CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A.1. What are the institution’s historical context and unique characteristics (e.g., HBCU or religious)? [one paragraph]

Benedictine College is rooted in the fifteen hundred year-old tradition of the Benedictine Religious Order and the more recent dedication of the American Catholic church to providing sound general and religious education to its members. In 1858, Benedictine monks opened a boarding and day academy in Atchison, Kansas and enrolled six students. In 1863, seven Benedictine Sisters also started a school for the children of the townspeople. Both of these academies continued to enlarge their curricula and became accredited liberal arts colleges in 1927 (St. Benedict's College) and 1932 (St. Scholastica's College). The two colleges ultimately merged on July 1, 1971 to form Benedictine College. During the years since then, Benedictine College has formed its own identity, one steeped in the history and tradition of its parent institutions.

A.2. What is the institution’s mission? [one paragraph]

Heir to the 1500 years of Benedictine dedication to learning, Benedictine College is ordered to the goal of wisdom lived out in responsible awareness of oneself, God and nature, family and society. Its mission as a Catholic, Benedictine, liberal arts, residential college is the education of men and women within a community of faith and scholarship. [Benedictine College Catalog 2012 – 2013] The college embraces students and faculty of all faiths who accept its goals, seeking in its members a personal commitment to the ideals and principles of a spiritual life and the expression of these in worship and action. As a college founded on the Benedictine tradition, Benedictine College inherits the themes handed on to us by the Benedictine family: peace, the balance of activity and contemplation, and the glorification of God in all undertakings. With the ideal of a common life vitalized by the spirit of St. Benedict, the members of the Benedictine College community can share work and prayer in common, faithful participation in the life of the community, attentive openness to the Word of God, deep concern for issues of justice and peace, and the pursuit of moderation, hospitality and care for the gifts of creation. As a liberal arts college, Benedictine College is dedicated to provide a liberal arts education by means of academic programs based on a core of studies in the arts and sciences. Through these programs, the college guides students to refine their capacity for the pursuit and acquisition of truth, to appreciate the major achievements in thought and culture, and to understand the principles that sound theoretical and practical judgment require. In addition, the college provides education for careers through both professional courses of study and major programs in the liberal arts and sciences. As an essential element in its educational mission, Benedictine College fosters scholarship, independent research and performance in its students and faculty as a means of participating in and contributing to the broader world of learning. As a residential college, Benedictine College supports and encourages the full development of its students through a
community life that expresses and proclaims the worth and dignity of each individual. In a
caring and supportive atmosphere, students are helped to develop a sense of meaningful purpose
in life and encouraged to participate in programs which promote sound bodies, emotional
balance and dedication to the welfare of others.

A.3. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship
to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional
educators? [1-2 paragraphs]

Benedictine College’s Professional Education unit is the Education Department, which offers 15
initial and two advanced programs. The dean of the college has designated the co-chairs of the
Education Department with the overall responsibility for the Professional Education Unit. Both
co-chairs also serve as members of the Dean’s Council. The composition of the governance
structure of the unit includes the Dean’s Council (some department chairs) and Academic
Policies Committee (composed of all department chairs), oversees the academic programs at the
college, the Committee on Teacher Education, oversees the initial teacher education programs,
and the Graduate Studies Committee, oversees the advanced programs. In addition, the Diversity
Subcommittee provides consultation and assistance regarding all programs’ diversity initiatives.
Members of these committees include faculty from the unit, various faculty form the arts and
sciences, as well as PK-12 teachers and education candidates. As the unit with responsibility for
coordinating all education programs at Benedictine College, the Education Department provides
leadership and support to all programs in the Professional Education Unit, accreditation, PreK-12
School Partnerships, Clinical Experiences, and Licensure.

A.4. What are the basic tenets of the conceptual framework and how has the conceptual
framework changed since the previous visit? [1-2 paragraphs]

The mission of the Education Department is to prepare Educators as Builders of Community.
The conceptual framework of the unit is clearly aligned with the Benedictine College mission to
provide for “…the education of men and women within a community of faith and scholarship.”
Both the mission of the college and the mission of the unit have been shaped and guided by The
Rule of St. Benedict (Exhibit I.5.c.2) and the traditions of our two founding monastic
communities (St. Benedict’s Abbey and Mount St. Scholastica Convent). Both missions are
united by secular and religious theories that describe human beings as essentially social creatures
who need to work constructively together in achieving shared goals and promoting the common
good.

The unit’s mission calls for future teachers and administrators to perceive their roles in education
as developers of community. The learning community is within classrooms and schools as well
as outside of their walls. Not only do education graduates work toward building community with
students, families, and members of the local community; but they see a purpose of education to
be the development of individuals who assume responsibility for building a healthy community
locally, nationally, and globally. The vision of the unit is to prepare quality professionals with
the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to build community in classrooms and schools and in so
doing to provide the world with educated individuals who will work collaboratively to change it
for the better. The conceptual framework includes six outcomes for teacher candidates and other school-based professionals.

Candidates must demonstrate understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches.

Candidates must demonstrate the ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to create meaningful educational experiences that substantively increase student learning.

Candidates must demonstrate that they are professionally responsible builders of community who model the altruistic values and characteristics desired for students.

Candidates must demonstrate proficiency on the six Teacher Education Program Outcomes:

1. He/she uses practices which nurture the whole child/adolescent within the learning community.
2. He/she uses his/her understanding of communication and human behavior to create a classroom community that fosters positive social interaction, collaboration and active inquiry.
3. He/she respects and promotes diversity while creating instructional opportunities that meet the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.
4. He/she builds partnerships with students, colleagues, families and community groups to enhance communication and learning.
5. He/she plans and assesses instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, and community and curriculum goals.
6. He/she is a reflective builder of community who continually evaluates the effects of his/her actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Since 2005, modifications have been made to our conceptual framework, specifically to program outcomes. Assessment data and feedback from our partnership school community indicated that we could strengthen the conceptual framework’s program outcomes by rewriting the outcomes for clarity and relevancy to current educational issues. In doing this, portions of former outcomes were combined and outcome #5 was rewritten to emphasize lesson planning and assessment of PK-12 student learning. These alterations resulted in significant changes to the conceptual framework’s teacher education outcomes, reducing the number of outcomes from seven to six. The teacher education program outcomes are still aligned to the INTASC standards (Comprehensive Assessment System Manual [CASM] p. 14-15), the six Master of Arts in School Leadership outcomes are aligned to the ISLLC standards (CASM p. 16-17), and the six M.Ed. outcomes are aligned to the KSDE Teacher Leader Standards (CASM p. 18-20). Additional modifications made include the following:

1. The unit has developed and refined its assessment system for both initial and advanced programs (A history of this process, cross-referenced to appropriate documenting artifacts, is presented in p. 7-13 of the CASM). Progress through program benchmark points is determined by the evaluation of candidate professional portfolios that directly address program outcomes. These benchmarks points have been condensed to three distinct points: Entry to the Teacher Education Program (TEP), Acceptance to Student Teaching, and TEP Completion. Similarly, the Master of Arts in School Leadership
(MASL) program has also reduced its benchmarks to three: Acceptance to the MASL program, Acceptance to the Practicum, and Completion of the MASL Program.

Quantitative analysis of candidate performance on program outcomes allows the unit to assess its strengths and areas for improvement. A number of data-driven unit changes have been made on the basis of data summarized most concisely in Exhibit 2.3.h.2 (initial) and Exhibit 2.3.h.3 (advanced). The assessment system is described in greatest detail in the CASM, particularly p. 3-6, and p. 21-37.

2. All initial program candidates since spring 2003 have been required to complete teacher work samples using the prompts and rubrics originally developed by Emporia State University and the Renaissance Partnership. This teacher work sample has been further refined and is currently titled the Benedictine Performance Assessment (BPA).

3. The unit has involved members of the P-12 community in the evaluation of professional portfolios. Each portfolio is independently evaluated by two scorers; one from the unit and one from the larger professional community. The evaluator’s rubric for initial programs is presented on p. 54-63 of the CASM; the evaluator’s rubric for the advanced program is presented on p. 87-96 of the CASM.

4. The Education Department’s Administrative Assistant continually monitors and records data to the Comprehensive Assessment System Database. In addition, Benedictine College has a full-time Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. Approximately twenty percent of this individual’s duties focus on unit assessment.

5. The unit has entered into signed partnership agreements with Atchison County Community Schools USD 377, Atchison Public Schools USD 409, Easton Public Schools USD 449, Jefferson County North USD 339, Leavenworth USD 453, Lansing Public Schools USD 469, Troy Public Schools USD 429, Valley Falls, USD 338, Lincoln, NE Catholic Schools, Buchanan Co. R-IV Schools, the Catholic Archdiocesan Schools of Kansas City, Kansas, the Catholic Diocesan Schools in Lincoln, NE, and the Catholic Diocesan Schools of Kansas City/St. Joseph, Missouri.

6. The policy-making body for initial programs, the Committee on Teacher Education, has four members from its P-12 educational community thus strengthening the input our partners in program governance.

7. The unit has revised its Education Department Policies and Procedures Handbook and its Graduate Education Programs Handbook, significantly enlarging due process procedures for candidates with grievances (p. 25 in the Education Department Policies and Procedures Handbook for the initial program; p. 4 in the Graduate Education Programs Handbook for the advanced programs).

8. The unit has instituted a $10 assessment fee for all undergraduate education courses. Funds from this fee, which amount to approximately $4,000 annually, are used to develop and implement the unit’s assessment plan.
9. Benedictine College has built a new $21 million Ferrell Academic Center. The Education Department is located on the second floor, with five classrooms and a teacher education lab. The teaching and learning facilities support state of the art “smart board” technology and wireless internet access.

10. In addition to the Master of Arts in School Leadership (MASL) program, a new Master of Arts Education program with a focus in Teacher Leadership has been developed and initiated. The first students began taking courses in fall 2011.

11. To orient school faculty to unit expectations for clinical experiences, the unit has created a Blackboard Cooperating Teacher and Clinical Supervisor training module. All cooperating teachers, and clinical supervisors who work with student teachers and administrative interns (for advanced level candidates doing their practicum) are required to successfully complete the module.

12. An additional full-time, tenure track faculty position was advertised in fall 2011. Although a minority candidate was interviewed for this position, the candidate could not substantiate any PK-12 teaching experience, and was therefore not hired. The department again received formal approval to add another full-time, tenure track faculty position for the fall of 2012, but all efforts to hire a diverse faculty member were unsuccessful. Therefore, it was decided to leave the position open and again attempt to hire a qualified diverse faculty member for the fall of 2013. We were successful this time in hiring the half-time faculty member who presently teaches all sections of Ed200/201 Introduction to Education, a course required of all initial licensure candidates. She was formerly a principal in one of our Partnership Schools, and frequently served as a Clinical Faculty member, supervising our student teachers. She strongly understands and supports our conceptual framework.

13. The unit has advertised in The Chronicle of Higher Education and minority on-line journals and consistently sought opportunities through our Partnership School network to hire a full-time, tenure track minority faculty member. In addition to the half-time faculty member indicated in the preceding paragraph, we have benefitted greatly from having two dedicated part-time minority faculty members. Our long-term relationship with these two instructors has ensured that all teacher education candidates were taught by minority faculty members.

14. The topic of diversity is supported in all education courses, but specific courses in both undergraduate and graduate programs are entirely devoted to understanding and supporting diversity as well as working with diverse students. In the undergraduate program, Ed 312/313 School As Community and field experience focuses specifically on diversity and working with diverse students. Every education candidate takes this course. From fall 2008 to spring 2012, we have had two adjunct faculty members (both African American), supporting this course, in the capacities of Co-Director of Diversity Field Experiences and Director of Diversity Discussion Seminars. One of these men moved to another state in summer 2012, but we replaced him with another minority, adjunct faculty member who has assumed the position of leading the Diversity Discussion Seminars.
This adjunct faculty member is a graduate of our MASL program and has had a strong relationship with us for the past 10 years. He also works with all advanced candidates by leading two practicum seminars and advising those practicum sections for the building leadership program and co-teaching a course in the teacher leadership program.

15. Repeated modifications in the Comprehensive Assessment System are evidence of the unit’s systematic use of data for program improvement. An examination of the history of the system as stated on p. 7–13 of the Comprehensive Assessment System Manual shows 32 specific modifications of the system between 2006-2012 (this includes both the initial and the advanced programs). Many of these changes have significantly improved unit programs.

Standard 1. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1. What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates’ meeting professional, state, and institutional standards? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results. (3 pages)

All initial and advanced program data, including the Praxis have been reviewed in SPA-like reports by the Kansas State Department of Education and approved by the Kansas State Board of Education. Each of the reports for these programs demonstrates an alignment between standards and at least six assessments of candidate performance. These reports can be found in the Kansas State Department of Education Document Warehouse. In addition to KSBE and NCATE approval, the Music program is also professionally accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music.

Our programs were reviewed in spring 2012 in relation to Kansas Program Review with eleven programs approved with no areas for improvements needed. Three programs were approved with areas for improvement noted. Two programs were approved with stipulations because they are new programs, and the math program was also approved with stipulations. Any program with areas for improvement noted will be responded to with corrections. A report will be filed on the areas for improvement noted within the stipulated two year time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Not Approved</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>X w/stipulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>New program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive K-6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFI's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive 6-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFI's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 6-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 6-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary K-6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 6-8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 6-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Not Approved</td>
<td>Areas for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language PK-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health PK-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History-Gov. 6-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 6-12</td>
<td>X w/stipulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFI's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music PK-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFI's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Leader</td>
<td>X w/stipulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>New program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial Programs**

Besides data from program assessments, the unit requires initial candidates to pass the Benedictine Performance Assessment (Teacher Work Sample) and achieve at least a C on the Student Teaching clinical experience. The Praxis II Academic Content Area and Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) are not required for program completion, but each year the Education Department tracks the number of graduates who take and successfully achieve passing scores on these exams that are required for Kansas licensure.

**Analysis of Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test.** At Benedictine College, between fall 2007 and fall 2012, we have had 182 graduates take the PLT. The pass rate for elementary candidates within this time period is 99 percent and secondary majors 98.7 percent. The overall mean pass rate for all program completers taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam is 99 percent. This is an outstanding affirmation that candidates are meeting state and institutional standards (Exhibit 1.3.k.1 and 1.3.k.2). This pass rate is directly attributed to the excellent methods courses, including field experiences, which candidates take, as well as the associated field experiences that are done in our Partnership Schools.

**Analysis of Praxis II Content Test.** Again, between fall 2007 and fall 2012, we have had 182 graduates take a content test. Within this time period, the overall mean pass rate for all program completers taking the Praxis II Content exam is 99 percent. This too is an affirmation that candidates are meeting state and institutional standards (Exhibit 1.3.k.2).

Our overall pass/fail data show that the great majority of candidates, who initially fail to pass the content test, pass it in the same academic year or the next one (Exhibits 1.3.k.3, and 1.3.k.4). Few candidates have to take the Praxis content test more than twice to achieve a passing score. The lowest score recorded during this reporting period was in the content area of chemistry, which had only one graduate take but not achieve a passing score. This candidate took the test once, missed the passing score by four points, took a job outside of education and did not retake the test. Otherwise, the Praxis II content area with the overall lowest pass rate has consistently been in Spanish, and this is generally a Kansas state pattern. We have recently realigned the program even more closely to standards and areas of the Praxis II exam. We will continue to monitor the pass rates to make future data driven decisions.
**Analysis of Benedictine Performance Assessment (Teacher Work Sample)** The *Benedictine Performance Assessment* (BPA) is required for all candidates during their student teaching practicum. All candidates understand and take responsibility for demonstrating that all students can learn. Criterion 4 of the BPA requires candidates to exhibit that they can positively affect PK-12 student learning. The expected outcomes of the BPA are that candidates demonstrate that they can deliver an effective instructional unit, taught over two to three weeks, employ meaningful classroom assessments, and analyze and reflect on their experiences to improve future instruction.

*Exhibit 1.3.g.2* provides average scores for all teacher education candidates from fall 2008 to fall 2012. Candidates must achieve at least an 80 percent on all criteria. These scores show consistent high performance across all three measured criteria. These scores demonstrate an ability to analyze the learning environment, develop appropriate learning goals and objectives, and design and implement instruction. Mean scores show that candidates can successfully plan and deliver meaningful instruction for PK–12 students. From fall 2008 to fall 2012, scores have consistently stayed in the upper 90–100 percent range. *Exhibit 1.3.g.3* represents the average learning gain for PK–12 student scores over the same eight semesters. Mean scores also demonstrate that candidates’ teaching has a positive impact on student learning in knowledge, skills, and reasoning objectives. Learning gain scores during the same time period, range from a low of 63 percent to a high of 80 percent gain on learning objectives. Even the lowest number in this range indicates a positive effect in P-12 students’ learning gains. Overall, BPA teacher work sample scores indicate that candidates score highly in meeting institutional and state standards. The major department effort that has led to these high scores has been the preparation using a practice version of the BPA that candidates are required to do during their methods courses. This acquaints candidates to the requirements of the full BPA, requires them to do some of the basic criteria of the BPA, and enhances candidates’ performance on this project during their clinical student teaching experience.

**Advanced Programs**

The unit offers two advanced programs, one in building leadership, the Master of Arts in School Leadership (MASL), and one in teacher leadership, The Master of Arts in Education (M.Ed.). These programs are both submitted for state review, the Teacher Leader is a new program and was submitted in fall of 2011 and the Building Leadership program was submitted with other unit programs in spring 2012. The Building Leadership program was approved with all standards met and no AFIs, the Teacher Leader program is new and was approved with the stipulation of an update report in October 2013. The unit’s advanced programs and their assessments are built around the same conceptual framework as the initial programs, *Educators as Builders of Community*, and the six outcomes derived from the framework, KSDE Standards, Kansas Teacher Leader Standards (KTLead) and the ISLLC Principles. These holistic outcomes incorporate all required knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Knowledge and skills for these two programs are demonstrated through KSDE program evaluations, coursework, content area exams, exit GPA’s, and follow-up studies of graduates and employers. The building leadership program also evaluates candidate knowledge and skills before and after the clinical experience.
Knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed at three benchmark points for both of the advanced programs. The program benchmarks are:

Benchmark Point 1: Admission to the MASL or M.Ed. program
Benchmark Point 2: Admission to the Practicum in School Leadership (MASL) or Admission to Directed Study (M.Ed.)
Benchmark Point 3: Program Completion

Acceptance into one of the advanced programs is screened by the program director and formally approved by the Education Department and Graduate Studies Committee. Only qualified individuals are accepted, as determined by the required entry criteria. Candidates who have obtained provisional admission to the program must meet entry criteria by the end of their first semester of study.

Since the previous accreditation visit, all candidates have maintained a minimum 3.25 GPA at Benchmark Points 2 and 3, and all MASL candidates have passed the comprehensive exam. This data is presented in Assessment #7 of the building leadership program review. The Teacher Leader (M.Ed.) program is new and candidates in this program will not reach benchmark point 2 until spring of 2013. Therefore, only benchmark point 1 data are available.

Analysis of Praxis Scores. Both of the advanced programs are state approved licensure programs, the MASL program is an approved Building Leadership program and the M.Ed. is an approved Teacher Leader program. Both programs require ETS administered exams for licensure. One of the advanced programs, the M.Ed. (Teacher Leader) is currently in its first year and only limited data were reviewed in August 2012. All but one of the advanced program candidates in the building leadership program who have taken the content licensure test since the previous visit have passed the test by meeting or exceeding the pass score of 165 set by the state of Kansas found in Exhibit 1.3.k.5. Candidates who do not meet the passing score meet with the director of the program for review and plans for remediation. More detailed data disaggregated by standards are available in the program review Assessment #1 data.

Initial Program Analysis of Partnership School Clinical Experience/Student Teaching
Student teachers are rated four times by their cooperating teachers, four times by their clinical supervisors, at least once by a co-chair of the Education Department, and in the case of secondary student teachers, once by their major department chair. All evaluators use an identical student teacher evaluation instrument that consists of 44 indicators, assessing knowledge, skills, dispositions, and the six program outcomes. The indicators are rated as 1 unsatisfactory, 2 basic, 3 proficient, or 4 distinguished. In addition, the 44 items fall into nine broad categories: knowledge, skills, dispositions, and six teacher education program outcomes (TEP). The six TEP outcomes measure numerous indicators of effective teaching (Exhibit 1.3.d.1). Ultimately all student teacher evaluation indicators are then grouped into four themes for data evaluation: subject area knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions. These student teaching data show numerical values for every indicator in the first three categories, from spring 2009 to fall 2012 (Exhibits 1.3.d.2 through 1.3.d.4). Data demonstrates that candidates have been rated highly on every indicator and across all themes during the clinical student teaching experience. All themes record at least a 3.4 score which indicates between proficient and distinguished. The highest rated themes are:
knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. The slightly lower rated theme is professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, specifically indicators skills G: Transitions occur smoothly with little loss of instructional time, and Indicator 2E: Effectively manages student behavior in the learning environment. These areas represent some of the most difficult things for beginning teachers to master. Data are also provided for portfolio benchmarks from fall 2007 – fall 2012. These data are recorded on a three-point scale, 0-.99 unacceptable, 1.0-1.99 acceptable, and 2.0-3.0 distinguished. The summary of data for ten semesters demonstrates candidates overall growth and at least proficiency on all knowledge, skills, dispositions, and TEP outcomes (Exhibits 1.3.d.5 through 1.3.d.11).

**Advanced Program Analysis of Clinical Experiences**
Candidates in the MASL practicum are evaluated two times by their clinical supervisors and four times by their college supervisor on knowledge, skills, and dispositions using an evaluation instrument aligned to the program outcomes and six ISLLC/KSDE standards for Building Leadership. The evaluation rubrics score candidates on knowledge and performance for each standard using a four point scale assessing 1 as unsatisfactory, 2 as basic, 3 as proficient, and 4 as distinguished. Data presented show that all candidates score in the proficient or distinguished range on all standards. Candidates in the M.Ed. program are evaluated 2 times by their clinical supervisor and two times by the college supervisor on program outcomes and Teacher Leader Standards 4 and 7. All candidates in advanced programs are evaluated a minimum of two times by both clinical and college supervisors on dispositions.

**Surveys of Graduates and Employers**
Graduate and employer surveys are sent out each year to measure the progress on first-year teachers (Exhibit 1.3.i.1, 1.3.i.2, 1.3.j.1, 1.3.j.2). There are no items rated below 2.5 indicating above “basic.” Most indicators in the themes of knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge receive at least a rating of 3 indicating “proficient.” The lower areas fall into three areas, the ability to differentiate instruction, use of a variety of techniques for student understanding, and the use of technology to help students learn. These are areas that are inherently difficult for new teachers.

**Initial Program Dispositional Data**. The unit’s approach is to catch dispositional concerns as early as possible to attempt remediation. Dispositional concerns are a specific item on every monthly department meeting. Education faculty members discuss any dispositional concerns and determine the best course of action to inspire corrections. In addition, dispositions are formally assessed at the three benchmark points: Application to the TEP, Application to Student Teaching, and Program Completion. For elementary majors, this appraisal is done in consultation with all Education Department faculty and adjunct faculty. For secondary candidates, the department co-chairs also consult department chairs in each content area. The content area department chair consults with other content faculty members and sends a final dispositional appraisal via email to the education co-chairs (Exhibit 1.3.e.8). When there is a dispositional concern, the first course of action is for the faculty member experiencing the problem to meet with the candidate. During this meeting the faculty member councils the candidate, and if necessary, presents the candidate with a Dispositional Concern Form (Exhibit 1.3.e.4). A commonly agreed corrective course of action is agreed upon and the candidate’s performance is closely monitored. Typically, candidates make needed improvements and
continue on toward successful completion of the program. In a few cases, the candidate elects to withdraw from the program after that conference. If the candidate does not correct the disposition, they are officially dropped from the program. For the reporting period spring 2009 – spring 2012, there were no candidates dropped from the program for dispositional issues. In the spring of 2012, however, two student teachers were counseled about correcting dispositional concerns and both immediately did so. Dispositions are also directly appraised at least nine times on student teaching evaluations.

*Advanced Programs Dispositional Data.* Dispositions for advanced program candidates are formally assessed, with input from all faculty members who have worked with the candidate, at each of the three benchmark points in the graduate programs: Application to the program, Application to the practicum (MASL) or to the directed study (M.Ed.), and Program Completion. In the MASL program, dispositions are also rated by the cooperating administrator at the halfway point of the clinical experience. Dispositional rating scales and data are seen in exhibit 1.3.e.9, 1.3.f.3, and 1.3.f.4. As with the initial programs, dispositional concerns are also brought to the unit’s monthly meetings as they may arise. Any advanced program faculty member who may have a dispositional concern should first address this with the candidate. Should concerns continue, they are brought to the director of the program. The program director will meet with the candidate addressing concerns and documenting in writing the concerns and a corrective plan of action. A failure by the candidate to display acceptable dispositions may result in a delay in beginning the practicum course(s) or directed study, termination of the practicum course(s) or directed study, or dismissal from the program. Recommended actions regarding dispositional ratings are brought to the Education Department by the program director for approval. Recommendations then go to the Graduate Studies Committee for final action. Since the last accreditation site visit three MASL candidates have been counseled on their dispositional ratings. One candidate in spring 2010 was able to plan corrective action and successfully complete the practicum course, one candidate voluntarily withdrew from the program, and one candidate who was unsuccessful in remediating concerns was formally dismissed from the MASL program.

*1.2.b Continuous Improvement (3 pages)*

*Initial Programs*
The data collected from student teaching evaluations, portfolio benchmarks, graduate, and employer surveys and feedback from our Education Advisory Committee led us to pilot a new Differentiated Instruction course in fall 2010. This became a permanent course in the student teaching block in fall 2011 and continues to be monitored closely to facilitate graduates’ ability to differentiate instruction, improve transitions and cooperative learning, and use of a variety of techniques for student understanding. Beginning in the spring of 2013, this class was divided into two sections, one for elementary candidates and one for secondary candidates. This natural division will be able to provide additional focus on how teachers differentiate instruction at different grade levels. These data also prompted us to establish two sections of the Classroom Management course as well. This too began in the spring 2013 semester. These courses will deal more specifically with classroom management strategies at the elementary and secondary grade levels and how teachers in these settings develop healthy classroom communities and manage student behavior to create an atmosphere that is conducive to learning.
Finally, the other area we continue to work to improve is candidates’ use of technology to help all students to learn. We have created a new two-credit hour course on the use of instructional technology also scheduled for pilot in spring 2013. The instructor for this course is the Learning Technology Integration Specialist in one of our Partnership Schools. The course, Ed 398 Effective Instructional Technology has been designed to support candidates’ factual knowledge, skill development, and application and of instructional technology in the classroom.

Advanced Programs
Data collected from cooperating administrator evaluations and from Praxis data and feedback from the Education Advisory Committee indicated that MASL candidates would benefit from a course specifically targeting school assessments and the use of this data to inform school improvement. As a result the course, Assessment and School Improvement, was added to the MASL program in spring 2011 and is included in the new M.Ed. Teacher Leader program. Initial feedback and data show that this has been an effective program change. Additionally, instructors from two courses have used data collected to inform changes in their courses. The instructor for Instructional Technology and Applications has used his research on technology, the education advisory committee surveys, and candidate feedback to strengthen and further develop his course and the instructor for Educational Leadership has used Praxis data and portfolio data as an indication there should be a stronger link between coursework and the KSDE/ISLLC Standards. The unit continues to monitor these changes and data to determine effectiveness.
Standard 2. The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations? [maximum of three pages]

The Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) for Benedictine College’s education programs has been a continuing work since before the creation of the NCATE 2000 Standards. The CAS is aligned with the conceptual framework, Educators as Builders of Community, with KSDE standards for licensure programs, and with KSDE/NCATE unit accreditation standards.

An essential feature of the CAS is the use of professional portfolios to obtain quantitative and qualitative data regarding performance --- of both candidates and programs --- on unit outcomes. Candidates in both the initial and advanced programs are required to compile and submit professional portfolios. These serve as linchpins for candidate, program, and unit performance. Artifacts in both the initial and advanced level programs are organized according to knowledge, skills, dispositions, and the six unit outcomes.

The CAS was developed with the unit’s professional community. It includes a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve both the teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion. The CAS uses multiple assessments from internal and external sources, collecting data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and administrators of the professional community. Data derived from the CAS are regularly and systematically analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations. Benedictine College maintains the CAS through the use of information technologies.

Regular reports of data patterns are key to the system’s use of assessment findings to inform program decisions. These reports provide an interpretive, continual picture of performance. Systemic review of data from all initial and advanced programs occur at the extended Education Department meetings/data retreats that occur typically during Finals Week of each term. Comprehensive Assessment System data is collected each semester from all courses that support the various licensure areas. Through summary reports of data, the unit and its respective advisory and policy-making committees use the assessment system to reflect on and improve candidate and faculty performance, program quality and unit operations.

Candidate and Faculty Performance
Candidates are required to reflect on their performance and develop plans for improvement. Both the Builder of Community essay (required at Benchmark Points 1, 2, and 3) and the Benedictine Performance Assessment in the initial program require candidates to assess their own performance in light of helping P-12 students. As part of these reflections, candidates must describe competency areas that should be developed and improved. Student teachers are also required to reflect in writing on their strength areas and areas for improvement on the Student Teaching Evaluation Scale that is completed a minimum of eight times during student teaching.
The advanced program candidates are required to write two reflective self-evaluations, using the program standards as a guide, to evaluate their strengths and areas for improvement in meeting the standards during their clinical experience.

During student teaching, every initial candidate is required to complete a teacher work sample, the Benedictine Performance Assessment (BPA). As part of the BPA, candidates are required to pre-test students on three objectives for the multi-week unit that is required. At the end of the unit, their students are post-tested and candidates then determine learning gain scores for each student. These scores are aggregated each semester and used to: a) evaluate efficacy of candidates in producing student learning and b) to determine and inform programmatic changes.

There are established processes through which all Benedictine College faculty members continuously and systematically use data to reflect on and improve their own practice. The self-completed Faculty Annual Report serves as an important source of data produced by critical reflection and self-evaluation. Course evaluations completed by candidates serve as an important source of data for the annual evaluation of individual faculty members. Faculty members work with their peers and the unit co-chairs to reflect on their performance and develop ways to improve their teaching.

Program Quality
The KSDE licensure standards provide the framework that supports analysis and implementation of activities to improve program quality. For the initial programs one of the co-chairs of the Education Department meets annually with the department chair (or designee) of all programs leading to teacher licensure. For the advanced programs the program director and unit meet. Together these individuals review quantitative and qualitative data regarding the respective program and collectively devise and implement steps to maximize performance.

Unit Operations
Data is initially discussed and evaluated at Education Department meetings. The department meets once to twice a month; in addition there is one extended meeting/data retreat (half day to full day) each semester that focuses on CAS data and unit improvement. Data with respect to candidate and program performance are shared with the unit’s policy-making bodies (Committee on Teacher Education [initial programs] and Graduate Studies Committee [advanced program]) and its Education Advisory Committee (EAC) on a regular basis as evidenced in meeting minutes. Beginning spring 2013, the unit has committed to sharing such data with the public via publication on the Benedictine College website.

Benchmark Points, Decision Points and Continuous Improvement
As defined by the unit, a benchmark point is one in which a candidate’s professional portfolio is evaluated by a team of one member of the unit and one member of the broader professional community. Portfolios are evaluated independently. If there is a significant discrepancy (defined as any rating that is different by more than 1 point), a third member of the unit also scores the portfolio.

There are three Benchmark Points in the initial program. At Benchmark Point 1 candidates first apply for admission into the Teacher Education Program. At Benchmark Point 2 candidates apply for admission to student teaching. At Benchmark Point 3 candidates apply for program
completion. Similarly, in the advanced programs there are three benchmark points. Benchmark Point 1 is candidate application to the program, Benchmark Point 2 is application to the practicum (MASL) or application to the Directed Study (M.Ed.), and Benchmark Point 3 is application for program completion.

It is important to note that the unit systematically makes decisions about both candidate performance and unit operations at a number of points beyond the three benchmark points. Our system focuses on continuous evaluation and improvement. The benchmark points at which professional portfolios are evaluated provide an added level of systematic scrutiny regarding candidate and unit performance on both qualitative and quantitative measures.

A number of specific examples might best illustrate how the CAS goes beyond collecting data and making decisions at the three benchmark points.

1) During the 2011-2012 school year, a unit faculty member raised the concern that the evaluation of professional dispositions needed to go beyond being done systematically at the three benchmark points and become continuous. The concern was that with the increasing number of prospective teachers, candidates could fall into the cracks during the periods between benchmark points. An agenda item, “Professional dispositions” has now been automatically added to all monthly unit meetings so evaluation will be continuous.

2) Data collected after completion of programs is used to make decisions about candidate performance. All candidates and their employers are electronically surveyed at the end of the first year of teaching service. A data driven decision, based on results of candidate and employer input, was implemented during the 2010-2011 year when the course Ed 455 Differentiated Instruction was added for all candidates so as to better meet the needs of K-12 students.

The Comprehensive Assessment System Manual (CASM) provides insights into unit and candidate assessment at Benedictine College. Included in the CASM are both an assessment calendar showing annual points at which data is received and acted upon and a history of the CAS showing the system’s continual evolution over the past fourteen years.

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.

Benedictine College has selected Standard 2 as the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. Quotes that follow in italics are from “Target” rubrics for NCATE Standard 2.

“The unit, with the involvement of its professional community, is regularly evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards.”

The “Historical Development – Comprehensive Assessment System” presented in the Comprehensive Assessment System Manual documents the unit’s activities over the preceding
twelve year period in developing, implementing and refining its assessment system. Over twenty-five separate developments/ refinements in the assessment system are detailed. Extended meetings/ data retreats are held twice a year; these began in 1999. Minutes for these meetings have been compiled and will be available for inspection during the on-site visit. The unit has and continues to regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system.

The six TEP and six graduate program outcomes unify the assessment system with the conceptual framework of *Educators as Builders of Community*. The Professional Portfolios for both initial and advanced programs are organized according to the six program outcomes in addition to knowledge, skills and dispositions. Instruments used to evaluate student teaching and the administrative practicum (MASL advanced program) also measure candidate performance on the six outcomes.

The initial program is aligned with KSDE and INTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards. The advanced Building Leadership (MASL) program is aligned with KSDE and ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards and the Teacher Leader (M.Ed.) program is aligned with the Kansas Teacher Leader standards.

“*Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and in practice after completion of programs.***”

The Professional Portfolios completed by all candidates require multiple assessments for each outcome as well as knowledge, skills and dispositions. In addition to data collected at the three benchmark points, however, data is systematically collected at a number of other points as demonstrated in the *Comprehensive Assessment Manual*. These points include prior to completion of student teaching and after completion of the program.

Decisions about candidate performance are based on “…practice after completion of programs.” The classroom management course was revised creating separate sections for elementary and secondary candidates after our annual survey of graduates/ employers at the end of their first year of practice identified a need in this area. Similarly, the formal needs assessment we conducted with our Education Advisory Committee meeting in October 2008 showed that the lowest performance of Benedictine College graduates was on the item, “Facilitate student learning through the use of technology,” with graduates receiving a rating of 2.5 out of 4. Based on this rating, additional information technology was purchased and training of candidates revised. When we administered the identical needs assessment at our Education Advisory Committee of October 2012, this item had improved to 3.2 out of 4.

“*The unit conducts thorough studies to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations. It also makes changes in its practices consistent with the results of these studies.***”

The “*Historical Development – Comprehensive Assessment System***” presented in the CASM details steps taken by the unit to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures. These have included: 1) continual revision of scoring rubrics and guides provided to candidates, 2) periodic training and re-training sessions for Professional Portfolio scorers, 3)
use of members of the professional community outside of the unit for scoring, and 4) adoption of procedures for reconciling discrepancies in scoring. In the fall of 2009, scoring of the Professional Portfolios became blind; candidates were required to replace their names with Student ID #’s wherever they occurred in the Professional Portfolio.

Due process procedures are specifically spelled out to ensure fairness to candidates. The following policy is published in the current Benedictine College Catalog, “Students who do not fulfill the qualifications for admission to the Teacher Education Program, admission to student teaching, or completion of the Teacher Education Program are extended the right of a due process hearing before the Committee on Teacher Education. Following this, if necessary, an appeal may be made to the dean of the college. Additional due process rights and procedures for resolving student grievances are described in detail in the Education Department Policies and Procedures Handbook, the Graduate Programs in Education Handbook and posted on the college website.” Additional policies are presented in their entirety in Exhibit 2.3.e.

During the fall 2012 term, approximately 100 candidates submitted Professional Portfolios requesting admission into either the Teacher Education Program or Student Teaching. After the portfolios were submitted, evaluated, and candidates informed of the results, all these individuals were invited to take part in an anonymous survey. The survey was completed by 56 candidates (for a response rate of 56 percent). Candidate perceptions regarding the fairness, and accuracy of the unit’s assessment system were examined using a 5-point Likert scale. Seventy-seven percent of candidates agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The process by which we are evaluated for admission into teacher education programs is a fair process (seventeen percent were neutral.)” Similarly, 79 percent of candidates either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “The Education Department is just interested in getting as many students as possible into its programs regardless of whether they will be good teachers.” The results from this study are presented in their entirety in the unit’s exhibits for Standard Two.

“The unit’s assessment system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of its programs, extending into the first year of completers’ practice.”

“Comprehensive” is defined as, “1. Large in scope or content; including much; broad. 2. Having the power of fully understanding or comprehending.” Data collected for the unit’s assessment system is comprehensive in the sense that the unit combines both qualitative and quantitative data to arrive at the fullest and most accurate picture of candidate and unit performance. Perhaps most noteworthy is the quantitative assessment. The use of numerical data in evaluation of candidate and unit performance on the six initial and advanced program outcomes, allows for the computation of means for each outcome. These means have been analyzed, tracked, and acted upon for the last ten years. Qualitative assessment is systematically integrated into the system via the active involvement of the unit’s professional community in such bodies as the Education Advisory Committee, the Committee on Teacher Education and the Graduate Committee. Unit members themselves contribute qualitative insights at the data retreats/extended meetings held every semester to improve candidate and unit performance.

The unit’s assessment system extends into the first year of the program completers’ practice. Prior to 2010, the unit collected data once a year from program completers at the end of their
first and third years of practice. This was changed for two reasons. The first reason was the low response rate for these surveys. It was only around 20-30 percent, and we were concerned it would jeopardize the validity of responses. The second reason was a concern that any survey conducted after the second year of teaching would likely be more related to experience and professional development rather than as the result of a teacher preparation program. In the spring of 2010, discussions held at the unit’s data retreat led to the following decisions: 1) graduates would only be surveyed at the end of their first year of practice, and 2) efforts would be intensified to produce improved response rates. These decisions resulted in the response rates for 2010-2012 approximately doubling those previous.

### Response Rates of Graduates and Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“These data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.”

All the criteria in the sentence above have been in effect since 2000 with the exception of public reporting. In the fall of 2012, the unit adopted the following policy regarding assessment, “The Education Department’s assessment system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of its programs extending into the first year of actual teaching. These data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized and analyzed. In addition to regular monthly discussions of anecdotal data, the unit conducts --- at a minimum --- two data retreats/extended meetings each semester at which time all relevant qualitative and quantitative data bearing on unit, program, and candidate performance are reviewed. A co-chair of the Education Department also meets at least annually with representatives of other Benedictine College departments with programs leading to teacher licensure to consider data specific to the licensure areas. Assessment data bearing on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance are shared with the larger professional community and general public at advisory committee meetings and by being posted annually on the Benedictine College website.” This policy is published in the current edition of the Benedictine College Catalog. Information for the general public will be posted for the first time on the college website in spring 2013.

“The unit has fully developed evaluations and continuously searches for stronger relationships in the evaluations, revising both the underlying data systems and analytic techniques as necessary.”

The “Historical Development – Comprehensive Assessment System” presented in the CASM documents the unit’s activities over the preceding twelve year period. The unit has engaged in a
continuous good faith effort to improve its data systems, analytic techniques and both candidate and unit performance.

**Future Plans**
The merger of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) will provide the unit with an exciting growth opportunity. The second CAEP standard appears similar to the second NCATE standard. Our future plans for the assessment system include: 1) careful consideration of the findings of the present NCATE/KSDE team, including final reports from KSDE’s Evaluation Review Committee and NCATE’s UAB, 2) training of as many unit members as possible in the CAEP standards, and 3) the careful combination of the best elements of the present system with improvements that will undoubtedly be facilitated by the CAEP standards.
**Standard 3. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.**

3.1 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn? [maximum of three pages]

**Initial Program**

The collaboration that occurs between Benedictine College and its school partners is due in part to the systematic integration of practicing teachers and school administrators into unit decision-making bodies. Four seats on the Committee of Teacher Education are held by P-12 educators. These individuals are full voting members in determining policy and in approving/rejecting candidates at program transition points. In addition, professional portfolios for both the initial and advanced programs are evaluated independently by teams consisting of one member of the Education Department and one member of the larger professional community. Numerical means obtained through these evaluations determine if candidates will move on in their program. P-12 members also comprise the Education Advisory Committee and lend their wisdom to the candidate and program improvement process.

For the initial programs the unit and its partners collaborate in developing, implementing and evaluating all field experiences for the preparation of teachers. These collaborations are formally articulated in the Partnership School Agreements signed by the Education Department and the school districts or schools in which candidates are placed. The agreements specify responsibilities of the various parties with respect to placement, selection of cooperating teachers, candidate and clinical faculty roles and assessing candidate performance. The unit has entered into signed partnership agreements with Atchison County Community Schools USD 377, Atchison Public Schools USD 409, Easton Public Schools USD 449, Jefferson County North USD 339, Leavenworth USD 453, Lansing Public Schools USD 469, Troy Public Schools USD 429, Valley Falls, USD 338, Lincoln, NE Catholic Schools, Buchanan Co. R-IV Schools, the Catholic Archdiocesan Schools of Kansas City, Kansas, the Catholic Diocesan Schools in Lincoln, NE, and the Catholic Diocesan Schools of Kansas City/St. Joseph, Missouri. These partnership agreements pertain to both the initial and the advanced programs.

Pre-student teaching field experiences are arranged by course instructors, with the exception of the initial field experience Ed 201, Introduction to Education Field Experience. These are linked to specific methods courses so that candidates have the opportunity to implement theories and strategies being discussed in college classes. All elementary and secondary education majors are required to complete a minimum of 170 hours of field experiences prior to student teaching.

Student teaching placements are arranged by the department co-chairs working with a liaison person in each partnership school or school district. Placements are always a joint effort of the unit and the partnership school with each having the opportunity to reject or request a different placement. Often a particular cooperating teacher believed to be a good fit for a particular student teacher is requested. Expectations for all field experiences are spelled out in written documents distributed to all parties (Exhibit 3.3.e.4, Cooperating Teacher Handbook, Exhibit
Student teachers are evaluated four times by their cooperating teacher and four times by their clinical supervisor using the 44-item Student Teacher Evaluation Scale (Exhibit 3.3.f.5). At the conclusion of student teaching, candidates also evaluate their cooperating teachers. Information received from these evaluations is considered in determining future student teaching placements. In addition, secondary student teachers are also evaluated by their Benedictine College content area department chairs.

In addition to evaluations from cooperating teachers and clinical supervisors, a co-chair of the Education Department formally evaluates each student teacher at least once. This arrangement, in place since 2006, helps to maintain close relationships with partnership schools and keep the unit fully informed as to strengths and areas for improvements of candidates. Policies regarding supervision of student teachers were most recently revised during the 2011-2012 academic year with the following statement, which appears in the current Benedictine College Catalog, “The Education Department and its school partners jointly determine the selection of cooperating teachers and other specifics regarding the placement of student teachers. Student teachers are supervised by cooperating teachers, clinical supervisors, and higher education faculty. In addition, each student teacher is observed and evaluated at least once by an Education Department co-chair.”

All candidates participate in field experiences that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups. Two mechanisms ensure this outcome. First, all candidates are successfully required to complete the keystone courses Ed 312 School As Community (3 hours) and Ed 313 School As Community Research and Field Experience (1 hour). The field experience requires a minimum of fifty hours. It is designed to expose students to diverse educational settings and to the wide range of community agencies that serve the needs of diverse children and their families.

The second mechanism ensuring diverse field experience is embedded in the application form for student teaching. Candidates are required to list the placement sites for all their pre-student teaching field experiences. When the Education Department co-chairs make student teaching placements, if a candidate’s previous field experiences were lacking in diversity, they are given a sufficiently diverse student teaching placement to ensure their experience with diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups as well as students with exceptionalities. This additional requirement in the student teaching placement is in addition to the diverse placement all candidates are required to do in Ed 312/Ed 313 School As Community.

The extensive use of P-12 school administrators as clinical supervisors who evaluate student teachers is another example of collaboration between the unit and its school partners. Clinical supervisors are selected based on their demonstrated educational leadership, instructional performance, critical reflection on instructional approaches, and philosophic congruency with Educators as Builders of Community. The unit moved to the clinical supervisor model of supervision for student teachers in 1998. The quality of the assessment of candidates has
improved with the use of skilled school administrators who also evaluate teachers on a continual basis.

The use of clinical supervisors also means that the unit must be careful to ensure that these individuals are knowledgeable regarding our conceptual framework and expectations for candidates. This is accomplished by: 1) visits to the placement school before and during student teaching, 2) use of a Blackboard training module required of all cooperating teachers and all new clinical supervisors and 3) the use of clinical supervisors with knowledge of and connections to Benedictine College.

**Advanced Programs**
The Master of Arts in School Leadership (MASL) program operates with systematic collaboration between Benedictine College and administrators in our partnership schools as well as cooperating administrators in other area schools. Partnership school members, serving on both the Committee on Teacher Education and the Education Advisory Committee, are candidates and graduates of the MASL program. Professional portfolios are evaluated on knowledge and skill indicators of the program outcomes and KSDE/ISLLC standards and dispositions by trained teams composed of department members and a MASL professor or administrator of a partnership school system.

The unit and its partners also collaborate in the MASL program, developing, implementing and evaluating practicum experiences for the preparation of school leaders. These collaborations are formally articulated in the Partnership School Agreements signed by the Education Department and the school districts or schools in which candidates are placed. The agreements specify responsibilities of the various parties with respect to placement, selection of cooperating administrators roles and assessing candidate performance (Exhibit 3.3.a.4).

The use of cooperating administrators also means that the unit ensures that these individuals are knowledgeable regarding our conceptual framework and expectations for candidates. This is accomplished by: 1) visits to the placement school before and during practicum semesters, 2) use of a Blackboard training module now required of all cooperating administrators, and 3) the use of cooperating administrators with knowledge of and connections to Benedictine College. Administrators with close ties to the unit served as cooperating administrators for 86 percent of fall 2012 practicum experiences.

### 3.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 3.

**Initial Program**
The increase in the number of teacher education candidates at Benedictine College has resulted in a number of changes necessary for the unit’s continuous improvement. The increase can be seen in the number of student teachers. In 2007-2008 there were 34 student teachers; in 2008-
2009 there were 41 student teachers; in 2009-2010 there were 40 student teachers; in 2010-2011 there were 51 student teachers; and in 2011 to 2012 there were 56 student teachers. This academic year (2012-2013) there are 85 student teachers and we are projecting 68 student teachers for the 2013-2014 academic year.

The increase in the number of candidates is due to several factors. The college has grown overall and the average ACT scores and cumulative GPA’s for incoming freshman continue to increase. As the quantity and quality of students has increased, more are eligible for the teacher education program. In addition, many of the incoming college students indicate they feel called to a life dedicated to greater ends in the service of God and their fellows.

One of the four pillars of Benedictine College’s mission is that it is a residential college. Most of our students live on campus and many lack automobiles. In the introductory field experience, Ed 201, there was a danger that the number of candidates being placed in Atchison schools was going to exceed the number of cooperating teachers available for them. At the fall 2011 Education Advisory Committee Meeting, we asked our professional partners if they would support an initial field experience for candidates that would sometimes occur in their hometowns during fall and spring breaks. Our partners strongly embraced this idea. Ed 201 now often occurs in the hometowns of candidates. They shadow two different teachers for a minimum of two six-hour days to acquire a beginning level understanding of the role and responsibilities of teachers.

Because of the reduction in demand for initial field experiences in the Atchison area, we have been able to maintain most subsequent field experiences within 25 miles of Atchison. We have also improved by increasing both pre-student teaching field experiences and student teaching in the Leavenworth Public Schools so as to improve and increase the diversity of field experiences. The Atchison Public Schools have large numbers of individuals with exceptionalities as well as socioeconomic diversity as well as cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity. The Leavenworth Public Schools have even greater cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity.

The increase in the number of candidates/student teachers has also resulted in an increase in the number of partnership schools. We predominantly use building principals and assistant principals as clinical supervisors. At P-12 schools in which we have had a candidate presence for a number of years, our clinical supervisors have an in depth understanding of our requirements and expectations. New clinical supervisors are required to complete our Blackboard Training Module so they will gain a similar understanding. In addition, the co-chairs of the Education Department make frequent visits to partnership schools. Since 2006, every Benedictine College student teacher has been observed/evaluated at least once by a department co-chair in their teaching of a lesson. Within the unit, we are constantly examining our model for field experiences/student teaching and considering ways it can be improved as our numbers increase.

At the Education Advisory Committee Meeting held in the spring of 2009, members of the committee completed a formal needs assessment, evaluating our candidates in a variety of areas. Overwhelmingly the lowest mean score, 2.5 on a 4-point scale, was candidate proficiency in the use of informational technology. Because of this data, we revised our training of candidates in
the use of technology and expended $6,000 from our NCATE Assessment line item to purchase Promethean Boards for two classrooms and our new academic building provides e-beam board technology in every classroom. These are the classrooms in which elementary and secondary methods courses for initial level candidates are taught. This ensures that candidates come into field experiences, particularly student teaching, already proficient in the use of technology present in P-12 classrooms.

Advanced Program
Because candidates in the advanced programs are working teachers, the field experiences take place in their home schools and another diverse placement. To ensure our clinical supervisors have an in-depth understanding of our conceptual framework, the program and our expectations for candidates the program director meets with the supervisor prior to the placement and new clinical supervisors are required to complete our Blackboard Training Module so they will gain a deeper understanding of the clinical experience. All candidates may not be working in schools or districts that have significant diversity in students at risk, with exceptionalities, or with cultural, ethnic, and linguistic differences from the majority culture. To adjust for this, the MASL program requires a 20-hour practicum experience at an approved school to ensure all candidates have diverse experiences. Additionally, the M.Ed. program requires a 10-hour experience working with one or more teachers assigned to a school with significant diversity.

Future Plans
The merger of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) will provide the unit with an exciting growth opportunity. Although there is no CAEP standard devoted specifically to field experiences, within the third CAEP standard, Indicator 2 states, “Field experiences and clinical practice, offered in collaboration with P-12 schools, support candidate development as effective educators.” Our future plans for our field experiences include: 1) careful consideration of the findings of the present NCATE/KSDE team, including final reports from KSDE’s Evaluation Review Committee and NCATE’s UAB, 2) training of as many unit members as possible in the CAEP standards, and 3) the careful combination of the best elements of existing field experiences with improvements that will undoubtedly be facilitated by the CAEP standards.
Standard 4. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area (3 pages)

Initial and Advanced Programs
The Conceptual Framework, Educators as Builders of Community, necessitates that all candidates develop knowledge of, appreciation for, and skills in supporting the learning of diverse P-12 students. These are clearly articulated within the conceptual framework’s required dispositions (see Dispositions) and diversity proficiencies expected of all candidates (Exhibit 4.3.a.1, Diversity Proficiency Form). The unit uses general education course work (initial candidates only), professional education course work, field experiences, faculty – student interactions, candidates’ own diverse backgrounds, and student teaching to teach and measure candidates’ knowledge of, appreciation for, and skills related to diversity.

Initial Programs
Curriculum/Course work. The preparation of initial candidates begins with general education requirements of at least 13 credits in courses that support awareness and understanding of diversity. These requirements are: World Civilizations three credits, seven credits in a foreign language, and three credits in either Introduction to Sociology, World Regional Geography, or Sociology of Race and Ethnic Relations. The professional education courses, taken by all candidates, specifically address diversity awareness and knowledge, and all courses that have corresponding field experiences also support the development of skills related to the diversity of P-12 learners (Exhibit 4.3.a.1, Curriculum Matrix in Diversity Proficiency). In addition, there are three keystone courses within the professional education program that all candidates take. These courses are entirely devoted to diversity awareness, knowledge, and skills. Ed 222 Psychology of Individuals with Exceptionalities: Provides candidates with an introduction to learning disabilities, intellectual disabilities, emotional and behavioral disorders, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorders, visual impairment, hearing impairment, speech and communication disorders, autism, traumatic brain injuries, and physical disabilities. Ed 312 School As Community and Ed 313 School As Community Field Experience: Requires candidates to explore their own personal cultural backgrounds and the potential effects these may have on teaching behaviors and decisions to ensure that all students can learn. The course explores topics of race and ethnicity, poverty, exceptionality, sexuality and gender, language, geography, religion, age, and how to teach from a multicultural perspective in building a classroom, a school, and a wider community. The field experience associated with this course Ed 313, requires candidates to devote a total of 50 hours to tutoring and working with children/adolescents from a variety of racial, ethnic, and low SES backgrounds, as well as English Language Learner (ELL) students, and intellectually disabled adults. In addition, candidates deliver lunches to low SES families, and sponsor a dance for intellectually and physically disabled clients from Atchison Achievement Services. Finally, the field experience
requires candidates to work with peers and community members to develop and execute a project in service of these children. **Ed 455 Differentiated Instruction:** Candidates learn to differentiate instruction for all learners through an understanding of learning style and the implementation of Universal Design for Instruction. Methods of identifying the learning styles of individuals students as well as planning multi-tiered lessons is explored through the foundation of school-wide professional learning communities. Candidates also learn to analyze the results of class, district, and national testing data in order to make data-driven decisions about student learning and instructional planning.

In addition, elementary education candidates are introduced to the growing diversity of P-12 students through completing **Ed 200 Introduction to Education.** In this course, candidates study changes that are taking place in American society and student diversity. In **Ed 220 Psychoeducational Development,** candidates are introduced to multiculturalism, social class differences, ethnic/racial differences, gender differences, and equity issues. The content and pedagogy of teaching children social studies through studying demographic changes and the resulting effect on numbers of ELL students and lower SES students is explored in **Ed 301 Social Studies Methods and Media.** In this course, candidates also create three products that impact their understanding of diversity: A cultural “knapsack” of their own characteristics and traits, a reflection on creating flexible classrooms that are sensitive to diversity, and tiered lesson plans addressing the needs of various diverse groupings of students. **Ed 319 Integrated Language Arts Methods and Practicum** candidates gain knowledge about language development, how to make accommodations and help struggling readers and writers. Candidates practice these in the field experience. **Ed 303 Science and Health Methods and Media** candidates develop inquiry experiences and differentiate instruction for science lessons, and **Ed 314 Math Methods and Assessment** introduces candidates to equitable instruction and support in mathematics and how to differentiate instruction and make modifications for students with learning disabilities and other handicapping conditions.

Secondary education candidates are also introduced to the growing diversity of P-12 students in **Ed 357** and **Ed 358** General Secondary Methods and Media through course information where candidates study demographic changes and the resulting effect on numbers of ELL students and lower SES students. These lessons are further explored in assignments and activities that require candidates to develop instructional plans that include accommodations for students with exceptionalities and practice those during micro-teaching activities. In addition, they receive initial practice in writing portions of a Teacher Work Sample, which also deal with diversity. In **Ed 332 Reading in the Content Area** candidates develop reading strategies for struggling readers. Topics also include linguistically diverse readers. The field experience places candidates in a setting where they tutor ELL international students.

**Ensuring diverse field experiences.** Due to the teacher education program design, all candidates are ensured to have diverse field experiences throughout the program. One field experience, **Ed 313 School as Community Diversity Field Experiences** specifically requires a 50-hour placement in multiple schools and local agencies that are all different types of diverse placements. These placements ensure that every candidate has had experiences working with diverse students. In addition, the **Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Application** materials that candidates fill out previous to student teaching require that they record all previous field experience
placements. The Education Department carefully monitors these and makes student teaching placements according to candidates’ needs for diverse placements.

Candidate-faculty interactions. The professional education faculty have numerous personal diversity experiences to draw from as course instructors, advisors, mentors and supervisors. These include working with low SES students, minority students, ELL students, experiences living abroad, teaching in small rural communities, teaching children with mental illness, and teaching on Native American reservations. In addition to other adjunct faculty members, the Education Department has three minority faculty members who teach every candidate. One of these faculty members, an African American female, has half-time faculty status. She teaches all sections of Ed 200/201 Introduction to Education, and has had a long-term relationship with our teacher education program and candidates. This half-time faculty member has been a teacher, a guidance counselor and recently retired as principal of one of our partnership schools. During her tenure as principal, she transformed her elementary school from a failing school to a school of improvement. While a principal there, she also served as a Clinical Faculty member, evaluating our student teachers. The department also has two adjunct minority faculty members, both African American males with whom we have had long-standing relationships. One is a 2002 graduate of our Masters in School Leadership program. He has worked with our undergraduates while an assistant principal in Atchison, and later as the administrative coordinator for special education services in Leavenworth, both are partnership schools. He currently serves as our Director of Diversity Discussion Seminars for the initial program. In this capacity, he leads two evening seminar discussion sessions with all candidates in our diversity course, Ed312/313 School As Community. One of these seminars deals with race and ethnicity issues, and the other with special education issues. He is also an adjunct faculty member and teaches all candidates in both of our graduate programs, serving as practicum resource and seminar instructor in the Master of School Leadership program and as co-teacher for Ed 518, Building Community in the classroom. The final adjunct faculty member serves as Co-Director of Diversity Field Experiences. This person is also an African American male who has lived in the Atchison community his entire life. He has numerous connections with the African American community in Atchison and is recently retired from the Youth Center of Atchison, a school for adjudicated boys. While working there, he served as a youth counselor. Although he has worked with numerous Benedictine students for many years, we were very fortunate to have him officially join our teacher education program when we lost the adjunct that had been serving as Director of Diversity Field Experiences. In this position, he assists the course instructor in working with our candidates in Ed 313 School as Community Diversity Field Experiences as they do tutoring work at Atchison’s Boys and Girls Club and also as they work with children in the community to develop their School As Community projects.

Student and faculty demographics. Exhibit 4.3.e.1 displays the overall gender and racial/ethnic demographics of Benedictine College students. White students comprise 78 percent of the student population and 54 percent are female. Exhibit 4.3.e.2 displays the demographics of candidates within the Education Department. White candidates comprise 89 percent, and 76 percent of them are female.

The overall Benedictine faculty are 67 percent male, 33 percent female, and 93 percent White and 7% minority. Exhibit 4.3.d.2 notes that the professional education faculty are 87 percent
White and 42 percent female. Initial program candidates are taught by a half-time assistant professor that is African American. She teaches Ed 200 and Ed 201, courses that are required of all candidates for teacher education. All candidates are therefore provided with experiences working with diverse faculty. In addition, all initial candidates take coursework from two male African-American adjunct instructors.

Among teacher education candidates, 38 percent are from rural areas and 14 percent are from urban areas. When comparing the overall racial/ethnic distribution of candidates with residents of Atchison and surrounding counties, the analysis reveals that the overall percentage of minority candidates (African American, Asian, Hispanic and Native American) at 11 percent is higher at Benedictine than the overall ethnic distribution in Atchison County at nine percent. When compared to two of the surrounding three counties, Doniphan and Jefferson this pattern remains the same. The overall ethnic distribution in Leavenworth County 15 percent and the state of Kansas 14 percent are both slightly greater than that of teacher education candidates.

Advanced Programs
All graduate level program candidates begin with a common core of requirements of at least 12 credits in courses that support awareness and understanding of diversity. These requirements are: Ed 534 Assessment and School Improvement, Ed 522 Advanced Foundations of Education, Ed 515 Models and Strategies in Instructional Leadership, and Ed 532 Foundations of Curriculum Development. In Assessment and School Improvement, candidates analyze data from class, school, district and national testing to inform data driven decisions about student learning and how to work cooperatively with colleagues to achieve results. Candidates construct plans for sharing data and decisions for improvement with all stakeholders. In Advanced Foundations of Education candidates study varied topics in the social, philosophical and historical foundations of education including ethnicity, culture, socio-economic status, gender, religion, and language. In Models and Strategies in Instructional Leadership candidates learn to facilitate effective student improvement teams, implementation and supervision of Universal Design for Instruction, and candidates conduct a case study of individual students taking them through these processes and collecting data to inform instructional decisions. Finally, in Foundations of Curriculum Development candidates develop curriculum programs that are suitable for all students particularly in designing the curriculum to meet the needs of students with exceptionalities and students from diverse backgrounds, as well as how to incorporate multicultural education in the curriculum.

Additionally, there are courses specific to each of the graduate programs that address knowledge and skills proficiencies in working with diverse populations. For the MASL program, in Ed 642 Educational Leadership candidates acquire knowledge and develop skills in communicating and working with diverse populations, teachers, parents, students and the greater P-12 community. In Ed 622 Education Law topics in this course include basic constitutional issues related to students and school personnel and identifying and applying legal concepts and theory to special education, student disciplines, student rights, personnel practices, professional negotiations, and other powers, duties and liability concerns of the principal and school system. For the M.Ed. (Teacher Leader program) candidates take Ed 518 Building Communities in which emphasis is placed on creating an environment rich in diversity that promotes knowledge and respect for all cultures, exceptionalities, and ethnicities through curriculum, teacher collaboration, and working
with all stakeholders to develop the whole child. Projects for this course include developing and implementing workshops for parents and an action plan for building parent, school, and community partnerships.

**Ensuring diverse field experiences.** As a part of their final practicum experience, all MASL candidates are required to complete a 20-hour field experience in a significantly diverse setting. This experience includes a report on the cultural/ethnic/socio-economic setting of this school, including a description of the community in which the school is located; the specific programs the school has for meeting the special needs of all students; leadership concerns and challenges as identified by the cooperating administrator; and a reflection on their skills to work in this cultural setting. For M.Ed. candidates, *Ed 542 Current Trends and Methods in Teaching* includes a ten-hour field experience with a teacher in a diverse setting including a report on the cultural/ethnic/socio-economic setting of this school differences than the “home school” where they teach, including a description of the community in which the school is located; the specific programs the school has for meeting the different needs of students; and a reflective section addressing how they would work in this cultural setting and how well they are suited to perform as a teacher leader in the setting.

**Candidate-faculty interactions.** The professional education faculty for advanced programs has a wide variety of diverse P-12 experiences to draw from as course instructors, advisors, mentors and supervisors. These include leading and/or teaching in districts with significantly high numbers of economically disadvantaged students (40 percent and above); significant populations of ethnic minority students (30 percent and above), including a district with over 30 percent Native American population; working with ELL students, experiences living abroad, and teaching and leading in urban, suburban, as well as in small rural communities. Over half of the advanced program faculty has experience in teaching students with exceptionalities or leading/coordinating programs for students with exceptionalities.

**Student and faculty demographics.** For the Building Leadership and Teacher Leadership programs the majority of the advanced program faculty are White, 42 percent are female and 58 percent are male. All advanced program candidates have one or more seminars or coursework with a male, African American adjunct instructor. Advanced program candidates are drawn from the local pool of licensed teachers and the advanced program candidate ethnicity and gender data are comparable to that of licensed teachers in Kansas, as shown in the Kansas State Department of Education’s last published *Licensed Personnel Report Summary 2010-2011*. This report shows the percentage of male teachers at 25 percent, female teachers at 75 percent, White teachers at 96.51 percent and ethnic minority teachers at 3.49 percent. Reported gender and ethnicity of 2012-2013 advanced program candidates at Benedictine College shows 75 percent female, 25 percent male, 97 percent White and three percent ethnic minority.

4.2b **Continuous Improvement (3 pages)**
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 4.
Overall, data indicates that candidates and graduates are highly proficient in diversity-related areas in portfolio assessments, student teacher ratings, and graduate and employer surveys. Some data do indicate that candidates’ performance could be improved, however, particularly in the areas of differentiating instruction, promoting multiculturalism, and behavior management. A discussion of this follows.

**Portfolio Evaluations**

*Exhibit 1.3.d.11* provides a summary of Portfolio data from Fall 2007 to Fall 2012. These data contain evidence from candidate performances, course projects, field experiences, student teaching evaluations, and candidate Builders of Community Outcome Essays. The scoring rubric is from 0-0.99 Unacceptable, 1-1.99 Acceptable, to 2-3 Distinguished. On the final portfolio submission at program completion, the ratings on Outcome 3 were slightly lower (2.54), although not significantly, than some of the other outcomes. This outcome specifically measures diversity: “The BC candidate respects and promotes diversity while creating instructional opportunities that meet the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with exceptionalities.” Of all of the candidate artifacts that are presented within the Outcome 3 section of the portfolio, the most important is the student teaching data related to diversity.

**Student Teaching Data**

The Student teachers are rated four times by their cooperating teachers, four times by their clinical supervisors, at least once by a department co-chair, and in the case of secondary student teachers, once by their content area department chair. All evaluators use an identical student teacher evaluation instrument that consists of 44 indicators, assessing knowledge, skills, dispositions, and the six program outcomes. All indicators are rated as 1 unsatisfactory, 2 basic, 3 proficient, or 4 distinguished. Indicators are then grouped into five themes for evaluation; subject area knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions. *Exhibits 4.3.c.36 and 4.3.c.37* represent data related to diversity in the pedagogical content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills themes. These data, aggregated from spring 2009 to fall 2012, demonstrate that all candidates have been rated highly during the clinical student teaching experience. No item falls below 3.4 which indicates between “proficient” and “distinguished” on the student teaching evaluation scale. Item 1A “Builds positive relationships with students,” (3.9); Item 1D “Encourages students to explore questions and topics that are personally meaningful,” (3.7); Item 2B “Interactions are appropriate to age/developmental level of students,” (3.83); Item 2F “Demonstrates fair, clear and consistent behavioral expectations,”(3.7); Item 3A “Demonstrates equitable interaction with all students regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, or exceptionality,” (3.88); Item 3B “Demonstrates an understanding of exceptionalities and inclusion in the classroom,” (3.76); Item 3C “Displays respect for and interest in the cultural heritage of students,” (3.76); Item 3E “Promotes multiculturalism through instruction,” (3.64); Item Skills E “Uses a variety of techniques for facilitating student understanding,” (3.60). Of all of these indicators, the lowest is Item 3E at (3.64) and Item Skills E at (3.60).

**Surveys/of Graduates and Employers**

In addition to portfolios, graduate and employer surveys also provide relevant information. These are sent out each year to measure progress on first-year teachers on all of the same indicators as the student teaching evaluation instrument. The items too are further disaggregated
to represent categories of “content knowledge,” “pedagogical content knowledge,” and “professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.” Since the spring of 2010 we have sent these surveys out in an electronic format, which has yielded a much higher return rate. The spring 2012 return rate for graduates was 62 percent and for employers 53 percent. Exhibits 4.3.c.38 a and b present these data. Across all 44 indicators, there are no items rated below 2.5 indicating above “basic.” Most indicators, rated by both graduates and employers in the themes of pedagogical content knowledge, and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related specifically to diversity receive at least a rating of 3 indicating “proficient.” The lowest aggregate rating of all indicators on the graduate and employer survey, although still rated as proficient, is again Item 3E “Promotes multiculturalism throughout instruction.” Student teachers report that this item is difficult to institute across all content areas. Regardless, all department faculty members continue to strongly emphasize this pedagogical value in all methods courses as well as block courses and during student teaching.

Data collected from portfolios, student teaching evaluations, graduate and employer surveys and feedback from our Education Advisory Committee informed us that candidates should have additional preparation in differentiating instruction, and reinforcing multiculturalism throughout instruction. We are incorporating these skills even more strongly within methods courses and a newly created course, Ed 455 Differentiated Instruction. We piloted Ed 455 for the first time in 2010. This became a permanent course in the student teaching block in fall. In addition, for the first time in spring 2013, Ed 455 as well as Ed 462 Classroom Management were divided into two sections, one for elementary and one for secondary student teachers. These changes are being closely monitored through data collection, analysis, and interpretation. We believe that dividing these courses by elementary and secondary levels will lead to stronger preparation for candidates in their ability to develop techniques that facilitate student understanding, encourage incorporating multicultural issues, and in managing behavioral expectations in the classroom.

The Education Department’s diversity plan serves to continually direct our efforts to increase diversity within the department for both our initial and advanced programs. When advertising for faculty positions we place ads in online job fairs specifically geared toward attracting minority applicants. In addition, we use our Partnership School network to seek faculty from diverse backgrounds. Benedictine 2020, the college’s strategic plan initiative states as priorities: recruiting, retaining, and developing high quality faculty and students. The Benedictine College Diversity Plan also works to ensure that minority candidates are sought for faculty positions and minority students are recruited. The college has developed three new scholarships in an attempt to attract more diverse students, particularly Hispanics. Benedictine College has been named a University Partner with the Christo Rey Network of high schools. Ninety six percent of these high school students are from low socioeconomic and minority backgrounds.

In fall 2011, the Education Department sponsored two programs for students at Atchison High School. One program entitled “Teach for Tomorrow” featured an introductory to education course that was either free tuition or extremely reduced tuition. This was taught by three faculty members and had an enrollment of five students. Although the program was successful, but we intend to improve the course by offering it onsite at Atchison High School during the school day and sponsor this again in spring of 2014. The second program was a Mentoring Program designed to support high school 11th and 12th graders to attend college. This was particularly
focused toward first-generation, college-bound students. This is an ongoing program. The goal of both programs is to impact on minority student’s interest in the teaching profession and in attending Benedictine College.

As a result of Education Advisory Committee surveys and conversations with leaders in our partnership schools on the cultural and linguistic needs of ELL students, the education department researched and began the preliminary steps to develop an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program endorsement that would be available to candidates in both the initial and advanced programs. Work in this area continues and we expect to request program approval from KSDE within the next two years.
**Standard 5.** Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The Unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance? [maximum of three pages]

Professional education faculty in the initial and advanced programs at Benedictine College, full time, half-time, and adjunct, are qualified individuals who model the Educators As Builders of Community outcomes. Seventy-one percent of the full time professional education faculty have doctorates or a terminal degree. Exhibit 5.3.a.1 shows that three out of the six full-time faculty in the Education Department have a doctorate, and three are completing the requirements for a doctoral degree. Two full time professional education faculty members are also completing requirements for a doctoral degree, and one adjunct graduate faculty member is completing doctoral requirements. All Education Department faculty have an extensive history of teaching in P-12 schools and maintain relationships with schools through supervision of field experiences, student teaching, and partnership efforts. One hundred percent of Education Department faculty have current or have had teaching licenses from Kansas or other states (Exhibit 5.3.a.1).

Adjunct (part-time non-tenure track) and half-time faculty for both the initial and advanced programs possess a doctoral degree or a master’s level degree or have exceptional expertise (varied and extensive years of experience) in the area in which they teach (Exhibit 5.3.a.2). Adjunct instructors in the advanced programs are required to hold earned doctoral level degrees or possess exceptional expertise in their field. All adjunct and half-time instructors receive ongoing, individual assistance from Education Department faculty. All school clinical cooperating teachers are licensed in the areas in which they work with candidates (Exhibit 5.3.b.5). All clinical supervisors for student teachers are practicing school administrators with extensive contemporary professional experiences, as shown in Exhibit 5.3.b.4. Education Department clinical faculty who place, instruct, and supervise field experiences and student teachers have a combined 107 years of experience in P-12 schools (Exhibit 5.3.b.6). In addition, each co-chair of the unit has received the “Distinguished Faculty Member of the Year” award that is annually given to one Benedictine College faculty member.

The mission of Benedictine College, briefly stated, is “…the education of men and women within a community of faith and scholarship.” The policies and procedures of Benedictine College articulate the expectations for faculty members responsible for seeing that the college mission is achieved. Scholarship is one of five criteria that faculty members at Benedictine College must address in applying for promotion and tenure. Three definitions are provided for scholarship in the Benedictine College Faculty Handbook, 2012-13. They are:

a) …continue to develop understanding and skill in their discipline;
b) …are actively involved in productive research with other colleagues and/or students that contributes to their discipline or education in general;
c) …actively participate in learned and professional societies. (p. 8)
Intellectual growth and scholarship are experienced by participation at conferences and workshops, ongoing coursework leading to a terminal degree, and personal research on current and relevant educational topics. Faculty are active or have leadership roles in professional associations (Exhibit 5.3.a.1). Exhibit 5.3.d.1 indicates the scholarship activities of full-time professional education faculty from 2009 through 2012.

In addition to excellence in scholarship, all faculty at Benedictine College are expected to engage in service by participating in the life of the college, collaborating through committee work, being available to students and student groups, and participating in departmental and school-wide meetings and programs. Education Department faculty are involved in a wide variety of service and collaborative activities in schools (Exhibit 5.3.e.1). As shown through an analysis of Faculty Annual Reports (FAR), Vitae, and the NCATE Faculty Qualifications Questionnaire fall 2012, Education Department faculty assist the college in a variety of leadership roles in recruitment, assessment, professional development, graduate programs, and student affairs. Members of the faculty are also expected to serve their local communities. This has occurred through volunteer work and participation in community and religious organizations. Education Department faculty are also heavily engaged with P-12 schools in the community and are actively involved in professional associations at the local, regional, state, national, or international levels (Table 5.3.e.1).

Teaching effectiveness is an important expectation at Benedictine College (Exhibit 5.3.f.9, Benedictine College Faculty Handbook, 2012-13, p. 8). Faculty model various instructional strategies and assessment methods that are student-centered and authentic. The responses on the NCATE Faculty Qualifications Questionnaire fall 2012, Item 11, indicate that teaching effectiveness is demonstrated by the use of varied approaches that address the needs of all learners. Examples include: authentic learning; cooperative learning groups; pairing activities; the use of technology such as the Promethean Board, computers, and document reader; the use of rubrics for authentic assessment; role playing, one on one support, and oral and written assignments. The mean number of instructional strategies listed by all respondents was seven and seven-tenths (Exhibit 5.3.a.3). Education Department faculty use current research to connect their syllabi to the conceptual framework and to incorporate innovative instructional approaches that address the needs of candidates (Exhibit 5.3.a.4). In all courses, candidates are required to demonstrate proficiency in the use of various technologies. Exhibit 5.3.a.5 indicates all Education Department faculty employ technology in their instruction. Integration of technology ranges from the use of Blackboard for assignments and resources to teaching how to use the Promethean Smartboard to having candidates create iMovies and Webquests.

Professional education faculty constantly self-evaluate their effectiveness in supporting candidates. As part of the Rank and Tenure process, faculty write an extended or a brief Faculty Annual Report (FAR), which is a reflection of their progress toward annual goals and documents their teaching efforts, scholarship, and service. In addition, they use semester student evaluations, peer evaluations, and annual department chair evaluations and conferences in ongoing self-assessment. The conferences include an update on progress in working towards promotion and tenure. Education Department faculty also continuously analyze candidate data to assess their effectiveness as a department at semester data retreats.
The Education Department conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluation of faculty to improve all facets of performance. These evaluations involve both classroom observation and the annual assessment of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of: 1) teaching effectiveness, 2) scholarship, 3) advising and counseling effectiveness, 4) engagement in the life of the college and community, and 5) effectiveness in administration. Full time, adjunct, and half-time faculty members who teach courses in the initial programs are evaluated by one of the co-chairs. A co-chair meets with each faculty member to review the evaluation and discuss strengths, challenges, and goals. Adjunct instructors in the advanced programs are evaluated annually by the program director. The results of candidate evaluation and program director evaluation are shared and discussed with the instructor. Non-tenured faculty have been required to request a formal peer evaluation (Peer Evaluation Form B) during each semester. During the fall of 2012, the Benedictine College Faculty Handbook 2012-13 was revised by the Rank and Tenure Committee to reflect changes in the tenure process: “All tenure-track faculty members must have one class observation per year from another faculty member and make at least one visit per year to a class taught by another member of the faculty. The untenured faculty member will then submit a written reflection of insights gained from those visits, focusing on ways that his or her own teaching might be improved. Candidates are encouraged to consult their department chair for recommendations of appropriate faculty to observe. All tenure-track faculty members must secure at least one peer evaluation of their course materials (e.g. syllabi, course objectives, exams, assignments, rubrics, etc.) for one course per semester. At least one of these evaluations must be from an evaluator outside the candidate’s department,” (p. 10). A department chair will also make one unannounced visit to their classroom and incorporate their evaluation into their annual evaluation of the faculty member.

Data relative to best practices in teaching are generated by student evaluations. All faculty are evaluated by students using the IDEA Center Survey Form - Student Reactions to Instructions and Courses (IDEA). All faculty are encouraged to review and use their results to improve their planning for future courses.

The strength of teaching in the Education Department is demonstrated by a higher mean on student evaluations in all areas when compared to the Benedictine College faculty as a whole. The data from fall 2011 through spring 2012 indicates Education Department faculty were rated at mean scores ranging from 4.3 to 4.5 on a 5.0 scale, compared to the entire college means ranging from 4.0 to 4.2 (Exhibit 5.3.f.1). This shows faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach, and that faculty, through their actions, demonstrate that they value candidate learning and model best professional practices.

Professional education faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 schools, other departments on the Benedictine College campus, and other members of the professional community to improve teaching, learning, and the preparation of educators. Fifty-two percent of the activities identified and classified as service activities in Exhibit 5.3.e.1 are also collaborations with P-12 schools. The policy-making bodies for the teacher education program (Committee on Teacher Education) and the two advanced programs (Graduate Committee) are collaborations between the Education Department, other academic departments, candidates, and colleagues from P-12 schools. Partnership School Agreements that have been signed between Benedictine College and Atchison County Community Schools USD 377,
Atchison Public Schools USD 409, Easton USD 449, Jefferson County North USD 339, Leavenworth USD 453, the Archdiocesan Schools of Kansas City, Kansas, Lansing USD 469, Troy USD #429, Valley Falls, USD #338, Lincoln, NE Catholic Schools, and the Catholic Diocesan Schools of Kansas City/St. Joseph, Missouri are other indicators of collaboration.

The extent to which Education Department faculty collaborate with other individuals and P-12 organizations is perhaps most evident in its evaluation of candidates. The professional portfolios of candidates for the teacher education program are evaluated by teams of one professional education faculty and one P-12 educator. In addition, interviewers for candidates entering the program are consistently made up of one Education Department faculty and one member of the professional education faculty, the Committee on Teacher Education, a clinical faculty member, or a faculty member from a partnership school (Exhibit 5.3.e.3, TEP Interview Schedule, fall 2012). The broader professional community is involved in managing the education program, thereby improving teaching, candidate learning, and the preparation of future educators.

Recommendations for tenure by department chairs includes evaluation of the efforts made by faculty towards professional development (Exhibit 5.3.e.2 Benedictine College Faculty Handbook, p. 40). This includes attendance at professional meetings, presentations, and published scholarships and grants sought or received. Faculty consistently seek to improve their knowledge and skills and are supported in this endeavor through numerous opportunities in the Education Department and the college. Faculty are encouraged to complete the Faculty Development Committee Travel Request Form to attend workshops and conferences; faculty also take advantage of opportunities to attend professional development activities through the Education Department, the state, the college, and the local public school district. Education Department faculty have attended technology workshops, and the department and the college give ongoing individual technology support. Exhibit 5.3.g.1 shows nearly three hundred professional development activities in which professional education faculty have participated.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Unit Standard 5.

Continuous Improvement
The unit is dedicated to continuous improvement in the education and performance of candidates, program quality, and unit performance. Education Department faculty meet regularly to disaggregate data on candidate performance. A more structured disposition evaluation process has been created to ensure candidates receive needed support in early stages of their program. This includes disposition discussions at each meeting, consistent use of disposition reports, and a formal meeting with candidates, if necessary. Portfolio assessment has been improved with the addition of blind evaluations and a third evaluator if needed.

The Education Department solicits guidance for program improvement from its Education Advisory Committee, comprised of undergraduate and graduate candidates and graduates, P-12 partnership school administrators, and teachers. Members of this advisory group are committed
to the concept of preparing *Educators as Builders of Community* and know and understand the goals and policies of the TEP, MASL, and M.Ed. programs. The committee meets regularly each semester to review data and make recommendations for program and unit improvement (*Exhibit 5.3.e.2, 2012-2013 Benedictine College Catalog, pg. 125*).

In addition, The Committee on Teacher Education, a standing committee appointed by the dean of the college and the policy making body for all initial education programs, formally reviews suggestions and changes in the Education Department. The Committee on Teacher Education provides annual feedback; this past year their advice prompted an increase in funding for technology, which resulted in two classroom Smartboards to provide inquiry learning and constructivist teaching, additional candidate computers for the curriculum library, and the addition of iPads for departmental faculty.

The M.Ed. was approved by Benedictine College and the Higher Learning Commission in 2010-2011, and the Kansas State Department of Education approved the program for the Teacher Leader endorsement in 2011. The first cohort of this program began in August of 2011. This program began as a response to the needs of the P-12 community and tasks required in this program offer multiple opportunities for professional education faculty and the P-12 community to grow and collaborate.

In the spring of 2011, a faculty search was initiated to find a creative and experienced teacher for the overflowing elementary education courses. After narrowing the search down to three candidates, the department hired an additional faculty member, who has many years of elementary teaching experience with a focus on reading literacy. In the spring of 2012, a second faculty position was approved, but the search was unsuccessful. Each time a search is initiated, special care is taken to use resources that advertise to diverse applicants to broaden the experiences offered to candidates. During the last search, a minority applicant was interviewed, but she proved to be unqualified, she had no college teaching experience, and other teaching experience could not be verified. During the fall 2012 term, an African-American faculty member joined unit faculty as an Assistant Professor. She is half-time and is teaching all sections of Ed 200/Ed 201 Introduction to Education, so that all initial candidates receive coursework from her. Additionally, two other minority adjuncts have been hired for several courses that each candidate is required to take during their programs.

As part of the ongoing focus on current teaching expertise in technology, each faculty member received a personal iPad and training during the summer/fall of 2012. These will be used in the classroom to model and initiate practice by candidates as the department strives to stay abreast of the technological developments in education. Additional training opportunities in technology will be a part of the department’s continuous effort to provide faculty and therefore, candidates, with up to date technology skills.
Standard 6. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 How does the unit’s governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards? [maximum of three pages]

Benedictine College and the Education Department operate within a well-defined system of governance that ensures broad involvement in decision-making. The Benedictine College Board of Directors is the policy making board for the college. The president of Benedictine College serves as the chief executive officer of the institution and is appointed by the Board of Directors. The president is advised by a cabinet consisting of the dean of the college, chief financial officer, the vice president of student life, dean of enrollment management, the vice president for institutional advancement and the vice president of college relations. The dean of the college is the chief academic officer of the college and is responsible for the academic programs and academic support services. The dean of the college acts as administrative head in the absence of the president (Exhibit 6.3.b.1, Organizational Chart).

The co-chairs of the Education Department are members of the faculty appointed by the dean of the college to administer the affairs of the department. An important responsibility of the co-chairs is maintaining program and unit accreditation with KSDE and NCATE. Primary responsibility for maintaining accreditation with KSDE and NCATE resides with the co-chairs; it may not be delegated to other faculty members.

The Education Department is the governing unit that has primary responsibility for the initial and the advanced programs at Benedictine College. The department operates within the governance structure of the college that includes the Board of Directors, Dean’s Council, Academic Policies Committee (initial programs), and the Graduate Studies Committee (advanced program) (Exhibit 6.3.c.2, Benedictine College Catalog, pgs. 125 and 139-140).

The Education Department solicits guidance for program improvement from its Education Advisory Committee, comprised of initial and advanced program candidates and graduates, and PK-12 partnership school administrators and teachers. Members of this advisory group are committed to the concept of preparing Educators as Builders of Community and know and understand the goals and policies of both the initial and advanced education programs. The committee meets regularly each semester to review data and make recommendations for program improvement (Exhibit 6.3.c.2, Benedictine College Catalog, pg. 125).

The Committee on Teacher Education (CTE) is a standing committee appointed by the dean of the college. The CTE members include all full-time faculty in the Education Department, at least five faculty from departments that have secondary education programs, four P-12 partnership school representatives, and student representatives that have been admitted to the teacher education program. The assistant licensure officer serves as the secretary of the CTE. The CTE is the policy making body for all initial education programs. It formally considers education program changes, and deliberates and approves applications for admission to teacher education and student teaching, with the following decisions: (a) Approved, (b) Approved
conditionally, depending on status of student application file, and (c) Rejected, when criteria have not been satisfactorily met. (Exhibit 6.3.a.1, Benedictine College Education Department Policies and Procedures Handbook, fall 2012, pg. 9)

The Graduate Studies Committee is also a standing committee composed of the unit co-chair, graduate education program director, School of Business Chair, associate dean (ex officio), and three faculty members appointed by the Dean of the College. The Graduate Studies Committee is the policy-making body for both the MASL and M.Ed. advanced programs, as well as the graduate programs in the School of Business. Management and oversight of the programs resides in the Education Department. Decisions governing the programs are made by the Education Department acting as a whole during regularly scheduled meetings. The function of the Graduate Studies Committee is more fully explained in the Graduate Studies Policy Handbook, Exhibit 6.3.a.3.

The Education Advisory Committee is composed of: 1) adjunct faculty, 2) preservice teachers in the initial programs, 3) practicing educational administrators, 4) practicing teachers, and 5) advanced program candidate members representing each active cohort. Members of the committee are appointed by the Education Department and the director of the graduate education programs. The purpose of the committee is to participate in the on-going process of improvement and to provide advice relative to all aspects of the unit’s programs, including curricular design and the program’s conceptual framework. The Education Advisory Committee meets each semester.

The unit’s initial program budget documents are presented in Exhibits 6.3.f.1 and 6.3.g.1 with the advanced program budget presented in Exhibit 6.3.f.2. Over the course of the last six years the department’s budget for the initial programs has increased from $343,916.07 to $511,441.06. This increase is a reflection of the department’s growing candidate pool as well as the college’s commitment to the department. Adequate funds are available to meet both on-campus and clinical needs necessary for the preparation of professional educators. The unit has been well supported by the Academic Dean and CFO as needs have arisen. Budgets for the advanced programs are adequate for the needs of the program and were increased for advertising when the M.Ed. program began in fall of 2011. Advanced program candidates have physical access and off-campus electronic access to the library, e-mail, and other support and technology.

Currently six full time and one half-time faculty members and eight adjunct faculty serve the department for the initial programs, three of the full time faculty and eight adjuncts teach in the advanced programs. Over the last three years, increases in the college population and candidate pool have resulted in course overloads and the addition of multiple sections of offered courses in the initial programs. In the spring of 2011, the unit hired an additional faculty member to help in handling the increasing demand for courses. In the spring of 2012, a second faculty position was approved, but the search was unsuccessful. The unit has plans to open the position again during the 2012-2013 academic year. Unit faculty and clinical faculty are able to cover current teaching loads, advise candidates and serve as clinical supervisors for practicum and student teaching experiences.
Technology is an issue that continues to present challenges to the department. The Education Advisory Committee has listed technology as an area for improvement on multiple feedback instruments. In response to this feedback the unit has acquired additional technology, which include Promethean Boards, additional candidate computers for the curriculum library, and faculty technology. Training has been provided unit faculty on issues related to incorporating best practices from the field into academic courses and the use of existing campus wide technology.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of 3 pages]

In an effort to better understand the data based decisions made by the department in the previous five academic years, minutes from all department, Teacher Education Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, and Advisory Committee meetings were reviewed. A coding system was developed to sort decisions made by the department across issues being dealt with and sources of data used to present these issues. Concerning data streams, departmental feedback unveiled the highest number of issues. Departmental feedback can be defined as concerns brought to the department from direct experience or ongoing assessment protocols. Other data sources include feedback from educational professionals working in the field, direct student feedback from candidates in the departments, changes articulated by the Kansas State Department of Education, feedback solicited from the departments Advisory Committee, feedback solicited from the college’s committee on teacher education and changes presented by the NCATE process.

A number of issues warranted inclusion in this analysis. Like all units preparing candidates to become professional educators, the department wrestles with issues in service delivery. Some concerns are handled with immediate solutions, other issues involve months of dialog and multi-faceted responses. Three of the most involved issues presented over the past five academic years are concerns related to increasing class size due to increased enrollment; portfolio assessment protocols, and course offerings. Other issues include, feedback to administration regarding the planning and completion of a new academic center, which houses the Education Department; changes made to policy surrounding student teaching experiences; implementation of a new advanced level program; waivers granted to candidates who have not successfully made application to the unit; concerns related to diversity; candidates completing areas of concentration in special education; candidates seeking licensure completion in special education; candidates seeking a non-licensure degree track; the use of technology rich classrooms; and the professional dispositions of candidates. A table of these issues sorted by data source and the date of the meeting where consideration or action was taken is present in Standard 6 exhibits (Exhibit 6.3.k.1).

The process of identifying areas of concerns through the multiple data sources that are integrated into the Comprehensive Assessment System will continue in the future. As new issues present themselves, appropriate solutions will be implemented after data is collected, reviewed, analyzed, and interpreted. Three concerns currently considered which will require continued attention are course over-crowding and the implementation of appropriate education technology. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the unit will request permission to conduct a candidate search for the position that went unfilled in the spring of 2012. This position will assist the unit in handling course over-crowding and further disperse the number of advisees each faculty member serves.
Concurrently, careful attention will be given to the number of candidates entering the program to insure that faculty expansion does not increase beyond need. Secondly, members of the professional community and recent graduates will be sources of feedback regarding the continued use and future adoption of education technologies. Appropriate budgetary measures have been taken to insure necessary resources for the expansion of current technologies.