• The recent hire of the COE Director of Assessment will provide coherence, alignment and shared understanding about assessment and the use of data for continuous improvement

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.10(1)** The team finds that there is no clear delineation of requirements for the work of program coordinators (PC). Individuals in PC positions indicate a significant time commitment for this work, without support/recognition. The team is concerned that the time required for PC work may negatively impact the individuals’ capacity to do the entire work of the faculty position well. The team recommends the unit examine the roles of PCs and the allotment of time in consideration of all faculty duties to ensure quality program delivery.

2. **79.10(1)** The team finds evidence that communication from COE Executive Leadership to faculty and staff is not purposeful, consistent, and transparent. There are a number of changes being considered/determined but faculty and staff have limited knowledge and understanding. The team recommends the unit consider methods to enhance communication on important issues.

3. **79.10(4)** The team finds insufficient evidence that the elementary education program is consistently embedding unit standards in curriculum and assessments. Students and faculty were not able to articulate knowledge of unit standards and how they are being integrated in syllabi, portfolio etc. The team recommends the unit examine alignment of unit (InTASC) standards across elementary education curriculum and make adjustments for consistent implementation.

4. **79.10(5)** The team does not find evidence of consistent and efficient use of the TEP advisory committee, including the use of data for soliciting advice. The team recommends that the unit formalize processes (i.e., meeting every semester and prioritized advance notification of meeting, explicit communication about role/responsibilities, annual review of how changes are being implemented from feedback provided), to make this committee more useful.
5. **79.10(7)a** Interviews with faculty and program coordinators indicates that there are not sufficient numbers of faculty for the work required. The team recommends the unit examine the roles and work of faculty compared to capacity to make adjustments as needed.

6. **79.10(7)e** The team finds evidence that the number of support staff positions has decreased significantly in recent years while the amount and complexity of work required has increased. The team is concerned that this may negatively impact the unit’s capacity to provide adequate support for a quality program. The team recommends the unit examine the roles and workload of administrative support staff to ensure equity and capacity.

7. **79.10(9)** The team finds evidence that adjunct faculty in the educational leadership program do not understand the unit expectations for curriculum and the program. The team recommends the unit examine policies and communication for adjunct faculty and makes adjustments in order to ensure provision of a quality program.

**Concerns:**
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.10(5)** Members of the advisory board for educational leadership programs reported being solicited for only one advisory board discussion in the last year. The requirement is that advisory committees are solicited twice each year. The team requires the unit to document policy for soliciting information from the educational leadership advisory board at least twice each year.

2. **79.10(7)d** The team finds evidence in the educational leadership program that one clinical faculty member is in charge of supervising 32 principal and superintendent candidates in clinical experiences across the state. The team is concerned that one position cannot provide quality supervision (observation, support, feedback) for such a large number of candidates. The team requires the unit to examine roles and capacity for supervision and make adjustments to provide quality clinical experiences.

**Resolution of Concern #1:**
Unit leadership determined the best course of action was to develop a separate advisory board for the educational leadership programs. The unit has begun determining membership and soliciting members. The first of the bi-annual administrative program advisory board meeting will take place in spring of 2019. **The team considers this standard MET.** Department consultants will examine evidence of bi-annual advisory board meetings during the one-year follow up review.

**Resolution of Concern #2:**
After discussion between the Dean of the College of Education and other members of university administration team, the decision was made to add another clinical faculty line to alleviate the supervision overload in the educational leadership preparation program. The
position is to be filled no later than fall of 2019. **The team considers this standard MET.** Department consultants will examine documentation of hiring and faculty qualifications during the one-year follow up review.

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

Executive Vice President and Provost, Associate Provost, Interim Vice President for Research, Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education, Dean, the Graduate College, Associate Provost Assessment, Dean, College of Education, Associate Dean Teacher Education and Student Services, Academic Department Executive Officers, Program Coordinators/Chairs (ELED & Secondary), Teacher Education Prep Advisory members (local principals, adjuncts, AEAs, alumni), Director of Finance, Associate Director Employer Engagement, Executive Associate Registrar, Administrative Assistants

Review of:

- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators?

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIVERSITY**

**281—79.11(256) Diversity standard.** The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

**79.11(1)** The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.

**79.11(2)** The institution’s and unit’s plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.

**Initial Team Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commendations/Strengths:

- The team finds that the TEP and the College of Education offer a number of diversity related initiatives for students, including the Diversity in Education Conference, MLK Symposium, and student-sponsored events.
- The team finds that the Diversity Committee recognizes the need for diversity related engagement. This COE committee includes faculty, students, and staff and seeks to create a space for intellectual engagement and community on these important issues.
- The team recognizes the new full-time diversity coordinator (Sept 2017) for the TEP program. This position will allow for the continued recruitment of diverse students.
- The team appreciates the holistic approaches taken when admitting students into the TEP. Along with GPA, the admissions committee is also looking at academic history, content area, recommendation letters, statement of purpose, etc. to get a sense of the whole student.
- Great work is being done to promote and support diversity through the Teacher Leadership Center. There are specific tracks devoted to providing opportunities for candidates and faculty to serve students with disabilities as well as English Language Learners.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. 79.11(1) The team finds programmatic support (i.e., diversity in education conference, workshops, etc.) for students. However, curricular support (i.e., race/ethnicity and gender studies classes, etc.) for students is limited in scope. The team also finds programmatic/curricular support for faculty to be limited. The team recommends the unit examine support and curriculum to better support and prepare candidates and faculty to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

Concerns:

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:

College of Education Admissions, Focus Groups (current TEP Elementary/Secondary education students), Senior Associate to the President on Diversity, Title IX Coordinator, COE Diversity Committee Co-Chairs, Foundations of Education class, Human Relations in the Classroom class
Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Institutional report
- University and COE websites
- Program response to review team’s initial report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FACULTY**

**281—79.12(256) Faculty standard.** Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.

79.12(1) The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.

79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member’s preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.

79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.

79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.

79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:

a. Colleagues in the unit;

b. Colleagues across the institution;

c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

**Initial Team Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Commendations/Strengths:

- The team heard from faculty that a Secondary Program Coordinator group is being established. This is a good plan for organization, communication, and collaboration.
- The faculty seem very clear on requirements for evaluation, promotion, and tenure.
- The unit consists of many members who are leaders in their respective fields.
- Faculty members have strong research agendas.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. 79.12(1) The team finds references to faculty identifications such as course supervisor, primary instructor, team teaching, and teaching assistants. The team finds no evidence that the descriptions of the qualifications for these positions are consistent, resulting in assignments for faculty to teach courses for which they are not qualified. The team recommends the unit examine faculty position descriptions for clarity and utility, with documentation of policies.

2. 79.12(3) The team finds evidence of inconsistent evaluation of part time faculty. A number of part time faculty members described a lack of evaluation. In discussion with education leadership program administrators, the only evaluation of part-time adjunct faculty in that program occurs through student course evaluations. The team recommends the unit examine and update evaluation of part time faculty members to ensure quality, consistent and aligned instruction.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. 79.12(2) The team does not find documented evidence of verification of the alignment of teaching duties for a number of faculty members. The team requires the unit to examine faculty qualifications and teaching assignments and make adjustments to resolve concerns. The list of faculty members was provided to the unit.

2. 79.12(5)c. The team does not find documented evidence related to a number of faculty members maintaining recent and ongoing collaboration and involvement with colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. For those faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration. The team provided a list of faculty members to the unit.

Resolution of Concern #1:
The unit described a number of resolutions. Of the 22 faculty members identified, eight are no longer teaching at the university, and five no longer teach courses in an endorsement sequence. Three faculty members (AB, Mhn, DM) provided additional documentation that
illustrates their acceptable qualifications. Three faculty members (MC, DH, and GF) provided plans to gain qualifications over the next academic year. Department consultants will monitor their progress.

The unit provided more detailed information on one faculty member, A.Mo. This person has graduated from the University of Iowa teacher education program, and earned an MA in Art Education, but has no teaching experience beyond student teaching, yet is serving as a TA in an art methods course. The unit has identified her teaching as being limited to studio sections of the course which entail working with hands-on creative art processes, and do not address pedagogical implications. All pedagogy is taught by the qualified FT faculty member, thus A.Mo. is teaching studio art content rather than art education. A.Mo. is participating in P-12 classroom experiences on a limited capacity, with plans to continue to do so. **The team considers A.Mo. qualified for the limited teaching she is doing in this course.**

One faculty member (J.Se) has classroom experience but very little in the content area she is currently teaching. The team considers J.Se qualified, but suggests she focus PD efforts in her field.

The unit also provided sample position offer forms for faculty positions. The form for open rank faculty (special education) clearly articulates qualifications for the teaching position. While the sample position offer form for teaching assistant (TA) does not articulate qualifications for the position, the TA application form clearly requires information on qualifications for a teaching assistant position. Based on the open rank offer form and the TA application form, the **unit is in compliance with the standard.** The team suggests the TA offer for be adjusted to align with the open rank offer form if possible. **The team considers this standard MET.**

**Resolution of Concern #2:**

A significant number of faculty members do not have the required 40 hours in the past five years. The unit has begun development of policies and documentation strategies for the requirements in this standard. The provided sample position offer form for open rank faculty articulate the requirement and requires four hours each semester. The teaching assistant sample position offer form states the requirement from the chapter 79 standard, but does not articulate policy as clearly as the open rank form.

Of the 70 faculty members identified in this standard, 36 are no longer teaching in the university or in preparation courses. Four have been determined to be teaching courses for which the collaboration requirement does not apply. Sixteen have provided evidence that documents compliance with this standard. Fourteen have provided documented plans for achieving and/or continuing collaboration to meet the 40 hour requirement. **The team considers this standard MET.**

Department consultants will examine documentation for implementation and on-going application of initiatives in place to resolve the two faculty standard concerns in the one-year follow up review.
Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Unit Faculty (full-time, part-time, supervisors), Program Coordinators, DEOs

Review of:
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report
- Faculty Curriculum Vitae
- Teaching assignments

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ASSESSMENT

281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. The unit’s assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.

79.13(1) The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.
79.13(2) The assessment system is based on unit standards.
79.13(3) The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.
79.13(4) Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:
   a. Entrance into the program (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16).
   b. Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.
   c. Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).
   d. Program completion (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16; see subrule 79.15(5) for required teacher candidate assessment).
79.13(5) Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.
   b. Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.
   c. Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.
   d. Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.
   e. Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.
   f. Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.
   g. Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.
79.13(6) Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:

a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.

b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.

c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.

d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.

e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle.

79.13(7) The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.

79.13(8) The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.

79.13(9) The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.

**Initial Team Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Or</th>
<th>Met with Strength</th>
<th>Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Commendations/Strengths:**

- Programs in School Counseling, School Social Work, Teacher Librarians and Speech/Language Pathology and Audiologist are nationally accredited. These programs show clear alignment to national standards and assess candidates according to those national standards. Through these processes, the programs have an established process to regularly review, evaluate, and revise the assessment system.

- In School Counseling, School Social Work, Teacher Librarians and Speech/Language Pathology and Audiologist candidates are assessed on their progression toward the standards in coursework and in clinical experiences. Faculty members meet with candidates each semester to discuss their progression in the program.

- Recently, the library program was recognized by their national accrediting body for their dissemination and use of alumni and employer surveys to guide program decisions.

- Students in school counseling report feeling they are taught national standards for their program extremely well as evidenced by the statement “National standards are hammered home in a good way.”

- The TEP used data to make substantial changes to their admissions requirements and added a professional dispositional qualities assessment. Faculty and staff reported satisfaction with the changes/additions and were particularly excited about the use of the dispositions assessment.

**Recommendations:**

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.13(1) Leadership** The unit has developed goals and verbally described a plan for developing a leadership program comprehensive assessment system based on standards.
The team recommends the unit document policies, standards alignment, action steps and timelines for implementation.

2. **79.13(2) Leadership** The program has identified course-specific assignments for each standard; however, it was not clear how those assignments were used as part of a cohesive assessment system. The team recommends the unit map standards with assessments and coursework.

3. **79.13(4)c Leadership** Candidates are not allowed to engage in fieldwork until they are approved by the clinical supervisor. It is unclear what criteria is used to make the decision. The team recommends the unit clarify and communicate criteria for admission to clinical experiences.

4. **79.13(5)d TEP:** The transition to the InTASC standards is not complete - students who are further along in the program (student teachers for example) are being evaluated on a newly developed evaluation form based on InTASC standards. This is the first time many of these students have seen/been aware of InTASC standards. The team recommends the unit align all assessments and evaluation instruments on the InTASC standards and communicate standards with candidates.

5. **79.13(5)b Leadership** Course assignments have been identified for each standard; however, the team does not find evidence that the assignments and associated rubrics are directly aligned to the standards. The team recommends the unit develop a system that more clearly allows candidates to demonstrate attainment of unit standards.

6. **79.13(6)d Leadership** The team did not find evidence of how evaluation data is shared with stakeholders. The team recommends the unit develop and implement policy to use data when soliciting advice from the advisory committee and other stakeholder groups.

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.13(2) TEP:** The unit has developed goals and a plan for moving ahead with this comprehensive assessment system based on InTASC standards. It is not clear if a written plan documenting the necessary action steps and dates have been determined. The team requires unit to document policies, standards alignment, action steps and timelines for implementation.

2. **79.13(5)a TEP:** Other than the use of the edTPA as the summative assessment, the team did not find evidence of how the program determines if their assessment measures/tools are fair, reliable, and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

3. **79.13(5)b TEP:** The team does not find evidence of how candidates are assessed on their progression on unit standards. For example, other than student teaching, syllabi did not
reference the InTASC standards. There is not evidence to indicate candidate completion of signature assignments show evidence of attainment of the standards. Faculty and candidates equate passing a course and uploading signature assignments as meeting standards. The team requires the unit to develop a system that more clearly allows candidates to demonstrate attainment of unit standards.

4. **79.13(5), 79.13(6), 79.13(8) Educational Leadership.** The team did not find evidence the leadership preparation program is conducting candidate and program assessment in accordance with standards. The following citations articulate this concern.

   A. **79.13(5)a Educational Leadership** The team did not find evidence of how the program determines if the measures/tools they use are fair, reliable, and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

   B. **79.13(5)c Educational Leadership** The team does not find evidence the program uses multiple measures to assess the candidate on each standard. The team requires the unit to implement multiple measures to assess candidates on each standard.

   C. **79.13(5)d Educational Leadership** There is not evidence the standards are addressed to show candidate progress on the standards at different developmental levels throughout the duration of the program. The team requires the unit to implement assessments to evaluate candidate progress at different developmental levels in the program.

   D. **79.13(6)a Educational Leadership** The team did not find evidence that individual assessment data on unit standards is analyzed. The team requires the unit to implement policy for analyzing assessment data for program assessment.

   E. **79.13(6)c Educational Leadership** The team did not find evidence of how the program is aggregating and using performance data to guide program improvements. The evaluations used for program assessments currently are perception based (alumni and course evaluation surveys). The team requires the unit to implement policy for aggregating and using candidate performance data for programmatic decisions.

   F. **79.13(8) Educational Leadership** The team does not find evidence that the unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system. The team requires the unit to implement policy for regularly reviewing and revising the assessment system.

**Resolution of Concern #1.**

The unit has clearly articulated, documented and communicated an action plan and timeline for modification of the assessment system using the Tk20 electronic system. **The team considers this standard MET.**

**Resolution of Concern #2.**

The unit has documented a clear plan to verify the fairness, validity and reliability of assessments. This work will be managed by the newly hired Assessment Coordinator position in
collaboration with the Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services. **The team considers this standard MET.**

**Resolution of Concern #3.**

The team noted that this concern was the most significant finding they determined in their self-study process for this program review. Because the unit identified this issue early in the review process, they have made significant progress in resolving this concern. The central focus of candidate progress assessment is the e-portfolio system. The unit has developed, piloted and revised a system of standards based assessments using the Tk20 assessment management system. The unit continues to refine and improve this system. **The team considers this standard MET.**

**Resolution of Concern #4.**

The unit has addressed this concern in a number of ways. The College of Education has hired an assessment coordinator, a newly created position. The unit has assigned the assessment coordinator oversight of the resolution of this compliance concern. Under the coordinator’s direction, a number of continuing initiatives have begun:

- Redesign assessments and alignment of assessments with standards and instruction
- Comparing results of multiple assessments
- Refining and consistently using rubrics for inter-rater reliability
- Assessment Coordinator will oversee review of assessment practices using data
- Implementation of an ISSL standards alignment form to ensure proper multiple assessment measures are being used in each course
- Ensure use of standards alignment form by each instructor for course assessments
- All faculty will examine the standards alignment form and other materials annually for relevance
- Establishment of a summer faculty retreat to examine the assessment system and recommend adjustments according to data

Based on the initiatives in place, **the team considers this standard MET.**

Department consultants will examine documentation for implementation and on-going application of initiatives in place to resolve the four assessment standard concerns in the one-year follow up review.

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

- Associate Dean for TEP in the College of Education, Instructional Technology Director, Assessment Director, Dean of the College of Education, Adjuncts, Candidates, Alumni, Unit Faculty, Library Director(s), Content Area Faculty, Overview of Assessment Systems with TEP and School Psych, Ed Leadership, School Counseling, and School Psychology
Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- E-portfoliо
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL

281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.

79.14(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

79.14(2) PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:
   a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and
   b. High-quality cooperating teachers.

79.14(3) Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates’ achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ attainment of unit standards.

79.14(4) Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.

79.14(5) Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.

79.14(6) Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:
   a. High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.
   b. Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.
   c. The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment.
The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:

a. Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 consecutive weeks in duration during the teacher candidate’s final year of the teacher preparation program.

b. Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.

c. Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.

d. Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate’s classroom.

e. Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.

f. Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.

g. Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).

h. Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate’s permanent record.

The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.

The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted Below |

Commendations/Strengths:

- The team finds the student teaching handbook contains thorough information that will support and be a source for cooperating teachers throughout the student teaching placement. Interviews indicate cooperating teachers appreciate the online and hard copy of the handbook.

- The team finds that students in the elementary education program exceed the minimum 80 hours of field experiences.

- The team finds that the TEP is quick to respond to issues that arise with students in field placements, including student teaching.

- The team finds that for elementary education students (practicum and student teaching) there are almost weekly 3-way conferences between cooperating teacher, supervisor, and student to evaluate lessons taught focused on areas of strengths and areas for growth.
• The team finds students in the Literature I, II, and III sequence receive close supervision and detailed feedback in their clinical settings. Students are highly appreciative and complimentary of the strategies learned regarding diverse students in Literature III.
• Teacher Librarian: The team finds positive collaboration between the faculty, supervisors, and students. All feel well-supported and personally involved in the clinical processes.
• Teacher Librarian: The team finds that adjunct faculty and graduates spoke highly of experiences in the programs and found them purposeful and integrated to appropriate standards.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.14(1):** The team finds that cooperating teachers in pre-student teaching clinical experiences request more guidance. Specifically they need guidance on practicum expectations to ensure each student is maximizing opportunities for learning in clinical settings. The team recommends the unit clarify, document and communicate clinical experience expectations to ensure all candidates maximize learning.

2. **9.14(4)** The team does not find clear evidence that teacher candidates are receiving substantive experiences in working with diverse learners (i.e., race, class, disability, non-traditional, etc.). Information regarding types of diversity does not appear to be tracked in a systemic or purposeful manner. The team recommends the unit examine requirements for placements and experiences to ensure candidates are well prepared to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1. **79.14(6):** The team finds inconsistencies for Secondary Teacher Education students in the number and quality of practicum opportunities prior to student teaching. Some programs offer multiple opportunities while others may only offer one without a requirement to interact with students. The team requires the unit to evaluate the secondary education program to develop and implement policy to ensure equity in opportunity and quality of clinical experiences.

2. **79.14(7e):** The team does not find evidence that the mock evaluation was taking place during the student teaching experience. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure mock evaluations takes place and are useful.

3. **79.14(8):** The team finds concern with the duration, content, and attendance of the workshop for cooperating teachers. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure the cooperating teacher workshop is used to meet the needs of cooperating teachers and the program.
Resolution of Concern #1.

The unit has made efforts to articulate UI requirements for active engagement during practica. Each secondary program has written a letter to cooperating teachers stating the requirement for active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment. Many syllabi define how a candidate may meet the requirement for the active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment, while some are not as clear. The syllabi for Foreign Language education, EDTL 4406 and 4407, have been changed to move requirements from reliance on observation to classroom interaction. The team suggests the Foreign Language department more clearly articulate active engagement opportunities and requirements as is done in other departments within the unit. The team considers this standard MET.

Resolution of Concern #2.

The unit has implemented policy to ensure mock evaluations are taking place. Further, the unit is moving to an electronic assessment management system, and once in place, will document completion of the mock evaluation for each candidate. The team cautions the unit on using requirements, forms and guidance from 2003, since the chapter 79 standards and guidance have been rewritten twice since that time. The team considers this standard MET.

Resolution of Concern #3.

The unit has designed and implemented a new method of providing workshop information over four separate meetings and a webinar. The unit has also updated the information provided in these meetings to provide pertinent information for cooperating teachers to meet the requirements of the unit program. The team considers this standard MET.

Department consultants will examine documentation for implementation and on-going application of initiatives in place to resolve the three teacher clinical standard concerns in the one-year follow up review.

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Cooperating teachers, supervising teachers, student teachers, practicum students, principals, Director of Student Teaching and Clinical Experiences, focus group participants

Review of:
- Student records
- Course syllabi
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators
Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

281—79.15(256) Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Teacher candidates demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.15(1) Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge including but not limited to English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

79.15(2) Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:

a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

b. Students with disabilities.

c. Students who are gifted and talented.

d. English language learners.

e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.

79.15(3) Each teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge about literacy and receives preparation in literacy. Each candidate also develops and demonstrates the ability to integrate reading strategies into content area coursework. Each teacher candidate in elementary education demonstrates knowledge related to the acquisition of literacy skills and receives preparation in a variety of instructional approaches to reading programs, including but not limited to reading recovery.

79.15(4) Each unit defines unit standards (aligned with InTASC standards) and embeds them in courses and field experiences.

79.15(5) Each teacher candidate exhibits competency in all of the following professional core curricula:

a. Content/subject matter specialization. The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the discipline(s) the candidate teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the subject matter meaningful for students. This specialization is evidenced by a completion of a 30-semester-hour teaching major which must minimally include the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements, or secondary level occupational endorsements. The teacher candidate must either meet or exceed a score above the 25th percentile nationally on subject assessments designed by a nationally recognized testing service that measure pedagogy and knowledge of at least one subject area as approved by the director of the department of education, or the teacher candidate must meet or exceed the equivalent of a score above the 25th percentile nationally on an alternate assessment also approved by the director. The alternate assessment must be a valid and reliable subject-area-specific, performance-based assessment for preservice teacher candidates that is centered on student learning. Additionally, each elementary teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal
interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours.
b. **Student learning.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of human growth and development and of how students learn and participates in learning opportunities that support intellectual, career, social and personal development.
c. **Diverse learners.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners.
d. **Instructional planning.** The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, curriculum goals, and state curriculum models.
e. **Instructional strategies.** The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of and an ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills.
f. **Learning environment/classroom management.** The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior; creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; maintains effective classroom management; and is prepared to address behaviors related to substance abuse and other high-risk behaviors.
g. **Communication.** The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, and other forms of symbolic representation, to foster active inquiry and collaboration and to support interaction in the classroom.
h. **Assessment.** The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student, and effectively uses both formative and summative assessment of students, including student achievement data, to determine appropriate instruction.
i. **Foundations, reflective practice and professional development.** The teacher candidate develops knowledge of the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education. The teacher candidate continually evaluates the effects of the candidate’s choices and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community; actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally; and demonstrates an understanding of teachers as consumers of research and as researchers in the classroom.
j. **Collaboration, ethics and relationships.** The teacher candidate fosters relationships with parents, school colleagues, and organizations in the larger community to support student learning and development; demonstrates an understanding of educational law and policy, ethics, and the profession of teaching, including the role of boards of education and education agencies; and demonstrates knowledge of and dispositions for cooperation with other educators, especially in collaborative/co-teaching as well as in other educational team situations.
k. **Technology.** The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.
l. **Methods of teaching.** Methods of teaching have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level endorsement desired.

79.15(6) Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in content coursework directly related to the Iowa core.

79.15(7) Each teacher candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended.

79.15(8) Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.
Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- The elementary literacy course sequence provide candidates opportunities to plan, instruct, and assess literacy in depth.
- Candidates take courses in both technology and classroom management.
- EdTPA support helps candidate clearly understand standards.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. **79.15(4)** The team finds evidence through syllabi review of inconsistent use of InTASC standards except in the student teaching seminar. The team recommends the unit examine the application of InTASC standards in curriculum and assessments to ensure candidates are able to demonstrate the InTASC standards.

2. **79.15(4)** Evidence indicates that portfolio key assessments are often determined by individual faculty members rather than being aligned to standards. The team recommends the unit examine the consistency of alignment of standards and portfolio assessments.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Current students, student teachers, unit faculty, local administrators, advisors

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators
Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATOR CLINICAL**

281—79.16(256) Administrator preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful school administrators in accordance with the following provisions.

79.16(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating administrators.

79.16(2) The PK-12 school and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and

b. High-quality cooperating administrators.

79.16(3) Cooperating administrators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate’s achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ attainment of unit standards.

79.16(4) Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:

a. A minimum of 400 hours during the candidate’s preparation program.

b. Take place with appropriately licensed cooperating administrators in state-approved schools or educational facilities.

c. Take place in multiple high-quality educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups.

d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating administrators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEA’s and for higher education supervising faculty members.

e. Include prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities of the candidate for ethical performance of both leadership and management tasks.

f. The involvement of the administrator candidate in relevant responsibilities to include demonstration of the capacity to facilitate the use of assessment data in affecting student learning.

g. Involve the candidate in professional meetings and other school-based activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning.

h. Involve the candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating administrators in the school.

79.16(5) The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating administrators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating administrator, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating administrator other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.

79.16(6) The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for administrator candidates.
Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- The clinical coordinator makes efforts to introduce mentors to other faculty so that they can be used as guest speakers in classes throughout the program beyond the clinical experience.
- Adjunct instructors express appreciation for the professional development/learning activities offered to them.
- Expectations for candidates, administrators, and the clinical coordinator are clearly delineated in the Clinical Handbook.
- The program is making changes to clinical experience based on 2016-2017 feedback.
- 12 hours of coursework must be completed before qualifying for clinicals and research & theory course
- Clinical Supervisor meets with candidate a minimum of 3 times
- Every candidate is required to complete a clinical project

Recommendations
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1. 79.16(4) The team found inconsistency in the diversity of clinical placements. This is partially due to candidates being tasked with seeking their own placements. This is manifested in two ways. The program does not ensure clinical settings are different from that in which the candidate may be teaching. Management of clinical placements does not consistently provide experience in working with a wide range of student needs. The team recommends the unit examine requirements for clinical placements and experiences to ensure candidates are consistently well prepared to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

Concerns:
1. (Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
  Cooperating administrators, supervisors, candidates, focus group participants
Review of:
- Student records
- Course syllabi
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ADMINISTRATOR KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS (CURRICULUM)

281—79.17(256) Administrator knowledge, skills, and dispositions standard. Administrator candidates shall demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.17(1) Each educational administrator program shall define program standards (aligned with current ISSL standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice administrator.

79.17(2) Each new administrator candidate successfully completes the appropriate evaluator training provided by a state-approved evaluator trainer.

79.17(3) Each administrator candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support the implementation of the Iowa core.

79.17(4) Each administrator candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that administrator candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:

a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

b. Students with disabilities.

c. Students who are gifted and talented.

d. English language learners.

e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.

79.17(5) Each administrator candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Commendations/Strengths:
- Students are creating a comprehensive entry plan in the program, which they present to the education leadership faculty. This entry plan is evidence of overall learning throughout the program and will help them be marketable to the field after earning the degree.
- Course syllabi for ELPS 6265 and ELPS 6383 are clearly and effectively align to the Iowa Core.
- Education leadership students are required to attend the Iowa School Finance and Leadership Conference each year to develop their skills and understanding of Iowa School Finance.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

None

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
- Current candidates, unit faculty, local administrators, advisors

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM CLINICAL

281—79.20(256) Clinical practice standard. The unit and its school, AEA, and facility partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful practitioners in accordance with the following provisions.

79.20(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating professional educators.

79.20(2) The PK-12 school, AEA, and facility partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:
   a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and
   b. High-quality cooperating professional educators.

79.20(3) Cooperating professional educators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate’s achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate the candidate’s attainment of unit standards.

79.20(4) Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:
   a. Learning that takes place in the context of providing high-quality instructional programs for students in a state-approved school, agency, or educational facility;
   b. Take place in educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups;
   c. Provide opportunities for candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice;
   d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating professional educators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members;
   e. Include prescribed minimum expectations for involvement of candidates in relevant responsibilities directed toward the work for which they are preparing;
   f. Involve candidates in professional meetings and other activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning; and
   g. Involve candidates in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating professional educators in the school.

79.20(5) The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating professional educators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating professional educators, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating professional educators other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.

79.20(6) The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for candidates.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met | Or | Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions | Noted Below |
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Commendations/Strengths:

- **School Social Work, School Psychology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Professional School Counseling:** Recent graduate and current students speak highly of opportunities to practice and perfect their skills in meaningful and appropriate settings.
- **School Social Work, School Psychology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Professional School Counseling:** Recent graduate and current students indicate close, careful, and high-quality supervision with multiple opportunities for immediate and helpful feedback.
- **School Psychology:** Recent graduates and current students indicated the program required and monitored diverse placements including gifted/talented, urban/rural, race/ethnicity, and a variety of settings.
- **School Social Work:** Student performance in clinical experiences is assessed through the Learning Contract with practice behaviors, specific competencies, and rating scales that inform practice and show growth.
- **Communication Sciences and Disorders, School Psychology, and School Social Work:** Program students, supervisors, and faculty indicated collaborative relationships with AEA’s involving selection of sites, supervisors and experiences.
- **Professional School Counseling:** Documents and interviews indicate multiple evaluations of students, practicum sites, and a close alignment to standards.
- **School Social Work:** Interviews with faculty indicate a clear and structured system of evaluating potential sites prior to student practica allowing for a meaningful and strong experience.
- **Professional School Counseling:** Has a clinical coordinator who manages clinical experiences well. Students can recommend which school they would like to work in, but coordinator will make the placement. Students go to an initial visit where they meet the site supervisor and interview each other for a strong match
- Evidence indicates that all programs have clinical experiences that are well aligned with curriculum and well sequenced.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

**79.20(4)e. School Counseling:** Candidates clearly articulated learning about classroom structures such as PBIS and 504 plans. However, they described a lack of opportunities for application of this learning in clinical settings. The tea recommends the unit examine clinical opportunities and requirements to provide application of learning whenever possible.

**79.20(4)** Candidates suggested the program consider changing the practicum schedule that is only once a week. Their suggestion is to have multiple, successive days of practica to better allow for skill development or relationship building with P12 students. The team recommends the unit consider the candidates’ suggestions in scheduling practica.
Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
   Unit faculty, local administrators, focus group participants, adjunct faculty, supervisors,

Review of:
   • Course syllabi
   • Student records
   • Institutional Report
   • Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OTHER EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS (CURRICULUM)

281—79.21(256) Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Candidates shall demonstrate the content knowledge and the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.21(1) Each professional educator program shall define program standards (aligned with current national standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice professional educator.

79.21(2) Each candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:
   a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
   b. Students with disabilities.
   c. Students who are gifted and talented.
   d. English language learners.
   e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.
79.21(3) Each candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- **Professional School Counseling**: Evidence is clear of use and alignment of the 2016 CACREP standards in coursework, clinical practices, and licensure requirements. The program is accredited by CACREP.
- **School Psychology**: The program is accredited by the American Psychological Association and approved by the National Association of School Psychologists. There is clear evidence of alignment of standards, curriculum, and assessments, as seen in syllabi and other course materials.
- **Speech/Language Pathology and Audiology**: Evidence indicates clear alignments with the academic and clinical Knowledge and Skills Assessment (KASA) standards from the American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA.)
- **School Social Work**: Evidence indicates clear use and alignment with the MSW Foundation Competencies and Practice Behaviors in coursework, clinical practices, and licensure requirements. The program is nationally accredited.
- **Teacher Librarian**: Evidence indicates clear alignment and use of the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) standards in alignment with Iowa licensure standards.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

79.21(1) **School Counseling**: Candidates described struggles with the change from a 3 year program to a 2.5 year program. Their concerns are summer coursework tuition costs and maintenance of financial and benefit support after completing the program (and TA employment) mid-year when positions are difficult to find. The team recommends the unit communicate with and consider the candidates’ concerns when determining program schedules.

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None
Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
   Unit faculty, administrators, focus group participants, adjunct faculty, supervisors,

Review of:
   • Course syllabi
   • Student records
   • Institutional Report
   • Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with candidates
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating educators, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX: UI Responses to Team Report

University of Iowa
Practitioner Preparation Programs Review

Iowa Department of Education
Team Report

Preliminary Review: December 12, 2017
Site Visit: February 18-22, 2018
Final Report: May 9, 2018

Presented to the State Board of Education on:

Review Team Members:

Dr. Lawrence Bice, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Chad Biermeier, University of Dubuque
Dr. James Cryer, University of Northern Iowa
Dr. Trent Grundmeyer, Drake University
Dr. Shawna Hudson, Iowa Wesleyan University
Dr. Gaetane Jean-Marie, University of Northern Iowa
Mr. Matt Ludwig, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Kris Kilibarda, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Kevin Lam, Drake University
Dr. Carole Richardson, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Debra Stork, University of Dubuque
Dr. Carolyn Wiezorek, Clarke University
Acknowledgements

Team members would like to express their gratitude to the University of Iowa community for their hospitality and assistance in facilitating the team’s work. The tasks associated with the review process necessitate intense focus by reviewers during a concentrated period of time. Everyone we encountered graciously responded to our questions and requests for materials. We interacted with a wide variety of individuals who demonstrated enthusiasm, professionalism, and dedication to this program.

The team expresses its appreciation for the work of all involved with a special thank you to those whose roles were integral in the success of this visit. Some of those people are:

Dr. Daniel Clay, Dean, College of Education (COE)
Dr. Nancy Langguth Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services
Mr. David Tingwald, Office of Student Services
Ms. Amy Bennett, Office of Student Services
Mr. Jim Verry, Office of Student Services
Ms. Katherine Mossman, Coordinator, Academic Advising and Licensure
Governance and Resources

GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

281—79.10(256) Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.

79.10(1) A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.

79.10(2) The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.

79.10(3) The unit’s conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.

79.10(4) The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with ISSL standards.

79.10(5) The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.

79.10(6) When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.

79.10(7) The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:

   a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;
   b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;
   c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;
   d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and
   e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.

79.10(8) The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.

79.10(9) The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.

79.10(10) Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions | Not Met |

Commendations/Strengths:

- The Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services is a conduit to support academic units within the College of Education and across secondary levels in Colleges across the university, and advanced educator preparation programs.
- The transition of the elementary education program to the College of Education provides more direct oversight of the preparation of pre-service elementary teachers.
Advisory groups within COE at the program, departmental, and college level provide multiple perspectives from stakeholders within and outside the college to enhance and support educator preparation.

For teacher preparation, the conceptual framework (CF) is well developed and supported by research; CF guides unit assessment for continuous program improvement.

Strong support for teaching is provided for faculty through the Center for Teaching. The University provides programs to support research for new faculty through connections to larger projects university wide.

The recent hire of the COE Director of Assessment will provide coherence, alignment and shared understanding about assessment and the use of data for continuous improvement.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.10(1) The team finds that there is no clear delineation of requirements for the work of program coordinators (PC). Individuals in PC positions indicate a significant time commitment for this work, without support/recognition. The team is concerned that the time required for PC work may negatively impact the individuals’ capacity to do the entire work of the faculty position well. The team recommends the unit examine the roles of PCs and the allotment of time in consideration of all faculty duties to ensure quality program delivery.

Program Coordinators Duties and Load

We appreciate this recommendation and acknowledge the time commitment required of program coordinators. The work of program coordination takes many forms and requires varying levels of time commitment across departments and programs depending on the numbers of students in a given program, whether the program includes graduate and/or undergraduate students, and the number of courses offered in the program. It is difficult, therefore, to create one college level policy for program coordinator recognition, support, and compensation. To ensure that program coordinators are adequately supported and recognized, and to ensure quality program delivery, Department Executive Officers will be asked to create transparent guidelines both for evaluating program coordinator time commitment relative to other duties, and also for providing support, recognition, and compensation for program coordinator duties in a manner that is fair and equitable. Job descriptions for program coordinators will be created with clear articulation of responsibilities and how the role fits into faculty workload assignments. [Response Item 1]
2) 79.10(1) The team finds evidence that communication from COE Executive Leadership to faculty and staff is not purposeful, consistent, and transparent. There are a number of changes being considered/determined but faculty and staff have limited knowledge and understanding. The team recommends the unit consider methods to enhance communication on important issues.

College of Education - Executive Leadership Communication

The College of Education's (COE) Executive Council met over the summer to discuss this recommendation and to consider methods for enhancing communication on important issues. One idea that came from this meeting that we have already implemented is a periodic email from Dean Clay providing faculty and staff with updates on key happenings in the College and at the University. For instance, in Dean Clay’s recent COE Update, he provided faculty and staff with a table documenting our current enrollment numbers in each program along with the change in these numbers over the past year; an update on our collegiate review with a link to the final report from the Provost; a mention of Dean Clay’s plans to meet with our Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to discuss a draft of our new strategic plan; a list of topics discussed in recent Executive Council meeting; and an update on the university level committees Dan Clay will be serving on this year.

Additional strategies will include:

- The Dean and/or associate dean(s) will meet with each department at least once each semester to discuss current issues and answer any questions;
- A informal gathering, “Donuts with the Dean,” will be scheduled at least once each month for small groups of faculty and staff;
- The Dean and/or Associate Dean(s) will meet with the FAC and Staff Advisory Council at least once per semester. Additionally, the FAC chair will be invited to at least one executive council meeting per semester to provide an update on FAC activities and get an update on collegiate issues handled in the Executive Council.

We will evaluate the success of this and other methods of communication we implement in the future with the goal of continuing to improve transparency and communication.

[Response Item 2]
3) 79.10(4) The team finds insufficient evidence that the elementary education program is consistently embedding unit standards in curriculum and assessments. Students and faculty were not able to articulate knowledge of unit standards and how they are being integrated in syllabi, portfolio etc. The team recommends the unit examine alignment of unit (InTASC) standards across elementary education curriculum and make adjustments for consistent implementation.

**Elementary Education TEP Embedding of Standards**

At the time of the Spring 2018 site visit, unit standards were embedded in more than 30 courses taught throughout the Elementary Education program, and assessed through the use of 53 ePortfolio signature assignments within those courses. Initially, candidates learned about how those courses and assessments were connected to standards when they initially developed their ePortfolio sites, as part of the requirements of the course, EDTL:3002 Technology in the Classroom. Once candidates completed ePortfolio signature assignments, the assignments were evaluated by the course instructors before being approved for upload to the teacher candidates’ ePortfolios.

The University of Iowa Teacher Education Program has made the decision to transition to the use of the Tk20 assessment system as the means to gather and analyze the assessment data resulting from teacher candidates’ standards-based performances. This transition has provided an opportunity for the elementary education program to review and revise how the program assures that all candidates meet and are assessed on the standards. With that in mind, the elementary education program plans to do the following: develop a curriculum map of where state standards are taught within the program, identify standards-based assessments within the program and incorporate those assessments into the Tk20 assessment system. They will also implement the use of a common syllabus template that will provide all candidates with information about the standards that are addressed in each elementary education course and how those standards contribute to the development of competent elementary education graduates. [Response Item 3]

4) 79.10(5) The team does not find evidence of consistent and efficient use of the TEP advisory committee, including the use of data for soliciting advice. The team recommends that the unit formalize processes (i.e, meeting every semester and prioritized advance notification of meeting, explicit communication about role/responsibilities, annual review of how changes are being implemented from feedback provided), to make this committee more useful.

**TEP Advisory Committee Updates on Membership and Activities**

This recommendation is very well taken and will ensure we are making the best use of the Teacher Education Program (TEP) Advisory Committee and the commitment members of the committee have made to serving in this advisory role for our TEP.

The College of Education plans to continue actively engaging the TEP Advisory Committee twice each academic year, and has determined it can generate the greatest benefit -- in feedback and input -- through a combination of on-campus and online input. We will continue to host on-campus meetings for the committee each spring, and to solicit their input by an online survey each fall. The Spring 2018 committee meeting was held April 25, 2018. The Fall 2018 survey was sent October 10, 2018; the survey questions were put forward by the TEP Coordinators and Directors who are ex officio members of the committee, and therefore are familiar with the committee’s membership, and the committee’s function relative to the TEP.
The final question on the Fall 2018 survey will hold us accountable to using program data for soliciting committee members’ input at the Spring 2019 on-campus meeting. “As we prepare for our April meeting on campus, what data from our Teacher Education Program would be of most interest to you for your review and input relative to our continuous improvement efforts?” When survey data are received they will be summarized -- with the assistance of the College of Education (COE) Assessment Coordinator -- and reviewed with the Teacher Education Committee (COE’s internal TEP advisory group) at an upcoming meeting (November 2018 or February 2019).

Please see the attachments for:
- A working roster of updates to the TEP Advisory Committee membership for the 2018-2019 academic year;
- Notice and agenda of the April 25, 2018 meeting; and
- Fall 2018 survey questions sent to the advisory committee. [Response Item 4. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

5) 79.10(7)a Interviews with faculty and program coordinators indicates that there are not sufficient numbers of faculty for the work required. The team recommends the unit examine the roles and work of faculty compared to capacity to make adjustments as needed.

Roles of Program Coordinators and Faculty
We appreciate this recommendation. The College of Education’s Executive Council is working closely with our Director of Finance and Budget and our newly hired Assessment Coordinator to better understand our program capacities and faculty needs. With the recent growth of our Elementary Education TEP, for example, we have committed to searching for new faculty members in Elementary Literacy and Music Education as well as two new faculty members in Special Education this year. We will continue to closely examine our program capacities and make additional adjustments as needed. [Response Item 5]
6) 79.10(7)e The team finds evidence that the number of support staff positions has decreased significantly in recent years while the amount and complexity of work required has increased. The team is concerned that this may negatively impact the unit's capacity to provide adequate support for a quality program. The team recommends the unit examine the roles and workload of administrative support staff to ensure equity and capacity.

Support Staff Adequate Support

The site visit team’s observation of the need for the College of Education (COE) to examine the roles and workload of administrative support staff to ensure equity and capacity is very well taken and continues to be given careful consideration by COE administrators and supervisors. As a case in point: in June, a half day was dedicated to a workshop for the 12 Office of Student Services staff members at an off-campus meeting venue in order to focus on roles, responsibilities, and workload of individual staff members relative to the Office of Student Services, the Teacher Education Program, and COE. The workshop incorporated strategies associated with the Baldrige Continuous Improvement Framework, a framework being applied to college-wide improvement efforts. One outcome of this workshop was the reconfiguration of the reception area and certain of the work stations in the Office of Student Services, with the goal being a more welcoming and efficient work space. As a result of the physical reconfiguration of the office, student employees are in a position to serve a reception function for the office, allowing permanent employees to focus on their work, while still remaining a welcoming office.

Additionally, COE administrators are aware of the added responsibilities that have “come to the College” now that COE is conferring degrees (Bachelor of Arts, with major in Elementary Education, with additional majors proposed). For this reason, the roles and responsibilities of certain staff members have been reviewed and are in the process of being revised. We are hopeful that the one-year follow-up visit will find us with progress to share on this effort. [Response Item 6]

7) 79.10(9) The team finds evidence that adjunct faculty in the educational leadership program do not understand the unit expectations for curriculum and the program. The team recommends the unit examine policies and communication for adjunct faculty and makes adjustments in order to ensure provision of a quality program.

Educational Leadership Expectations for Adjunct Faculty

As a first step in clarifying expectations, on August 15, 2018 the following email was sent to adjunct faculty in the Educational Leadership Program. This email was accompanied by the ISSL Standards Alignment Form, which is included with the artifacts for this response item.

Good Afternoon,

The University of Iowa Educational Leadership program underwent an Iowa Department of Education review in the Spring of 2018. The overall response from the visiting team was overall very positive but there were specific concerns that we need to address. The concerns were focused on the following areas:

a. Evidence that the program utilized multiple measures to assess the candidate on each standard.
b. Evidence that standards are addressed to show candidate progress at different development levels throughout the duration of the program.
c. The need for ongoing review of the assessment program and determination on how best to use candidate performance for programmatic decisions.

So....our core team put together the attached document to help us start down the path in addressing these concerns. You will note that the document can hopefully assist your planning efforts while providing ongoing feedback of student progress in meeting the standards throughout their program. In order to meet the need for ongoing review, we will do our best to schedule a time this fall to bring our adjunct and campus based faculty together for a meeting to discuss ongoing improvements in the program.

A secondary need is for all instructors to forward me their current syllabus at the beginning of each semester when they are scheduled to teach.

Please let me know if you have further questions,

Steven M. Triplett
Clinical Supervisor/Program Coordinator
University of Iowa Educational Leadership
[Email address redacted]

A meeting with all full-time and adjunct faculty members was held September 16, 2018, to discuss and clarify expectations of faculty and expected adherence with the Standards Alignment document. The full-time and adjunct faculty members will meet regularly at least twice each academic year, once in the Fall semester and once in the Spring semester. [Response Item 7. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.10(5) Members of the advisory board for educational leadership programs reported being solicited for only one advisory board discussion in the last year. The requirement is that advisory committees are solicited twice each year. The team requires the unit to document policy for soliciting information from the leadership advisory board at least twice each year.

New Educational Leadership Advisory Board to be Established
In a meeting held on September 16, 2018, the Educational Leadership faculty determined the program will develop a separate, program advisory board, as the most appropriate way to fulfill the purpose of this standard: in gaining meaningful feedback from administrators in the field for continuous improvement of the program. Over the remainder of the Fall 2018 semester, the Educational Leadership program faculty will identify and recruit members of the advisory board. Membership of the advisory board will be evenly divided between graduates of The University of Iowa’s Educational Leadership program and members from outside the College of Education.
The advisory board will meet twice each academic year: once in fall and once in the spring. The meetings will allow for the instructional team to share progress, program status, and with input from the advisory board, develop a continuous improvement plan focused on both short-term and long-term goals. The first meeting of Educational Leadership Advisory Board is anticipated for Spring 2019. [Response Item 8]

2) 79.10(7)d The team finds evidence in the educational leadership program that one clinical faculty member is in charge of supervising 32 principal and superintendent candidates in clinical experiences across the state. The team is concerned that one position cannot provide quality supervision (observation, support, feedback) for such a large number of candidates. The team requires the unit to examine roles and capacity for supervision and make adjustments to provide quality clinical experiences.

**Educational Leadership Clinical Supervision Load - New Faculty Search**

Discussions on the most efficient and effective manner to handle this concern have been held with the Departmental Executive Officer of the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies and the Dean of the College of Education (COE). The COE Dean has approved a search for an additional clinical faculty member in the Educational Leadership program. The potential starting date of the position would be the Spring 2019 semester, or at the latest, the Fall 2019 semester. The job description is under development as of September 2018. [Response Item 9]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

Executive Vice President and Provost, Associate Provost, Interim Vice President for Research, Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education, Dean, the Graduate College, Associate Provost Assessment, Dean, College of Education, Associate Dean Teacher Education and Student Services, Academic Department Executive Officers, Program Coordinators/Chairs (ELED & Secondary), Teacher Education Prep Advisory members (local principals, adjuncts, AEA’s, alumni), Director of Finance, Associate Director Employer Engagement, Executive Associate Registrar, Administrative Assistants

Review of:
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators?

**Final Recommendation:**

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted | Not Met |
Diversity

DIVERSITY

281—79.11(256) Diversity standard. The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.11(1) The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.
79.11(2) The institution’s and unit’s plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- The team finds that the TEP and the College of Education offer a number of diversity related initiatives for students, including the Diversity in Education Conference, MLK Symposium, and student-sponsored events.
- The team finds that the Diversity Committee recognizes the need for diversity related engagement. This COE committee includes faculty, students, and staff and seeks to create a space for intellectual engagement and community on these important issues.
- The team recognizes the new full-time diversity coordinator (Sept 2017) for the TEP program. This position will allow for the continued recruitment of diverse students.

**Full-time Recruitment Coordinator, not Diversity Coordinator**

We are requesting that this commendation be redacted or revised for accuracy, as the College does not have a “full-time diversity coordinator for the TEP.” That said, the College **does** have a full-time TEP Recruitment Coordinator who continues to be cognizant of the College’s goal to diversify the TEP and the profession. [Response Item 10]

- The team appreciates the holistic approaches taken when admitting students into the TEP. Along with GPA, the admissions committee is also looking at academic history, content area, recommendation letters, statement of purpose, etc. to get a sense of the whole student.

**TEP Admission Holistic Approach**

We appreciate the recognition. The holistic approach has allowed us to bring strong candidates into the Teacher Education Program who -- in the past -- might have been discouraged from applying or excluded from consideration because of rigid requirements. [Response Item 11]

- Great work is being done to promote and support diversity through the Teacher Leadership Center. There are specific tracks devoted to providing opportunities for candidates and faculty to serve students with disabilities as well as English Language Learners.
**Recommendations:**

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.11(1) The team finds programmatic support (i.e., diversity in education conference, workshops, etc.) for students. However, curricular support (i.e., race/ethnicity and gender studies classes, etc.) for students is limited in scope. The team also finds programmatic/curricular support for faculty to be limited. The team recommends the unit examine support and curriculum to better support and prepare candidates and faculty to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

**Diversity Support and Curriculum**

The University of Iowa Teacher Education Program has committed to further integration of diversity and topics related to inclusion within the teacher education curriculum. These include the newly launched committee to address overall diversity efforts within Teacher Education, including recruitment and retention of underrepresented teaching candidates. This effort to recruit and retain diverse teaching candidates will include an effort to thoroughly examine, revise, and create more inclusive curricula, programs, and schedules that accommodate a greater variety of students within teacher education. The newly-launched course, EDTL:5091 LGBTQ Topics in Education, in addition to other courses in the design phase, will address race, gender, and global education topics in education. [Response Item 12]

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

College of Education Admissions, Focus Groups (current TEP Elementary/Secondary education students), Senior Associate to the President on Diversity, Title IX Coordinator, COE Diversity Committee Co-Chairs, Foundations of Education class, Human Relations in the Classroom class

Review of:

- Course syllabi
- Institutional report
- University and COE websites
- Program response to review team’s initial report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty

FACULTY

281—79.12(256) Faculty standard. Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.

79.12(1) The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.

79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member’s preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.

79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.

79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.

79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:
   a. Colleagues in the unit;
   b. Colleagues across the institution;
   c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- The team heard from faculty that a Secondary Program Coordinator group is being established. This is a good plan for organization, communication, and collaboration.
- The faculty seem very clear on requirements for evaluation, promotion, and tenure.
- The unit consists of many members who are leaders in their respective fields.
- Faculty members have strong research agendas.

Preparation and Knowledge of Faculty is a Strength

We appreciate the commendations from the review team, especially the recognition of the professional leadership and strong research agendas of our faculty. We are especially proud to note that -- while we needed to provide additional information and plans relating to faculty work experience and ongoing involvement -- no questions or concerns were raised under the 79.12 standard about the preparation and knowledge of our faculty.
Faculty Research Agendas are a Strength
And, in particular, we appreciate the recognition of our strong research agenda. Our faculty strive to contribute to education through our scholarship in areas such as teacher development, learner assessment, literacy, learning materials, social justice, technology, school culture, and more. Through this research, we are able to cycle findings back into our teaching of educators and in our work with school partners. It is a source of pride and passion, so the recognition by the reviewers means a great deal.

[Response Item 13]

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.12(1) The team finds references to faculty identifications such as course supervisor, primary instructor, team teaching, and teaching assistants. The team finds no evidence that the descriptions of the qualifications for these positions are consistent, resulting in assignments for faculty to teach courses for which they are not qualified. The team recommends the unit examine faculty position descriptions for clarity and utility, with documentation of policies.

Course Instructor Roles Clarification
We appreciate this recommendation and intend to develop methods for more clearly articulating the qualifications for each position. For instance, we will clarify that a course supervisor must be a full-time faculty member in the COE with preparation and experience appropriate for the course content as defined by the Iowa Department of Education. That person oversees the teaching of the course by a primary instructor who is not a full-time faculty member, that is, an adjunct instructor or a teaching assistant (TA). We will clarify that the primary instructor is the person who teaches the course. This person must have preparation and experience appropriate for the course content as defined by the Iowa Department of Education. A primary instructor may be a full-time faculty member, an adjunct instructor, or a TA. Finally, we will clarify that a TA is a graduate student who either serves as a primary instructor or as an assistant to a primary instructor. We will also clarify that TAs must have preparation and experience appropriate for the course content as defined by the Iowa Department of Education.

[Response Item 14]

2) 79.12(3) The team finds evidence of inconsistent evaluation of part time faculty. A number of part time faculty members described a lack of evaluation. In discussion with education leadership program administrators, the only evaluation of part-time adjunct faculty in that program occurs through student course evaluations. The team recommends the unit examine and update evaluation of part time faculty members to ensure quality, consistent and aligned instruction.

Educational Leadership Part-Time Faculty Evaluation
Annually, the Departmental Executive Officer (DEO) of the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies will meet with each part-time faculty member to discuss the results of the student course evaluations as part of a regular performance review. Reinforcing the efforts will be the availability of the ISSL Standards Alignment Form, which will provide updates concerning alignment of course activities with the ISSL Standards, and the impact on student progress in meeting those standards. [Response Item 15. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]
Concerns:

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.12(2) The team does not find documented evidence of verification of the alignment of teaching duties for a number of faculty members. The team requires the unit to examine faculty qualifications and teaching assignments and make adjustments to resolve concerns. The list of faculty members was provided to the unit.

Faculty Alignment of Teaching Duties with Qualifications

Department of Teaching and Learning

The review team did not find evidence -- for seventeen (17) members of the Department of Teaching and Learning faculty -- that the faculty members meet the requirement for professional experience in the setting for which the instructors are preparing educators.

Eight (8) of the faculty members have left The University of Iowa or are no longer teaching educator preparation courses.

One (1) of the faculty members teaches a course, EDTL:3114 Parent-Child Relationships, that is not included in requirements of an educator preparation program, and does not include content on application to classroom context. Based on review of the course syllabus it has been determined that the standard does not apply to instructors of this course.

Three (3) of these faculty members have classroom experience and have been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided.

Three (3) of the faculty members continue to provide instruction in the Teacher Education Program and have plans in place to gain experience and engage in additional collaboration in school and district administration.

Two (2) instructors of studio sections of the course, EDTL:2122 Creativity, Imagination, Play, and Human Development through the Arts were identified under this standard. See the response under 79.12(c), below, for detailed response, and plans to gain
Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies
The review team did not find evidence for three faculty members of the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies, that the faculty members meet the requirement for professional experience in the setting for which the instructors are preparing educators. One has left The University of Iowa. One is no longer has teaching assignments in educator preparation.

Department of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations
The review team did not find evidence -- for two members of the faculty who teach educator preparation programs' courses in Educational Psychology -- that the faculty members meet the requirement for professional experience in the setting for which the instructors are preparing educators. One has left The University of Iowa. J.Se. has classroom experience in teaching and curriculum design -- in secondary science and English, in an international school -- and has been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided. [Response Item 18.1]

2) 79.12(5)c. The team does not find documented evidence related to the following faculty members maintaining recent and ongoing collaboration and involvement with colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. For those faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration The team provided a list of faculty members to the unit.

Faculty Ongoing Collaboration and Involvement
Unit Strategies and Plans for Ensuring
The College of Education and the educator preparation Unit will continue exploration and development of new policies and practices for assuring faculty maintain appropriate ongoing collaboration and involvement in PK-12 school settings. Strategies the Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services may pursue include:

- Creation of College of Education or departmental policies to implement the 79.12 standards, to clarify and make more transparent the classification of courses and instructor roles that require compliance with these standards;
- Classification of courses and instructor roles;
- Identification of instructors whose courses and roles are covered under the policies;
- Creation of a centralized system that allows for administrator review of all instructors in the various University of Iowa faculty, adjunct instructor, teaching assistant, and staff classifications that meet the definition of instructor as interpreted under 79.12; and
- Ongoing, periodic review.
Department of Teaching and Learning
The department has worked with faculty to document or make plans to meet the expectations for the experience and collaboration standards. The department also has added language to position descriptions for searches that include preparation, knowledge, and experience, as well as the faculty responsibility to have four hours each semester in collaboration with classrooms (See artifacts). Teaching Assistant (TA) contracts have also been revised to list the four-hour expectation (See artifacts for a sample TA contract). Over the course of this year, the department will be working with faculty members who just joined the department to meet the collaboration standard and plans for experience, if needed.

In addition, course supervisors of certain courses have developed ongoing management plans for all instructors of the course.

EDTL:3002 Technology in the Classroom
The review team did not find evidence for ten (10) teaching assistants of the course, EDTL:3002 Technology in the Classroom, that the teaching assistants meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement. Eight (8) of these teaching assistants have left The University of Iowa, or no longer are teaching educator.

Two (2) of these teaching assistants continue to teach EDTL:3002, and will participate in the course plan in the 2018-2019 academic year.

As an ongoing plan for instructors of the course, EDTL:3002 Technology in the Classroom, the course supervisor, John Achrazoglou, Clinical Associate Professor, plans to work with a partner school to have all the EDTL:3002 teaching assistants spend four hours each semester in the classroom. The course supervisor will identify potential partner classrooms (those that are sites of technology innovation) with the administration of the Iowa City Community School District, and then form partnerships with teachers. Each Teaching Assistant will be allocated four hours per semester to co-teach technology topics to students in participating schools and classrooms.

EDTL:3120 Methods and Materials: Music for the Classroom Teacher
Instructors will have classroom partners, complete four hours each semester in the classroom, and collect documentation of the collaboration. For the current, 2018-2019 academic year, instructor plans include collaborations with music and elementary and teachers in classrooms at Horace Mann Elementary School, Iowa City; Sacred Heart School, Olewein; and Indian Creek Elementary School, Marion. The supervisor of this course, Associate Professor Mary Cohen, will work with instructors to assure that they understand and fulfill the requirement.
EDTL:2122 Creativity, Imagination, Play, and Human Development through the Arts
The course, EDTL:2122 Creativity, Imagination, Play, and Human Development through the Arts (formerly numbered EDTL:3122) serves both as the art methods course of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program, and as a course option of the CLAS Core, the general education requirements for undergraduate degree programs of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, that also serve as the general education requirements of undergraduate degree programs of the College of Education. As such, the course includes a significant number of non-teacher education students, in addition to students of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program and the Art Education Teacher Education Program.

The course, EDTL:2122 is offered in a lecture / discussion format. Students in the course meet twice each week, for one fifty-minute lecture, and for one two-and-a-half-hour art studio session (classified as a "discussion," in University of Iowa course listings).

The elements of the course that address theory and pedagogical applications are contained in the lecture, which is instructed by Dr. Clar Baldus, the faculty coordinator of the Art Education program, who is an experienced art teacher with an Iowa Permanent Professional License, and who maintains ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 schools.

The two-and-a-half-hour studio sections of the course entail working with hands-on creative processes, and do not address pedagogical implications.

However, most instructors of the studio sections have K-12 Iowa licensure to teach art, and have plans to maintain ongoing school interaction for four hours each semester.

One instructor of a studio section has a PhD in Art History, and does not have a K-12 teaching background. As an interim management strategy for this instructor, the Department of Teaching and Learning will explore classification of this instructor's studio sections as being intended for students who are enrolled to satisfy a general education requirement, and who do not intend to pursue the teacher education program. The Department of Teaching and Learning will monitor enrollments in these sections, and if the strategy is not determined to be feasible, will ensure that the instructor implements a plan to gain school experience, and engage in ongoing collaboration and involvement in elementary schools.

One instructor of a studio section that was identified by the review team is no longer at The University of Iowa.

Other Department of Teaching and Learning Faculty
The review team did not find evidence -- for an additional thirty nine (39) members of the Department of Teaching and Learning faculty -- that the faculty members meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

Eighteen (18) of the faculty members have left The University of Iowa.
Four (4) of the faculty members are no longer teaching educator preparation courses.

Three (3) of the faculty members instruct courses that either a) are not included in requirements of an educator preparation program and do not address application to the classroom context. Based on review of the course syllabi it has been determined that the standard does not apply to instructors of these courses.

Four (4) of these faculty members have ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 classrooms, and have been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided.

Ten (10) of the faculty members continue to provide instruction in the Teacher Education Program and have determined plans to gain experience and engage in additional collaboration in school and district administration.

- [J.B.] supervises practicum and student teaching in the Mathematics Education and Science Education teacher education programs, and has collaborated with a junior high science teacher on use of a formative assessment tool, and plans to continue collaboration at a rate of at least 4 hours each academic semester in secondary schools of the Iowa City Community School District. Additional documentation has been provided.
- [R.C.], who coordinates pre-student teaching practicum in the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program, has collaborated with elementary teachers, primarily in support of instruction of students with deficits in mathematics skills, and plans to continue collaboration at a rate of at least 4 hours each academic semester in elementary schools of the Iowa City Community School District. Additional documentation has been provided.
- [M.C.] plans to co-teach with an elementary music teacher in the Iowa City Community School district on planning and instruction for K-6 students. Additional documentation has been provided.
- [G.F.], who teaches EDTL:3166 Science Methods II, a science methods course of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program, plans to establish partnership with one or more elementary schools of the Iowa City Community School District (and is working with faculty colleagues to identify potential partner schools), and initially plans to spend an equivalent of four weeks interacting with elementary teachers on science content, planning, co-teaching, and outcomes evaluation. Additional information has been provided.
- [H.L.], who provides supervision for pre-student teaching practicum courses of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program, plans ongoing collaboration and involvement in the elementary classrooms of cooperating teachers, collaborating with elementary practicum students in instruction and interaction with elementary students, including 4 hours in the fall semester and 4 hours in the spring semester. Additional documentation has been provided.
• [D.H.], who instructs EDTL:3142 Geometry and Measurement, a mathematics content course of the Elementary Education Teacher Education Program -- which includes elements addressing pedagogical implications for teaching mathematics -- has initiated contacts with administrators in the Newton Community School District and the Cedar Rapids Community School District, has identified partner classrooms, and plans to include ongoing collaboration in elementary, middle, and high schools, to include planning, instruction, and student assessment, and initially will complete four weeks of co-teaching in these schools. Additional documentation has been provided.

• [D.J.], who teaches the methods course in the English as a Second Language added endorsement program, has collaborated with dual language education teachers and administrators in two elementary schools, one in the West Liberty Community School District, and the other in the Marshalltown Community School District -- engaging in observation, participation, and research -- and plans to continue collaboration at a rate of at least 4 hours each academic semester in Iowa schools. Additional documentation has been provided.

• [T.N.], who instructs a course in elementary school science methods, and who advises students in the Science Education Teacher Education Program, has extensive ongoing teaching and co-teaching involvement in classrooms at a variety of grade levels, and plans to engage in similar activities on an ongoing basis to meet the requirement for 40 hours. Additional documentation has been provided.

• [R.V.], who instructs the course, EDTL:3163 Methods: Elementary School Mathematics, has documented team teaching in elementary classrooms, and plans additional ongoing collaboration and involvement, including two full days collaborating in mathematics instruction with an area fifth-grade teacher, within in the 2018-2019 academic year. Additional documentation has been provided.

• [K.V.], who instructs the course, EDTL:4187 Elementary Student Teaching Seminar, has ongoing collaboration and involvement in elementary school classrooms, and plans additional collaboration and involvement in an area second grade classroom, working with students on math journaling, understanding of addition and subtraction facts, and academic language in math, using literacy to increase understanding. Additional documentation has been provided. [Response Item 16.2]
Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies
The review team did not find evidence for five faculty members of the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies (EPLS), that the faculty members meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

Two (2) of these members of the EPLS faculty have left The University of Iowa.

Two (2) members of the EPLS faculty no longer have teaching assignments in educator preparation.

[A.G.] continues to teach in the educator preparation programs, and has determined a plan to gain experience and engage in additional collaboration in school and district administration. Drawing on the faculty member's research in school leadership conducted in a local community, the local school district has invited the faculty member to: join a steering committee tasked with reviewing and evaluating the district’s equity and affirmative action plans; and assist the district in devising ways to support teachers and leaders of color to ensure long-term retention. [Response Item 17.2]

Department of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations
The review team did not find evidence -- for three members of the faculty who teach educator preparation programs' courses in Educational Psychology -- that the faculty members meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

In 2015, the College of Education administration shared updated guidance with the faculty of the Educational Psychology program, that instructors of educator preparation programs' educational psychology courses, PSQF:1075 Educational Psychology and Measurement, and PSQF:6200 Educational Psychology, are among the educator preparation faculty who must maintain ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 education under this standard.

Since 2015, instructors of these courses have been held to a requirement that faculty and teaching assistants must complete an average four hours of K-12-related instruction each semester. The program will maintain this requirement. The program's expectation -- for those instructors who have taught each of the fall and spring semesters over the three years since 2015 -- is that the instructors will have completed 24 hours of instruction (4 hours each semester times six semesters equals 24 hours).

Two members of the faculty have met the program's interim 24-hour expectation, and continue to engage in ongoing collaboration and involvement consistent with the program's requirement.

- [M.K.] documented 26 hours of involvement in schools with the original Institutional Report document, and will continue to maintain ongoing involvement, consistent with the program's requirement.
- [K.S.] documented 24.75 hours of involvement in schools with the original Institutional Report document, and will continue to maintain ongoing involvement, consistent with the program's requirement. 
[Response Item 18.2]
Department of Rehabilitation and Counselor Education
The review team did not find evidence -- for two faculty members of the School Counseling program -- that the faculty members meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

[G.B.] maintains ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 schools, including classroom guidance lessons, individual counseling sessions, and consultation with school counselors, and has been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided.

[S.W.] maintains ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 schools, including facilitation of parent meetings, providing staff development trainings, participation in a school counseling program's internal self-evaluation, and collaboration with program alumni on a presentation for current school counselor candidates, and has been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided. [Response Item 19]

School of Library and Information Science
At the site visit, the review team did not find evidence -- for one member of the School of Library and Information Science faculty -- that the faculty member meets the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

[C.Kk.] has extensive ongoing collaboration and involvement in K-12 classrooms and has been determined to be in compliance with this standard. Additional documentation has been provided. [Response Item 20a]

School of Social Work
The review team did not find evidence for seven members of the School of Social Work (SSW) faculty, that the faculty members meet the requirement for ongoing collaboration and involvement.

Two (2) members of the SSW faculty no longer have teaching assignments in educator preparation.
Five (5) members of the SSW faculty continue to have teaching assignments in educator preparation, which include practicum oversight and other School Social Worker program courses. The School of Social Work has determined a plan for faculty with these responsibilities to maintain ongoing collaboration and involvement.

**School of Social Work Plans for Ongoing Collaboration and Involvement**

Faculty who teach a practicum seminar course, and/or provide practicum administration, will be assigned practicum (liaison) coordination for students in the school setting, as part of their teaching load. Coordinators will attend at least three in-school coordination visits with the student and their school social work supervisor to finalize the students’ learning contracts, which include activities identified by the school social worker and the student in the school setting. This meeting focuses upon the identified learning objectives of the student to attain the competencies of a social worker in the school setting, and is also an opportunity for faculty to stay current with the day-to-day responsibilities of the school social work professional.

Faculty members who teach a course of the School Social Worker curriculum exhibit, but are not also a practicum coordinator, or do not have other ongoing involvement with school social workers in the school setting -- such as collaborating in trainings or research projects conducted in the school setting -- will be provided annual opportunities to visit the school setting and receive orientation from a school social worker. [Response Item 20b]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- Unit Faculty (full-time, part-time, supervisors), Program Coordinators, DEOs

Review of:
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report
- Faculty Curriculum Vitae
- Teaching assignments

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

ASSESSMENT

281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. The unit's assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.

79.13(1) The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.
79.13(2) The assessment system is based on unit standards.
79.13(3) The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.
79.13(4) Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:
   a. Entrance into the program (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16).
   b. Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.
   c. Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).
   d. Program completion (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16; see subrule 79.15(5) for required teacher candidate assessment).

79.13(5) Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.
   b. Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.
   c. Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.
   d. Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.
   e. Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.
   f. Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.
   g. Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.

79.13(6) Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:
   a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.
   b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.
   c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.
   d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.
   e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle 79.13(7) The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.

79.13(8) The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.
79.13(9) The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met Or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted Below | Not Met |
Commendations/Strengths:

- Programs in School Counseling, School Social Work, Teacher Librarians and Speech/Language Pathology and Audiologist are nationally accredited. These programs show clear alignment to national standards and assess candidates according to those national standards. Through these processes, the programs have an established process to regularly review, evaluate, and revise the assessment system.
- In School Counseling, School Social Work, Teacher Librarians and Speech/Language Pathology and Audiologist candidates are assessed on their progression toward the standards in coursework and in clinical experiences. Faculty members meet with candidates each semester to discuss their progression in the program.
- Recently, the library program was recognized by their national accrediting body for their dissemination and use of alumni and employer surveys to guide program decisions.
- Students in school counseling report feeling they are taught national standards for their program extremely well as evidenced by the statement “National standards are hammered home in a good way.”
- The TEP used data to make substantial changes to their admissions requirements and added a professional dispositional qualities assessment. Faculty and staff reported satisfaction with the changes/additions and were particularly excited about the use of the dispositions assessment.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.13(1) Leadership The unit has developed goals and verbally described a plan for developing a leadership program comprehensive assessment system based on standards. The team recommends the unit document policies, standards alignment, action steps and timelines for implementation.

Education Leadership Documentation of Assessment Plan

The Educational Leadership program’s faculty team (the members of the program's faculty, including all full-time tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty, and adjunct instructors) will document these going forward. Beginning with the Fall 2018 semester, the ISSL Standards Alignment Form will be collected for each student upon completion of a course and filed with the Program Coordinator who will review and document student progress towards meeting ISSL Standards. [Response Item 21. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]
2) **79.13(2) Leadership** The program has identified course-specific assignments for each standard; however, it was not clear how those assignments were used as part of a cohesive assessment system. The team recommends the unit map standards with assessments and coursework.

**Educational Leadership Map of Standards with Assessments**
The Educational Leadership program’s faculty team will map coursework and assessments to standards, going forward. To track student progress, the Educational Leadership faculty are working with College of Education instructional technology staff to incorporate the ISSL Standards Alignment Form onto the program's ICON site (Iowa Courses Online, The University of Iowa's course management system). This will allow the Program Coordinator, faculty advisors, and instructors to monitor and provide ongoing feedback on each administrator candidate's progress on addressing and meeting the standards as they move through the program. For the Superintendent preparation program, the online standards tracking system will build off the standards alignment that was included on pages 1202 through 1213 of our original Institutional Report (and is included with the artifacts for this response item). [Response Item 22. Click here and here for artifacts related to this response item.]

3) **79.13(4)c Leadership** Candidates are not allowed to engage in fieldwork until they are approved by the clinical supervisor. It is unclear what criteria is used to make the decision. The team recommends the unit clarify and communicate criteria for admission to clinical experiences.

**Educational Leadership Criteria for Clinical Placement**
The Educational Leadership program's criteria for allowing candidates to engage in fieldwork has been clarified in the program's clinical student handbook and course syllabi. The criteria are:

- Admission to the Educational Administration Program (degree/licensure).
- Successful completion of (or current registration in) a minimum of 12 credit hours exclusive of the clinical experience. Exceptions must be approved in advance by the student's advisor and clinical professor.
- Demonstrated commitment to educational leadership.
- A minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.00.
- A clinical onsite administrator holding licensure and endorsement for the area being sought by the student.
- A signed statement from the onsite administrator indicating that he/she is willing to supervise and direct clinical activities and to delegate significant responsibilities to the student. [Response Item 23]
4) 79.13(5)d TEP: The transition to the InTASC standards is not complete - students who are further along in the program (student teachers for example) are being evaluated on a newly developed evaluation form based on InTASC standards. This is the first time many of these students have seen/ been aware of InTASC standards. The team recommends the unit align all assessments and evaluation instruments on the InTASC standards and communicate standards with candidates.

Teacher Education Program Alignment of InTASC Standards

The review team’s recommendation that the TEP align all assessments and evaluation instruments with the InTASC standards and ensure candidates are aware of these standards is very well taken, and as the team has identified, continues to be a work in progress for our program. A concerted effort is underway to align all assessments and evaluation instruments on InTASC and the two additional state of Iowa standards and to ensure candidates are aware of these standards that shape the preparation program they are completing.

- Fall 2017: The newly developed InTASC-based TEP Conceptual Framework is introduced to all teacher candidates in the Orientation classes and is incorporated into assessment measures associated with those courses (Click here to view the TEP Conceptual Framework on a College of Education web page).
- Spring 2018, InTASC-based practicum evaluation forms were piloted that like the student teaching evaluation by which candidates will be evaluated during their student teaching semester, align with InTASC and the two additional state of Iowa standards. Additionally, in Spring 2018, InTASC-based course-based assessments were piloted in three classes using Tk20 for the evaluation using a rubric in common across program areas.
- Fall 2018 semester, InTASC-based course-based assessments are being completed by all candidates in the English Education and Social Studies Education program.
- Spring 2019 semester, all program areas will be submitting InTASC-based course-based assessments that will be scored by faculty using a common InTASC-based rubric.

Thus, it is the program’s goal that by Spring 2019 all teacher candidates will be familiar with InTASC and the two additional state of Iowa standards upon which the preparation program they are completing is based. [Response Item 24]
5) 79.13(5)b Leadership Course assignments have been identified for each standard; however, the team does not find evidence that the assignments and associated rubrics are directly aligned to the standards. The team recommends the unit develop a system that more clearly allows candidates to demonstrate attainment of unit standards.

Educational Leadership Alignment of Assignments and Rubrics with Standards

The attached document, ISSL Standards Alignment Form, will be used by all instructors going forward. This document allows instructors to directly align assignments and activities with the standards, determine the effectiveness of the instructional practice in meeting the standards, and document through ongoing assessment, the effectiveness of the student in meeting each standard. [Response Item 25. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

6) 79.13(6)d Leadership The team did not find evidence of how evaluation data is shared with stakeholders. The team recommends the unit develop and implement policy to use data when soliciting advice from the advisory committee and other stakeholder groups.

Educational Leadership Evaluation Data Sharing with Stakeholders

The enhanced information data secured from the ISSL Standards Alignment Form will be shared at the advisory board meetings in the fall and spring semesters. The meetings will be utilized for the instructional team to share progress, program status, and with input from the advisory board, develop a continuous improvement plan focused on both short-term and long-term goals. [Response Item 26. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

Concerns:

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.13(2) TEP: The unit has developed goals and a plan for moving ahead with this comprehensive assessment system based on InTASC standards. It is not clear if a written plan documenting the necessary action steps and dates have been determined. The team requires unit to document policies, standards alignment, action steps and timelines for implementation.

Course-based Assessment Implementation

The College of Education administration is working from the following timeline for implementation of course-based assessment through Tk20.

Spring Semester 2018

- Piloting of InTASC/state of Iowa standards course-based assessments on Tk20 in Orientation courses and Technology in the Classroom course

Fall Semester 2018

- Implementation of InTASC/state of Iowa standards course-based assessments on Tk20 for Orientation courses, Technology in the Classroom, English Education courses, and Social Studies Education courses
- Submission of Professional Dispositional Qualities Assessment (first of five for each candidate) on Tk20 for the Orientation courses
- Submission of edTPA for external scoring through Tk20 (in order to capture submissions for program improvement efforts)
Spring Semester 2019

- Full implementation of InTASC/state of Iowa standards course-based assessments on Tk20
- Full implementation of Submission of Professional Dispositional Qualities Assessment (five for each candidate) on Tk20 [Response Item 27]

2) 79.13(5)a TEP: Other than the use of the edTPA as the summative assessment, the team did not find evidence of how the program determines if their assessment measures/tools are fair, reliable, and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

**Assessment Fairness, Reliability, Validity**

The Teacher Education Program (TEP) has determined a number of initial steps, and plans for ongoing review, of assessment tools for fairness, reliability, and validity.

In support of the TEP's transition to course-based assessment, to prompt reflection and action by program area faculty, specific first steps for this Fall 2018 semester include:

- The Assessment Coordinator has prepared an overview of strategies for fairness, reliability, and validity in assessment, for use by College of Education (COE) faculty;
- The overview of strategies for fairness, reliability, and validity will be shared by email with all TEP faculty; and
- The overview of strategies for fairness, reliability, and validity will be incorporated into an informal "brown bag lunch" session to which all TEP faculty will be invited, and at which the Assessment Coordinator will lead a discussion on this topic.

On a program-wide level, this Fall 2018 semester, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Student Services is working with the Assessment Coordinator to use data in exploring validity measures that include:

- How Praxis Core scores (segmented by Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) correlate to edTPA scores; and
- How admission G.P.A. correlates to program completion assessment scores.

Regular practices to help assure fairness, reliability, and validity of assessment measures will include:

- Incorporation of the strategies for fairness, reliability, and validity as part of each program area's ongoing regular review of the assessment measures and tools used in courses; and
- Periodic review by the TEP Assessment Committee, reported to the Teacher Education Committee, of all key program-level assessments for evidence of fairness, reliability, and validity.

We look forward to sharing updates on these efforts in the one-year follow-up report. [Response Item 28. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]
3) 79.13(5)b TEP: The team does not find evidence of how candidates are assessed on their progression on unit standards. For example, other than student teaching, syllabi did not reference the InTASC standards. There is not evidence to indicate candidate completion of signature assignments show evidence of attainment of the standards. Faculty and candidates equate passing a course and uploading signature assignments as meeting standards. The team requires the unit to develop a system that more clearly allows candidates to demonstrate attainment of unit standards.

Course-Based Assessment Implementation Through Tk20

It is a pleasure to respond to this concern, as this concern speaks to what was perhaps the most significant finding and outcome of the program’s self study: that is, recognition that The University of Iowa Teacher Education Program's (TEP) trademarked ePortfolio system required revision or replacement to be useful as a tool to provide evidence of teacher candidates’ progression toward meeting InTASC and state of Iowa standards, and as a source of data for continuous improvement of the TEP.

The ePortfolio system -- when it was put in place 15-or-more years ago -- represented an advancement in making transparent and documenting teacher candidates' successful completion of standards-based signature assignments. But, in reviewing the ePortfolio system as part of the self-study, it was determined that ePortfolio would not provide a good basis for implementation of common rubrics and other practices that would be required for it to serve as a tool for assessing progression on standards.

As the review team identified, the program needed to transition to a system that assesses candidates on their progression toward meeting InTASC and state of Iowa standards.

With concerted effort by faculty and staff, we believe the TEP is well on the way to achieving this goal, with the development of a new plan for standards-based, course-based assessment (CBA). Key elements of the CBA plan which already are underway are:

- Establishment, by a committee of program faculty, of a set of rubrics-in-common for each of the twelve InTASC and state of Iowa standards;
- Identification for scoring under the rubrics-in-common -- by program faculty -- of certain assignments contained within the program’s courses;
- Scoring of these assignments, by faculty, using the rubrics-in-common;
- Implementation of the scoring of CBA assignments within Tk20, allowing teacher candidates to have transparent access to information about their progress in meeting standards, and the program to have data on their progress.

In the Spring 2018 semester, the system was piloted in three courses taken by all TEP candidates. During the Fall 2018 semester, in addition to those three courses, the English Education program and Social Studies Education program are implementing standards-based course-based assessments on Tk20. Full implementation of the standards-based course-based assessment plan on Tk20 will begin during the Spring 2019 semester. The timeline being followed for implementation of standards-based course-based assessment in the TEP is included with artifacts for this response item.
News, updates, and faculty and staff resources on the TEP’s implementation of Tk20 is published to the [web page of the College of Education](https://education.uiowa.edu/services/education-technology-center-etc/tk20-watermark-resources).

[Response Item 29. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

4) 79.13(5)a Leadership The team did not find evidence of how the program determines if the measures/tools they use are fair, reliable, and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

**Educational Leadership Assessment Fairness, Reliability, and Validity**

In the 2017-2018 academic year the College of Education hired an Assessment Coordinator. In collaboration with the Assessment Coordinator, the Educational Leadership faculty team has identified the following strategies for fairness, validity, and reliability:

- Provide students the opportunity during assessments to ask clarifying questions about items (Fairness)
- Use a grading rubric to support fair scores (Fairness)
- Build course pre-requisite requirements carefully to ensure students will have had the opportunity to learn the content that will be tested in each course (Fairness)
- Use multiple assessment measures together to allow candidates to demonstrate their qualifications for admission to the program (Fairness)
- Have raters use a scoring rubric to support consistency across raters (Reliability)
- Faculty regularly meet with each other to discuss expectations for comprehensive exams and work to create exams that are of similar difficulty for all students in the program (Reliability)
- Build program assessment into courses or program requirements that will support students’ motivation to complete them with substantial effort (Reliability)
- Not all assessments must cover all content. However, score interpretation must be limited to the content that is covered in the assessment (Validity)
- Assessments must be carefully and purposefully designed to include the relevant topics and content while excluding irrelevant or extraneous material (Validity)
- Use authentic assessments that represent the situations and problems student are likely to experience in their careers after they successfully complete the program (Validity)
- Use multiple assessments so important decisions about students are not made on the basis of a single assessment (Validity)
Each semester, the Program Coordinator will be responsible for reviewing input from the ISSL Standards Alignment Forms, and based on information from the ISSL Standards Alignment Forms, review assessment practices with instructors. The Program Coordinator will provide input to the Departmental Executive Officer on effectiveness of instructors in providing valid, fair, and reliable assessments. [Response Item 30. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

5) 79.13(5)c Leadership The team does not find evidence the program uses multiple measures to assess the candidate on each standard. The team requires the unit to implement multiple measures to assess candidates on each standard.

**Educational Leadership Assessment Multiple Measures**
The ISSL Standards Alignment Form (See artifacts) will be used in all classes to ensure multiple measures are used to assess candidates on each standard. As students move through the program, a review of student progression in all classes at the end of each semester will be available to ensure that instructors have utilized multiple measures to assess administrator candidates on each standard. [Response Item 31. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

6) 79.13(5)d Leadership There is not evidence the standards are addressed to show candidate progress on the standards at different developmental levels throughout the duration of the program. The team requires the unit to implement assessments to evaluate candidate progress at different developmental levels in the program.

**Educational Leadership Assessment Candidate Progression**
The ISSL Standards Alignment Form (See artifacts) will be used by all instructors going forward. This document allows instructors to directly align assignments and activities with the standards, determine the effectiveness of the instructional practice in meeting the standards, and document through ongoing assessment, the effectiveness of the student in meeting each standard. [Response Item 32. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

7) 79.13(8) Leadership The team does not find evidence that the unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system. The team requires the unit to implement policy for regularly reviewing and revising the assessment system.

**Educational Leadership Assessment System Review**
It will be the intent of the Program Coordinator to review the ISSL Standards Alignment Form, its use, and resulting data, each semester at the meeting of all faculty, and also with the Educational Leadership Advisory Board (See Response Item 8). Feedback from both groups will be utilized to enhance the leadership program that we provide our students. [Response Item 33. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]
8) 79.13(6)a Leadership The team did not find evidence that individual assessment data on unit standards is analyzed. The team requires the unit to implement policy for analyzing assessment data for program assessment.

**Educational Leadership**

A summer faculty retreat will be the primary setting for review of aggregated data from the ISSL Standards Alignment Forms, to ensure that all standards are being assessed. In addition, the forms will be analyzed to determine weaknesses in meeting standards, as well as individual student progress. Changes to the curriculum will be recommended as needed as a result of the analysis. [Response Item 34. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

9) 79.13(6)c Leadership The team did not find evidence of how the program is aggregating and using performance data to guide program improvements. The evaluations used for program assessments currently are perception based (alumni and course evaluation surveys). The team requires the unit to implement policy for aggregating and using candidate performance data for programmatic decisions.

**Educational Leadership Assessment Use of Aggregated Data**

In addition to the summer faculty retreat (See Response Item 34), it will be the intent of the Program Coordinator to review the ISSL Standards Alignment Form, its use, and resulting data, each semester at the meeting of all faculty, and also with the Educational Leadership Advisory Board (See Response Item 8). Feedback from both groups will be utilized to enhance the leadership program that we provide our students. [Response Item 35. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:
- Associate Dean for TEP in the College of Education, Instructional Technology Director, Assessment Director, Dean of the College of Education, Adjuncts, Candidates, Alumni, Unit Faculty, Library Director(s), Content Area Faculty, Overview of Assessment Systems with TEP and School Psych, Ed Leadership, School Counseling, and School Psychology

Review of:
- Course syllabi
- Student records
- E-portfolio
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted | Not Met |
## Teacher Candidate Clinical Practice

### TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL

281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.

79.14(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

79.14(2) PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

- High-quality college/university supervisors, and
- High-quality cooperating teachers.

79.14(3) Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates' achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' attainment of unit standards.

79.14(4) Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.

79.14(5) Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.

79.14(6) Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:

- High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.
- Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.
- The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment.

79.14(7) The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:

- Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 consecutive weeks in duration during the teacher candidate’s final year of the teacher preparation program.
- Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.
- Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.
- Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate's classroom.
- Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.
- Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.
- Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).
- Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate’s permanent record.

79.14(8) The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the
cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.

79.14(9) The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.

**Initial Team Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Commendations/Strengths:**

- The team finds the student teaching handbook contains thorough information that will support and be a source for cooperating teachers throughout the student teaching placement. Interviews indicate cooperating teachers appreciate the online and hard copy of the handbook.
- The team finds that students in the elementary education program exceed the minimum 80 hours of field experiences.
- The team finds that the TEP is quick to respond to issues that arise with students in field placements, including student teaching.
- The team finds that for elementary education students (practicum and student teaching) there are almost weekly 3-way conferences between cooperating teacher, supervisor, and student to evaluate lessons taught focused on areas of strengths and areas for growth.
- The team finds students in the Literature I, II, and III sequence receive close supervision and detailed feedback in their clinical settings. Students are highly appreciative and complimentary of the strategies learned regarding diverse students in Literature III.
- Teacher Librarian: The team finds positive collaboration between the faculty, supervisors, and students. All feel well-supported and personally involved in the clinical processes.
- Teacher Librarian: The team finds that adjunct faculty and graduates spoke highly of experiences in the programs and found them purposeful and integrated to appropriate standards.

**Recommendations:**

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.14(1): The team finds that cooperating teachers in pre-student teaching clinical experiences request more guidance. Specifically they need guidance on practicum expectations to ensure each student is maximizing opportunities for learning in clinical settings. The team recommends the unit clarify, document and communicate clinical experience expectations to ensure all candidates maximize learning.

**Pre-Student Teaching Practicum Guidance to Cooperating Teachers**

We appreciate this recommendation as a prompt to review and revise program practices. The exploration that was prompted by this recommendation was beneficial in causing the TEP program areas to re-visit the information they provide to cooperating teachers.
On August 10, 2018, The Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences (Julie Heidger) contacted TEP area Program Coordinators, requesting the program areas submit the text and documents the program area provides to cooperating teachers of pre-student teaching practicum students, and additional explanation as necessary on how expectations are conveyed to the cooperating teachers. The Director received responses and artifacts back from all 8 5-12 and K-12 program areas, and from the Elementary Education reading practicum and mathematics practicum. Some (3 out of 8) secondary program areas revised their expectations to make explicit the expectation that students need to participate in planning for instruction, assessment, and interact with students. [Response Item 36. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

2) 79.14(4) The team does not find clear evidence that teacher candidates are receiving substantive experiences in working with diverse learners (i.e., race, class, disability, non-traditional, etc.). Information regarding types of diversity does not appear to be tracked in a systemic or purposeful manner. The team recommends the unit examine requirements for placements and experiences to ensure candidates are well prepared to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

**TEP Field Experience Placements - Tracking Diversity**

The College of Education’s Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences, Julie Heidger, met on August 14, 2018 with Jeremy Penn, Assessment Coordinator; Michelle Yu, Application Developer; Mary Heath, Field Experiences Coordinator; and Nancy Langguth, Associate Dean; to address the recommendation of tracking diversity in field experiences. In the following weeks, meeting participants were able to identify several sets of readily available school-level data that may represent, or serve as proxies for, relevant differences among schools and student populations that teacher candidates should experience. The available data sets include:

- percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch;
- race and ethnicity;
- school enrollments; and
- designation of school districts as city, suburban, town, or rural.

As a next step, the Application Developer will begin to identify themes to track, and will load data into the Field Experience database. We anticipate that linking these data to the existing structure of field experience records will provide a more systematic means for tracking diversity in field experience placements. [Response Item 37]

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)
1) 79.14(6): The team finds inconsistencies for Secondary Teacher Education students in the number and quality of practicum opportunities prior to student teaching. Some programs offer multiple opportunities while others may only offer one without a requirement to interact with students. The team requires the unit to evaluate the secondary education program to develop and implement policy to ensure equity in opportunity and quality of clinical experiences.

**Pre-Student Teaching Practicum in 5-12 and K-12 TEP Areas**

In response to the review team’s concerns over (a) the “inconsistencies for Secondary Teacher Education students in the number and quality of practicum opportunities prior to student teaching;” (b) some programs offer multiple opportunities while others may only offer one without a requirement to interact with students;” and (c) the requirement that the unit “evaluate the secondary education program to develop and implement policy to ensure equity in opportunity and quality of clinical experiences,” the Secondary Education Committee (program coordinators of the 5-12 and K-12 TEP program areas) convened their September 4, 2018 meeting with these concerns as their primary agenda item.

During the course of the meeting, the committee came to the determination that differences in location and duration are inherent in the programs, based on the nature of their content areas, available placements in content areas, and travel restrictions caused by student schedules. In so doing, the committee found that the practicum experiences of each 5-12 and K-12 program area meet or exceed the state requirement in number of hours (80 hours or pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program), and in teacher candidates’ requirements to be involved in instructional planning, teaching, and student assessment. The committee identified that some individual syllabi may not have included a sufficiently-clear description of how the practicum experience accomplishes all state requirements, and the committee decided unanimously that all future courses that involve a practicum experience state clearly in their syllabi all the course goals and objectives, including the state standards for field experiences.

Following this meeting and on further review, several program areas revised their syllabi to more clearly state the goals of the practicum experience, and to ensure teacher candidates are offered an experience that allows for active engagement in planning, instruction and assessment. [Response Item 38. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]
2) 79.14(7e): The team does not find evidence that the Mock Evaluation was taking place during the student teaching experience. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure mock evaluations takes place and are useful.

**Mock Evaluation Information Dissemination and Compliance**

To address the concern that the review team did not find evidence of the Mock Evaluation taking place during the student teaching experience, the Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences (Julie Heidger) took steps to ensure implementation of this requirement. At the Secondary and Elementary Supervisor Meeting in August, 2018, Julie Heidger included in the meeting’s PowerPoint slide show a slide specifically addressing the Mock Evaluation (See artifacts). Starting with this Fall, 2018 semester, student teachers will include the week they will complete the Mock Evaluation in their Student Teaching Proposal. An example of the Student Teaching Proposal with the Mock Evaluation date has been included as an artifact. An e-mail is also sent out each semester detailing the requirements of the Mock Evaluation (See artifacts) to supervisors and secondary program areas. Moving forward, when Tk20 is used for student teaching (anticipated date: Spring, 2019), there is a form completed by the Cooperating Teacher to indicate the completion of the Mock Evaluation prior to the final evaluation (See artifacts). [Response Item 39. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

3) 79.14(8): The team finds concern with the duration, content, and attendance of the workshop for cooperating teachers. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure the cooperating teacher workshop is used to meet the needs of cooperating teachers and the program.

**Cooperating Teacher Workshop Duration, Content, and Attendance**

Beginning with the Fall 2018 semester, the College of Education (COE) Office of Student Field Experiences will offer a minimum of 6 hours of workshops for cooperating teachers. Cooperating teacher workshops will include:

- A face-to-face workshop (2.5 hours), beginning with the Spring 2019 semester;
- One or two meetings delivered by Zoom online videoconferencing (2 hours);
- An edTPA webinar specifically for cooperating teachers (1 hour); and
- A face-to-face meeting with the university supervisor -- using talking points provided by the Office of Student Field Experiences -- in connection with the Student Teaching Proposal meeting (45 minutes to 1 hour)[See artifacts for talking points of meeting].

The Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences is responsible for overseeing that this is carried out. The variety of face-to-face (beginning Spring 2019, the earliest practical implementation) and electronic modes of delivery will provide cooperating teachers with a more in-depth knowledge of The University of Iowa COE Teacher Education Program and its field experience and assessment procedures and practices. Additional Zoom meetings or webinars will be integrated into the Fall 2018 schedule, to meet the 6 hour requirement.
The on-site workshop and Zoom meeting(s) will provide activities and information to enhance the coaching skills of the cooperating teacher, so that the cooperating teachers will be better prepared to provide meaningful feedback. The content of the meetings defines the goals of the student teaching experience, outlines the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, highlights important Student Teaching Handbook pages, walks through the COE Conceptual Framework, explains the Student Teaching Proposal and evaluations, InTASC Standards, stresses the importance of the Mock Evaluation, reviews legal and ethical issues, provides further explanation of edTPA, as well as other topics of interest to the cooperating teacher [See artifacts for the agenda of the Spring 2018 Zoom meeting].

To ensure topics are useful and relevant, the Director sent an e-mail inquiry to all Fall 2018 cooperating teachers, asking for input on topics for the upcoming Zoom meeting [See artifacts for the email, and samples of responses].

The Office of Student Field Experiences offers a variety of delivery methods (face-to-face, Zoom and Webinar) to ensure cooperating teachers are getting pertinent information. The Zoom meeting(s) will be recorded, and a private YouTube link sent out to all cooperating teachers, so that teachers who were unable to participate during the designated time will have ready access to the information, if questions occur during the semester. Providing cooperating teachers with an on-site face-to-face meeting with the university supervisor, in addition to the Zoom and webinar delivery, and the on-campus meeting (starting Spring 2019), will ensure the necessary information will reach all cooperating teachers, including those who are outside the local Iowa City area. [Response Item 40. Click here for artifacts related to this response item.]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

Cooperating teachers, supervising teachers, student teachers, practicum students, principals, Director of Student Teaching and Clinical Experiences, focus group participants

Review of:

- Student records
- Course syllabi
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:
- The elementary literacy course sequence provide candidates opportunities to plan, instruct, and assess literacy in depth.
- Candidates take courses in both technology and classroom management.
- EdTPA support helps candidate clearly understand standards.

Recommendations:
(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.15(4) The team finds evidence through syllabi review of inconsistent use of InTASC standards except in the student teaching seminar. The team recommends the unit examine the application of InTASC standards in curriculum and assessments to ensure candidates are able to demonstrate the InTASC standards.

2) 79.15(4) Evidence indicates that portfolio key assessments are often determined by individual faculty members rather than being aligned to standards. The team recommends the unit examine the consistency of alignment of standards and portfolio assessments.

InTASC and Key Assessments
Thank you for this feedback. We agree. Please see responses above to recommendations and concerns under standards 79.10(4) [Response Item 3], 79.13(2) [Response Item 27], 79.13(5)d [Response Item 24], and 79.13(5)b [Response Item 29], which detail plans for alignment and tracking of standards under a Course-Based Assessment system, to be implemented in the Tk20 assessment system. [Response Item 41a]

Concerns:
(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.15(8) Curriculum exhibits have not yet been approved. The team requires the unit to gain approval of curriculum exhibits for all endorsements offered.

Curriculum Exhibits Approved
Staff of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners indicated approval of all curriculum exhibits as of April 12, 2018. [Response Item 41]
Sources of Information:
Interviews with:
Current students, student teachers, unit faculty, local administrators, advisors
Review of:
• Course syllabi
• Student records
• Institutional Report
• Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report
Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrator Preparation Clinical Practices

ADMINISTRATOR CLINICAL

281—79.16(256) Administrator preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful school administrators in accordance with the following provisions.

79.16(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating administrators.

79.16(2) The PK-12 school and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

   a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and
   b. High-quality cooperating administrators.

79.16(3) Cooperating administrators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate’s achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ attainment of unit standards.

79.16(4) Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:

   a. A minimum of 400 hours during the candidate’s preparation program.
   b. Take place with appropriately licensed cooperating administrators in state-approved schools or educational facilities.
   c. Take place in multiple high-quality educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups.
   d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating administrators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEA’s and for higher education supervising faculty members.
   e. Include prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities of the candidate for ethical performance of both leadership and management tasks.
   f. The involvement of the administrator candidate in relevant responsibilities to include demonstration of the capacity to facilitate the use of assessment data in affecting student learning.
   g. Involve the candidate in professional meetings and other school-based activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning.
   h. Involve the candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating administrators in the school.

79.16(5) The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating administrators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating administrator, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating administrator other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.

79.16(6) The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for administrator candidates.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Commendations/Strengths:

- The clinical coordinator makes efforts to introduce mentors to other faculty so that they can be used as guest speakers in classes throughout the program beyond the clinical experience.
- Adjunct instructors express appreciation for the professional development/learning activities offered to them.
- Expectations for candidates, administrators, and the clinical coordinator are clearly delineated in the Clinical Handbook.
- The program is making changes to clinical experience based on 2016-2017 feedback.
- 12 hours of coursework must be completed before qualifying for clinicals and research & theory course
- Clinical Supervisor meets with candidate a minimum of 3 times
- Every candidate is required to complete a clinical project

Recommendations

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.16(4) The team found inconsistency in the diversity of clinical placements. This is partially due to candidates being tasked with seeking their own placements. This is manifested in two ways. The program does not ensure clinical settings are different from that in which the candidate may be teaching. Management of clinical placements does not consistently provide experience in working with a wide range of student needs. The team recommends the unit examine requirements for clinical placements and experiences to ensure candidates are consistently well prepared to meet the needs of a broader range of diverse students.

Educational Leadership Diversity of Clinical Placements

The following new language has been added to each clinical syllabus encouraging the students to seek diverse placements during their clinical experiences:

"These courses are field-based experiences, which take place in a local school or agency setting. They are designed to bridge the gap (and provide balance) between theory and practice. The clinical experiences are supervised on-site by a practicing school administrator in an intern-like relationship with the student, as well as by the university clinical supervisor who has overall responsibility for the clinical courses. In addition to providing practical experiences for the student, the clinical experience is designed to provide assistance to participating school districts and administrators.

"Although a majority of your work will be completed at one site within a district, it is highly recommended that students look for additional learning opportunities within their primary district or in surrounding settings. The intent is to diversify your experiences and take advantage of all learning opportunities available to you." [Response Item 42]

Concerns:

1) (Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None
Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
Cooperating administrators, supervisors, candidates, focus group participants

Review of:
- Student records
- Course syllabi
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating administrators

Final Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Administrator Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

ADMINISTRATOR KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS (CURRICULUM)

281—79.17(256) Administrator knowledge, skills, and dispositions standard. Administrator candidates shall demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.17(1) Each educational administrator program shall define program standards (aligned with current ISSL standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice administrator.

79.17(2) Each new administrator candidate successfully completes the appropriate evaluator training provided by a state-approved evaluator trainer.

79.17(3) Each administrator candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support the implementation of the Iowa core.

79.17(4) Each administrator candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that administrator candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:

- Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- Students with disabilities.
- Students who are gifted and talented.
- English language learners.
- Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.

79.17(5) Each administrator candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Noted Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- Students are creating a comprehensive entry plan in the program, which they present to the education leadership faculty. This entry plan is evidence of overall learning throughout the program and will help them be marketable to the field after earning the degree.
- Course syllabi for ELPS 6265 and ELPS 6383 are clearly and effectively align to the Iowa Core.
- Education leadership students are required to attend the Iowa School Finance and Leadership Conference each year to develop their skills and understanding of Iowa School Finance.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

None
Concerns:

(Congerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.17(5) Curriculum exhibits have not yet been approved. The team requires the unit to gain approval of curriculum exhibits for all endorsements offered.

**Curriculum Exhibits Approved**

Staff of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners indicated approval of all curriculum exhibits as of April 12, 2018. [Response Item 43]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

Current candidates, unit faculty, local administrators, advisors

Review of:

- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other Educator Preparation Program
Clinical Practice

OTHER EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM CLINICAL

281—79.20(256) Clinical practice standard. The unit and its school, AEA, and facility partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful practitioners in accordance with the following provisions.

79.20(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating professional educators.

79.20(2) The PK-12 school, AEA, and facility partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:

   a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and
   b. High-quality cooperating professional educators.

79.20(3) Cooperating professional educators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate’s achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate the candidate’s attainment of unit standards.

79.20(4) Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:

   a. Learning that takes place in the context of providing high-quality instructional programs for students in a state-approved school, agency, or educational facility;
   b. Take place in educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups;
   c. Provide opportunities for candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice;
   d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating professional educators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members;
   e. Include prescribed minimum expectations for involvement of candidates in relevant responsibilities directed toward the work for which they are preparing;
   f. Involve candidates in professional meetings and other activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning; and
   g. Involve candidates in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating professional educators in the school.

79.20(5) The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating professional educators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating professional educators, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating professional educators other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.

79.20(6) The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for candidates.

Initial Team Finding:

| Met or Met with Strength | Met Pending Conditions Noted Below | Not Met |
Commendations/Strengths:

- School Social Work, School Psychology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Professional School Counseling: Recent graduate and current students speak highly of opportunities to practice and perfect their skills in meaningful and appropriate settings.
- School Social Work, School Psychology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Professional School Counseling: Recent graduate and current students indicate close, careful, and high-quality supervision with multiple opportunities for immediate and helpful feedback.
- School Psychology: Recent graduates and current students indicated the program required and monitored diverse placements including gifted/talented, urban/rural, race/ethnicity, and a variety of settings.
- School Social Work: Student performance in clinical experiences is assessed through the Learning Contract with practice behaviors, specific competencies, and rating scales that inform practice and show growth.
- Communication Sciences and Disorders, School Psychology, and School Social Work: Program students, supervisors, and faculty indicated collaborative relationships with AEA’s involving selection of sites, supervisors and experiences.
- Professional School Counseling: Documents and interviews indicate multiple evaluations of students, practicum sites, and a close alignment to standards.
- School Social Work: Interviews with faculty indicate a clear and structured system of evaluating potential sites prior to student practica allowing for a meaningful and strong experience.
- Professional School Counseling: Has a clinical coordinator who manages clinical experiences well. Students can recommend which school they would like to work in, but coordinator will make the placement. Students go to an initial visit where they meet the site supervisor and interview each other for a strong match.
- Evidence indicates that all programs have clinical experiences that are well aligned with curriculum and well sequenced.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)

1) 79.20(4)e. School Counseling: Candidates clearly articulated learning about classroom structures such as PBIS and 504 plans. However, they described a lack of opportunities for application of this learning in clinical settings. The team recommends the unit examine clinical opportunities and requirements to provide application of learning whenever possible.

School Counseling Practicum Experience with PBIS and 504 Plans

The School Counseling program faculty appreciate the feedback that was provided by the students about their clinical experiences. Based upon this feedback, the syllabi in the practicum course and internship course now emphasize that all students take advantage of opportunities to learn about behavioral support programs and disability support programs in the school. It should be noted that the majority of schools students are placed in for their clinical settings utilize Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and make use of 504 plans. Since coordination of these programs are not always the responsibility of the school counselor, students are encouraged to seek out the individual who is assigned this responsibility and to work on these aspects of school structures in order to be fully prepared with models of these programs. To ensure students are adequately exposed to both, program will also communicate to on-site supervisors the importance of providing students with opportunities to observe and participate in such learning. [Response Item 44]
2) 79.20(4) Candidates suggested the program consider changing the practicum schedule that is only once a week. Their suggestion is to have multiple, successive days of practica to better allow for skill development or relationship building with P12 students. The team recommends the unit consider the candidates’ suggestions in scheduling practica.

School Counseling Practicum Scheduling in Context of Developmental Sequence

The school counseling program faculty believe in a developmental process of learning and applying skills in the school setting. The practicum experience is designed to be the first experience for our school counselors to begin to integrate the knowledge and skills learned in their master’s curriculum. As such, this course intentionally allows time for reflective practice and time to develop and grow. While the faculty appreciates our students' excitement to start working with children, teachers, parents and administrators in the schools, it is important to put this course into the context of a progressive developmental sequence. While the course requires at least one day per week, students can elect to add days to the experience over the course of the semester. In addition, this course fulfills requirements for national accreditation that states the experience needs to be at least over 10 weeks of duration. [Response Item 45]

Concerns:

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

None

Sources of Information:

Interviews with:
Unit faculty, local administrators, focus group participants, adjunct faculty, supervisors,

Review of:
• Course syllabi
• Student records
• Institutional Report
• Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students
Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators

Final Recommendation:
Other Educator Preparation Program
Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

OTHER EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS (CURRICULUM)

281—79.21(256) Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Candidates shall demonstrate the content knowledge and the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.21(1) Each professional educator program shall define program standards (aligned with current national standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice professional educator.

79.21(2) Each candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:

a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
b. Students with disabilities.
c. Students who are gifted and talented.
d. English language learners.
e. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school.

79.21(3) Each candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

Initial Team Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted Below</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commendations/Strengths:

- Professional School Counseling: Evidence is clear of use and alignment of the 2016 CACREP standards in coursework, clinical practices, and licensure requirements. The program is accredited by CACREP.
- School Psychology: The program is accredited by the American Psychological Association and approved by the National Association of School Psychologists. There is clear evidence of alignment of standards, curriculum, and assessments, as seen in syllabi and other course materials.
- Speech/Language Pathology and Audiology: Evidence indicates clear alignments with the academic and clinical Knowledge and Skills Assessment (KASA) standards from the American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA.)
- School Social Work: Evidence indicates clear use and alignment with the MSW Foundation Competencies and Practice Behaviors in coursework, clinical practices, and licensure requirements. The program is nationally accredited.
- Teacher Librarian: Evidence indicates clear alignment and use of the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) standards in alignment with Iowa licensure standards.

Recommendations:

(Recommendations are made to inform the program for continuous improvement only. No action is required.)
1) 79.21(1) School Counseling: Candidates described struggles with the change from a 3 year program to a 2.5 year program. Their concerns are summer coursework tuition costs and maintenance of financial and benefit support after completing the program (and TA employment) mid-year when positions are difficult to find. The team recommends the unit communicate with and consider the candidates’ concerns when determining program schedules.

**Concerns:**

(Concerns are made to inform the program for continuous improvement. However, the program is required to address concerns before State Board action.)

1) 79.21(3) Curriculum exhibits have not yet been approved. The team requires the unit to gain approval of curriculum exhibits for all endorsements offered.

**Curriculum Exhibits Approved**

Staff of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners indicated approval of all curriculum exhibits as of April 12, 2018. [Response Item 46]

**Sources of Information:**

Interviews with:

Unit faculty, administrators, focus group participants, adjunct faculty, supervisors,

Review of:

- Course syllabi
- Student records
- Institutional Report
- Program Response to Review Team’s Initial Report

Visits to classrooms and discussions with candidates

Visits to clinical sites and discussions with candidates, cooperating educators, administrators

**Final Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met or Met with Strength</th>
<th>Met Pending Conditions Noted</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>