



The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation



(Part C of the AACTE Annual Report)

Section 1 - Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	10144
AACTE SID:	3470
Institution:	University of Louisiana at Monroe
Unit:	College of Education and Human Development
Next Accreditation Visit:	F09
Last Accreditation Visit	F04
Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:	11/06/2006

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name:	Sandra Lemoine
Unit Head Title:	Dean
Unit Head Email:	slemoine@ulm.edu
Unit Head Phone:	(318) 342-1235
Unit Head Fax:	(318) 342-1240
Institution Unit Phone:	(318) 342-1235
1st NCATE Coordinator:	Glenda Holland
1st Coordinator Title:	Associate Dean
1st Coordinator Email:	holland@ulm.edu
1st Coordinator Phone:	(318) 342-1242
1st Coordinator Fax:	(318) 342-1369
2nd NCATE Coordinator:	
2nd Coordinator Title:	

2nd Coordinator Email:

2nd Coordinator Phone:

2nd Coordinator Fax:

CEO: **Dr. James E. Cofer**

CEO Title: **President**

CEO Email: **Cofer@ulm.edu**

CEO Phone: **(318) 342-1010**

CEO Fax: **(318) 342-1019**

Corrected Unit Head:

Corrected Title of Unit Head

Corrected Unit Head Email:

Corrected Unit Head Phone:

Corrected Unit Head Fax:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head:

Corrected Title of 2nd Unit Head

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Email:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Phone:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Fax:

Corrected Institution Unit Phone:

Corrected 1st NCATE Coordinator:

Corrected 1st Coordinator Title **Associate Dean**

Corrected 1st Coordinator Email:

Corrected 1st Coordinator Phone: **(318)342-1242**

Corrected 1st Coordinator Fax: (318)342-1369

Corrected 2nd NCATE Coordinator:

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Title:

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Email:

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Phone:

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Fax:

Corrected CEO Full Name:

Corrected CEO Title:

Corrected CEO Email:

Corrected CEO Phone:

Corrected CEO Fax:

Section A. Conceptual Framework(s)

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

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

The updated conceptual framework, The ULM Interactive Learning Model: Learning Facilitators Making a Better World, has evolved over a period of 17 years. Interactive learning describes the teaching and learning process; Learning Facilitators who demonstrate identified performances in six areas constitute the product; and the assess/reflect/adjust/instruct cycle serves as the context. The conceptual framework vision is articulated as making a better world. The conceptual framework logo, illustrated and described at <http://www.ulm.edu/cehd/accreditation.html>, graphically depicts the process, product, and context as a world globe supported by books that symbolize the knowledge base. The knowledge base was updated during 2005-2006, and those updates are reflected in course syllabi and activities. Dispositions did not change; however, the instrument used for measuring candidate dispositions was revised as a result of candidate and faculty input.

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

A. Title II Report Card Data. During 2005-06, Louisiana was not able to implement the Teacher Preparation Accountability System due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. Quantity and PRAXIS examination passage rate data were collected and disseminated to the public in the 2005-06 Institutional Report for the Preparation of Teachers. While no score was given, ULM was the only public institution in Louisiana able to report that 100% of the program completers in initial teacher preparation programs passed the state teachers' exam (appropriate parts of PRAXIS I and PRAXIS II) for the sixth consecutive year (see report card at <http://asa.regents.state.la.us/TE/reports/2005>).

Due to the inability to track misplaced teachers and mentors after the hurricanes, the Graduate Satisfaction Survey was not administered by the Board of Regents, so these data are missing for 2005-06. Together the Survey and the PRAXIS examination passage rate data would have made up 50% of the final institutional score.

In non-hurricane years, Quantity Index counts 50% of the final institutional score. While no Quantity Index for program completers was computed for 2004-05, ULM recorded a higher number of completers than in any year since Title II data have been collected?173

B. Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program. Once again, all ULM program completers employed in their certification areas and eligible for the state assessment demonstrated competent performances, for a 100% pass rate.

C. Undergraduate Program Data. Evidence of program completers' mastery of requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions was gleaned from their performance on the PRAXIS, their performances at or above the target level of 80% on signature assessments, and their competent performance on parts of the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching during field experiences leading up to student teaching, wherein they demonstrated all of the LCET performances at a competent level.

D. Alternative Certification Program Data. Admitted into the alternate certification programs (initial) in July of 2005 were 87 candidates: 28 Elementary Education M.A.T.; 27 Secondary M.A.T.; and 32 Special Education M.A.T. Each one of those candidates met all of the program admission standards, including the baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution; either GRE score of 750 and undergraduate GPA of 2.5 or a formula score of 1875 when the GRE Verbal plus Quantitative scores are multiplied by the undergraduate GPA; passing scores on the PRAXIS I; and passing scores on the appropriate PRAXIS II content test(s). In terms of programmatic performance assessments, 42 of the M.A.T. candidates completed the course requirements and also demonstrated mastery at or above the 80% target level of the first two phases of the required assessments. Eleven of the candidates did not complete Phase II requirements for a variety of reasons: another job not in education, unable to find a teaching position, relocation to another state, grades, acceptance into program but no matriculation. An additional 34 candidates should complete the program in the coming year.

E. Advanced Program Data. Performance data for the 2005-2006 advanced graduate program completers shows that they performed at or above the target level of 80% on every signature assessment. Program completers in the LEC Ed.D. program demonstrated target performances at each checkpoint in their programs as well.

F. Evaluations of Instruction, Programs, and Graduates. Candidates' evaluations of their undergraduate and graduate courses averaged more than 4.5 on a five-point scale. Surveys completed by candidates as they prepared to exit yielded an average rating above 4 out of 5 for undergraduate completers and also for graduate completers.

G. LEC Evaluation. The LEC Educational Leadership doctoral program underwent a Board of Regents mandated review by an outside evaluation team, April 25-27, 2005. The review was positive and offered additional recommendations for improvements. Based on this review, feedback from the LEC Advisory Council, and candidate input, the LEC programs have been redesigned. Program changes include a research course near the end of the program to assist in dissertation research design, and better integration of research and practice throughout the programs. Both programs are clearly aligned with national standards.

H. Redesigned Advanced Programs. During summer 2005 ULM received approval for three redesigned advanced programs: the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction with a choice of major in Early Child, Elementary Education, Middle School, Instructional Technology Facilitation, Reading, or Secondary Education, the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, and the M.Ed. in Educational Technology Leadership. During summer 2006 the M.Ed. in Special Education was redesigned as a M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction with a major in Special Education. That program is undergoing Board of Regents external evaluation during 2006-07.

I. Other Examples of Unit Progress. Faculty members report increasing their use of technology by integrating Respondus, Blackboard, and assistive technology into their teaching. Course content and strategies were continuously improved. In the process of aligning signature assessments to the 6-8 required SPA assessments, scoring rubrics have been reconfigured and better designed. The unit continued to increase involvement and service to the community with collaborative grants developed with local school systems, organization leadership, and participation in special community projects.

Programs Deleted. The Practitioner programs in elementary education, secondary education, and special education were deleted. The M.A.T. in Early Childhood Education was deleted due to low enrollment.

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

(Advanced Preparation) The reading specialist program has not been nationally recognized.

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

Program Deleted. The unit deleted the reading specialist program in question. On August 4, 2005, The Louisiana Board of Regents deleted from ULM program offerings the Master of Education in Reading (CIP Code 13.1315). Hence, lack of national recognition is not an issue because the reading specialist program has been deleted.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

Assessment Plans and Progress. As documented by the Unit Accreditation Board decision in 2005, the unit meets the assessment standard. The unit assessment system reflects the conceptual framework and professional and state standards and continues to collect and analyze data about candidate qualifications and performances. Unit policies and procedures for program change ensure systematic tracking, responding, and documenting of data-based program changes. The Assessment Review Committee provides the vehicle for considering performance data and modifying curricula accordingly.

The state-supported electronic data system (Pass-Port) changed to a privately owned system during 2006. The Assessment Review Committee determined that Pass-Port had not been meeting the needs of the unit, and made a decision to review other electronic data systems. During summer 2006 the Committee, with leadership from Dr. Thilla Sivakumaran, researched other data management systems. Companies were invited to hold demo sessions for the Assessment Review Committee and for faculty from LEC sister institutions. The Committee determined that TaskStream most closely fit our needs. A final decision was not made during the summer because the unit did not have Board permission to make the change. During Fall 2006 ULM was given permission to make changes in the electronic data system, and TaskStream was selected for the unit. The Committee especially liked the user friendliness of the visual representation of an individual candidate's program portals.

Data Analysis and Evaluation. After reviewing data, in Fall 2005 the Assessment Review Committee recommended that we report candidate ratings as mixed numbers rounded to the nearest hundredth. During the next year we continued to monitor assessment scoring. A decision was made to change to a 3 point system, which will begin during Fall 2006. Program data will be reported as number, frequency and percent of candidates scoring at each of the three levels. We believe that with this reporting we will be able to make better judgments about how the candidates are moving through the portals.

Signature assessments and scoring rubrics were adjusted for Fall 2006 to eliminate discrepancies in the programs as a result of changing to the new SPA Review guidelines.

State Recommendation. The Unit is committed to continued refinement of the processes for data-based program improvements. As recommended by the Louisiana Unit Accreditation Board, the unit added a Results column to the Use of Data to Improve Programs tables to document results of collected data for 2005-2006.

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

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

Section C. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

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

A. Clinical & Field Supervisors and Mentors. The Director of Field Experiences provided a copy of the 2005-2006 ULM Handbook for Clinical & Field Experiences: Undergraduate Teacher Candidates & Supervisors or the 2005-2006 ULM Handbook for Alternative Certification Teacher Candidates and Mentors/Supervisors to each university and school site supervisor and mentor and also met with them each semester to discuss the requirements of student teaching, internship and practica. Roles and responsibilities of supervisors were discussed, mentoring strategies were examined, and time provided for questions and comments. The handbooks for student teachers, interns, practicum students, and their supervisors document our use of standards to guide our curriculum and assess our candidates and programs.

B. LaTAAP Training. The unit requires all supervisors of student teachers and interns to document earned teacher certification and also appropriate and successful teaching experiences for their supervisory assignments. In addition, although not required by the state, the unit requires that supervisors participate in state training for the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program (LaTAAP). During Summer and Fall 2005 all supervising faculty completed the intensive two- to three-day revised LaTAAP training sessions sponsored by the state.

C. Diversity. Candidates continue to work with diverse P-12 students throughout their programs. Regional schools continue to offer an instructive range of diverse students.

D. Professional Development Seminars. During the 2005-2006 academic year eight professional development seminars were held for alternative certification interns and new teachers (1st - 3rd year program completers). Content and topics of seminars were guided by feedback from program completer surveys, reflective comments of seminar participants, and current research in education and teacher preparation. The topics selected for interns and new teachers included PLT-Test Preparation Tips, Instructional Planning, Special Education Focus Groups, Passport Portfolio Development, What New Teachers Need to Know about Mandated Testing, Assistive Technology, and What Every Teacher Should Know about Teaching the Emotional Child. During the same year, twelve seminars with similar topics were held for student teachers; additional topics included Legal Issues, Interviews, and Resumé Writing. The seminars were again well received by participants, as documented in their reflections of seminar participation.

E. Online Professional Development. In 2004-05 online modules were developed to provide additional support for our alternative certification interns and completers. During 2005-06 two additional modules were funded by our Louisiana Transition to Teaching grant (LaT2T), Diversity and Teaching the Emotional Child. In addition to our alternative certification interns, student teachers, undergraduate candidates, graduate candidates, and supervising classroom teachers report using the modules to supplement their professional development.

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

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

Standard 4. Diversity

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

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

A. Unit Diversity Commitment. The unit continues to meet and exceed NCATE standards related to diversity. This commitment is evident in these quotes from the Board of Examiners' report from October of 2004:

The unit clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate during their professional program. Diversity is a primary focus for required courses in each program of study and integrated as a theme throughout the curriculum. Candidates demonstrate proficiency in developing and implementing lessons that incorporate diversity for all students. Candidates demonstrate by their instructional strategies, classroom interactions and speech proficiencies that show respect and appreciation for human diversity, and for all involved in the teaching and learning process, and for the education profession itself. The unit's assessments of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions relating to diversity are evident in the assessments of candidates in field and clinical experiences and student teaching. Assessment of candidate proficiencies provides data on candidate's ability to help all students learn.

B. Diverse Clinical and Field Experiences. Regional schools that provide the settings for candidates' clinical and field experiences offer an instructive range of diverse students.

C. Faculty Diversity. Two minority faculty members hold endowed professorships as of July of 2005. Additionally, our Technology Coordinator is a minority faculty member.

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

Candidates have limited opportunities to interact in classroom settings on campus with professional education faculty from diverse ethnic and racial groups.

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

Evidence of Unit commitment to recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty is apparent in the full-time faculty racial minority representation for 2005-2006: 16.67% for the Unit, with 33% minority faculty in the major teacher preparation department (Curriculum and Instruction).

In addition to the extraordinary and successful efforts cited in the NCATE Rejoinder, recent retention efforts have included naming a minority faculty member as Coordinator of Instructional Technology for the College of Education and Human Development and awarding endowed professorships to two minority faculty members, both continued July 2006. These actions reconfirm commitment to diversity as a central element of unit dispositions.

As in past years, the department continues to be exemplary in the diversity of its faculty (ethnicity and gender) and has one of the most diverse faculty compositions at ULM with over one-fourth minority (22% African-American females and 6% Asian male). The department is approximately 80% female with several of them continuing to hold important administrative positions including the Assistant Dean and Director of Clinical and Field Studies, PK-16 Coordinator, and Unit Assessment Coordinator.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

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

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

Endowed Professorships. Based on their positive performances and sustained contributions to unit progress, eight unit faculty members who were awarded endowed professorships in June, 2005 were continued in July, 2006 for an additional year. These included Dr. Peggie Jelks (Early Childhood), Dr. Bob Cage (Education), Dr. Otis LoVette (Educational Administration), Dr. Ava Pugh (Elementary Education), Dr. Wilson Campbell (Kinesiology), and Dr. Mark Doherty (Instructional Technology), and Dr. Thilla Sivakumaran (Outstanding New Faculty), and Dr. Gary Stringer (Science Education).

Faculty Scholarship and Productivity. In spite of the demands of graduate redesign of programs, state-mandated reading competencies review, nine-month department heads, and the financial burdens precipitated by the hurricanes, the unit continued to produce scholarly endeavors in research, publications, and presentations. Faculty belong to nearly 100 different professional organizations and are active members and officers. They have reviewed manuscripts and serve as editors for international and national journals.

Faculty Development. Faculty participated in a variety of development activities. For example, they continued in

PassPort training to facilitate candidates' electronic entry and faculty's electronic scoring of performance artifacts. During University Week in August of 2005 and January 2006, professional development opportunities included rubric development, syllabus development, assessment, faculty evaluation, instructional technology, and research-based teaching. As noted earlier in response to Standard 3, every clinical supervisor participated in intensive two- to three-day revised LaTAAP training sessions sponsored by the state during Fall 2005. In addition, faculty participated in unit mini-workshops that addressed NCATE standards in terms of redesign and reading competency mandates.

Priorities for professional development for 2005-2006 will focus on the use of the new electronic data management system (TaskStream), use of TaskStream assessment results to improve programs, documentation of program integrity, and opportunities for candidates to interact with minority faculty. Hence, NCATE and program development mini-workshops will continue during 2006-2007 on at least a monthly basis.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

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

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

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

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

1. **The addition or removal of programs**
2. **Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face**
3. **Unit or institutional name changes**
4. **Addition or removal of a level of preparation**
5. **Significant change in physical facilities**
6. **Status of an institution, i.e., merged, separated, etc.**
7. **Significant changes resulting from unforeseen conditions, e.g., natural disasters, health calamities, etc**
8. **Significant changes in budget**

Programs Deleted. The Practitioner programs in elementary education, secondary education, and special education were deleted. The M.A.T. in Early Childhood Education was deleted due to low enrollment.

Reorganization. The CEHD has begun the process of reorganization inline with University guidelines. Beginning July 1, 2005 all department heads and other 11 or 12 month faculty moved to 9-month faculty status. Additionally, Psychology and Educational Leadership and Counseling gave up their departmental secretaries. Department heads are supposed to concentrate more of their time on academic issues and the Dean's office is supposed to handle more of the departmental administrative load. Also, a new position, Budget and Facilities Manager was created to help relieve departments and the Dean's office from many of the daily operational duties.

The 2005-2006 academic year was not without challenge for the College. Several anchor faculty were lost through retirements and resignations. The retirement of Dr. Joyce Choate, Associate Dean, necessitated the redefining of the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean positions. The move of Dr. Glenda Holland from Assistant Dean to Associate Dean along with the merging of Dr. Beverly Flowers Gibson's position as Director of Teacher Certification and Field Experiences into the Assistant Dean's position helped alleviate much of the transition problems.

Resources, External Funding.

Acquisition of resources was complicated by budget constraints brought on by the after effects of hurricanes

Katrina and Rita; however, the unit had several funded projects.

The Kinesiology Department, headed by Dr. Wilson Campbell, in collaboration with Monroe City School System, received three-year funding (\$820,184.00) for a Carol M. White Physical Education Grant (PEP) grant for the district. The funds allow kinesiology faculty to implement an innovative, integrated program of physical education K-12. The school district commitment to physical education is strengthened by the hiring of 12 elementary school physical education teachers over the next three years so each school will have a specialist on staff. The grant has significant benefit to teacher education candidates as they will participate in teacher professional development workshops. An additional benefit during student teaching is the training and supervision they receive from a cooperating teacher who is implementing a curriculum designed to increase student activity levels during physical education, improve fitness levels, and integrate academic content.

In addition to the PEP grant, other funds received included:

1. Continuation of grant received from the US Department of Education, Transition to Teaching: LaT2T, \$2,435,006, October, 2004. Project Director: Dr. Glenda Holland of which \$492,046.19 was received for 2005-06.
2. Continuation of grant received from La Gear Up/Pennington Biomedical Research Center, La Health, \$120,000, Spring, 2005. Project Director: Dr. Lisa Colvin
3. An additional \$309,756 in other grants and external funds provided support for Unit activities.

Technology. Reflecting the unit's instructional technology priority, additional technology was obtained and made available for the use of faculty and candidates. Two computer labs in Strauss Hall received equipment upgrades. A new Digital Media Studio contains 10 Mac computers, 12 scanners, 5 digital video cameras, 10 still cameras, and printers. A mobile cart with 20 laptops is housed in the Digital Media Studio and is available for faculty and candidates to use in classrooms. Assistive technology software is loaded on lab computers and on the mobile cart computers.

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

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

If you have another comments, use the space below:

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2005-2006 academic year?

247

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2005-2006 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Name of the Person Filling Out the Report: **Glenda Holland**

Draft *Deferred*
 Final

Creation Date: 09/26/2006 11:51:39 AM Last Modified By: Marsha Russell Last Modified Date: 01/30/2007 Date Received over Web: 11/06/2006

Exempt