2011 Part C of the AACTE / NCATE Annual Report

Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	16130	AACTE SID:	3200
Institution:	Monmouth University		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section I - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2010-2011 academic year?

299

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2010-2011 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section II. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. Changes in program delivery from traditional to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

No Change / Not Applicable

2. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.

No Change / Not Applicable

3. Increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites and outside the United States.

No Change / Not Applicable

4. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in budget

No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in candidate enrollment

No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in size of the full-time faculty

No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in significant changes as the result of a natural disaster

No Change / Not Applicable

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in delivery of a program in while or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner

No Change / Not Applicable

9. Addition or removal of a level of preparation(e.g., a master's degree).

No Change / Not Applicable

Section III. Areas for Improvement

II.1 Summarize activities, assessments and outcomes toward correcting AFI(s) cited in the last Accreditation Action Report, if applicable.

There are no AFI's since the last Accreditation Action Report dated April 2010

Section IV: Units with Regular/Continuous Improvement Accreditation Option

C.1. Summarize evidence indicating progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected by the unit

   ≖ Std. 1   ᗷ Std. 2   ≖ Std. 3   ≖ Std. 4   ≖ Std. 5   ≖ Std. 6

The unit establishes the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations. Program coordinators meet every semester with other program faculty and members of the PAC with the purpose to examine current core assessments and data. The purpose of these meetings is to determine if the core assessments are producing the anticipated outcomes and whether specific groups of candidates (e.g., gender, ethnic groups, etc.) are performing better or worse than others. Data provide evidence for examining assessments for the alignment of SPA standards, course content and core assessments in courses. All programs have student handbooks that are distributed to all candidates during orientations. Information about the conceptual framework, dispositions expected of candidates, key assessments, and other requirements are included in the handbook for each initial and advanced program. Rubrics to assess candidates' work are shared with the candidates before they are used and are included in course syllabi. Thus, candidates know what they will be assessed on, what is expected of them, and the level of proficiency associated with each scoring decision. Unit faculty members review all assessments, rubrics, and data at the SOE retreat held each semester. They also discuss this information with the PAC, and assessment tools and rubrics are revised and clarified where needed. Data are available on the SOE Web site and are also shared with students, faculty in the Arts and Sciences, and members of our P-12 partnership schools. To increase the reliability of findings, candidate proficiencies identified in the conceptual framework have been linked to questions on the exit survey, alumni survey, and employer survey for both the initial and advanced programs.

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 unit has fully developed evaluations using input from faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, advisory council meetings, and using exit and alumni surveys from candidates. Data is disaggregated by program and by level (initial or advanced). Not only are quantitative data collected but qualitative as well. The addition of collecting qualitative data has helped the unit understand the quantitative data, provided insight into how the unit must change and improve, as well as help the unit to revise its assessment instruments. The unit not only makes changes based on the data, but also systemically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Since most of the assessment instruments are used consistently we are able to view trends in the data over several years. This allows the unit to make changes and systematically analyze the effects of those changes.

C.2. Summarize data that demonstrate continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge

The unit is constantly striving to improve upon its assessment system. The unit, with the involvement of its professional community, will continue to regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system. The unit has plans to increase our data sharing to the larger community to ensure timely feedback for program and unit improvement. For example, Monmouth University currently has three academies for school professionals: the Superintendents' Academy; the Principals' Academy; and the Special Services Academy. The purpose of these academies is to create a forum for dialogue and an exchange of ideas and experiences. Using the University as a catalyst, the academies provide professional growth opportunities for school leaders and central office personnel. It creates a network of support for colleagues and establishes a collaborative relationship with the University and its resources. Our goal is to start sharing data on the unit and programs with these three academies in order to reach the greater community, which includes and extends beyond our current partnership districts. The unit also wants to start collecting data on candidates that extends beyond the academic and field experiences. The unit has implemented several professional development seminars for sophomore and junior students, which focus on resume writing, interviewing skills, and other skills needed to be successful in student teaching and the professional world. Our goal is to collect, analyze, and share data from those seminars in order to improve students' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. We also have the goal of improving candidates' success after they have graduated from our programs. The unit has implemented a three-year Alumni Novice Teacher Mentoring Academy, which will help our recent graduates be more successful in their professional lives. Data collected from this academy will be shared with the various advisory councils and will hopefully improve upon the unit's ability to show a strong relationship between students' success in our programs and later in their classrooms and schools. While the unit has numerous plans for collecting new data and sharing it with new constituents, we also have the goal of maintaining high standards with our current assessment system. We must continue to collect data regularly using a consistent assessment instrument. This way, the programs, unit, and advisory councils can see change over a period of years, which is important for long-term improvement. For example, an area that the unit must improve upon is the consistent collection and analyzing of students' dispositions in the advanced programs. Core courses where students will be assessed must be identified and a consistent methodology must be used to collect the data. While the unit has a strong assessment system, over the next several years, the unit hopes to streamline the data collection, data analysis, and data sharing process in order to ensure improvement.

Exhibits that support the narrative: 🖉 Description of Unit Assessment System 🖉 Assessment Handbook

Notes on C.2: Standard 1 will be the focus of the 2010-2011 Annual Report. Please submit sample data/evidence/exhibit(s) - no more than two - that demonstrate continuing to meet standard 1 related to content knowledge only. The sample can be from a single program but should be representative of the unit as whole. For selection of exhibits, please use NCATE's Exhibit List provided as a guide.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Tina R Paone

Phone: 732-263-5291

E-mail: tpaone@monmouth.edu