

WSU Five-Year Program Review
Self-Study

Cover Page

Department/Program: Teacher Education

Semester Submitted: Fall 2013

Self-Study Team Chair: Kristin Hadley
Teacher Education Department Chair
McKay Education 222, x8653
kristinhadley@weber.edu

Self-Study Team Members: Louise Moulding
McKay Education 313, x7665
lmoulding@weber.edu

Kristin Radulovich
McKay Education 231, x6309
kradulovich@weber.edu

Peggy Saunders
McKay Education 235, x7673
psaunders@weber.edu

Natalie Struhs
McKay Education 230A, x6636
nataliestruhs@weber.edu

A. Brief Introductory Statement

The Teacher Education Department at Weber State University has three licensure programs that prepare elementary, secondary, and special education teachers. With consistently high student interest in the programs, the department has maintained accreditation and worked as a quality unit. We currently are accredited through National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), but have moved toward using an Inquiry Brief approach to accreditation based on Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and now recognized by Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The Inquiry Brief system requires teacher preparation programs to give evidence for claims about graduates, provide documentation for quality control systems, and show the use of data-driven decision making to improve the program.

In 2010, the Dean of the College of Education approached the Teacher Education Department with a proposal to engage in a significant self-study. We called this project “Google Teacher Ed” to represent the process of gathering and indexing information as a search engine does. Beginning in December of that year, the department began to review every aspect of the program from recruitment, advisement, admission and retention, course content and sequencing, faculty engagement, and measures of success. Every member of the faculty and staff was all assigned to at least two teams that reviewed specific components and, after two semesters of work, made recommendations to the department. Teams presented their findings to the entire department so that the implications of each recommendation could be evaluated and an action plan defined. As a result, substantial changes have taken place in the department over the past year.

Major recommendations led to the following significant changes to the program structure.

- Graded practicum added to each program. This included a graded practicum for two semesters in elementary, one in secondary, and one in special education. This has been accomplished, with all curriculum changes approved by faculty senate.
- Associate of science degree in pre-education created to standardize the pre-requisites and support courses for elementary and special education majors. This was especially important for recruitment and retention of students who completed EDUC 1010: Introduction to Education as high school seniors through concurrent enrollment.
- Program levels (courses taken concurrently) reorganized to reflect changes in practicum and AS degree.

In addition to program changes, Teacher Education responded to changes to teaching standards defined by the Utah State Office of Education. The Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS) are now in place and are used to evaluate in-service teachers based on these standards. Based on these standards, the “Tuning” committee at the Utah Board of Regents has defined the Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes (UPTLO). New courses and new standards require revision of many existing measures of students such as student teaching observation protocol, practicum observation protocol, and rubrics for evaluating lesson plans and materials. The result of the self-study has been manifold. First, the department faculty and staff have a much deeper understanding of the entire program and their individual roles in preparing

teachers. Second, the stated program outcomes are now aligned to new standards. Third, the faculty has an inquiry orientation for evaluating course and program outcomes. The inquiry orientation is the most significant result and will allow greater data-driven decisions about the program in the future.

In spite of the actions taken to date, much work is still in progress including the development of new measures that align to the standards, organization of data into a well-functioning database that can provide information for program improvement, and articulation of course outcomes in the newly configured levels. These areas of need are the focus for the on-going teams.

Data that have remained constant through these changes are Praxis exam pass rates (content knowledge tests), student teaching pass rates, disposition ratings, and exit surveys. Assessments that are more finely focused on the new Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes are being developed and piloted.

Demographic Information about our Students

As is typical of most education professionals, the majority of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education majors are female (Table 1). Efforts to recruit males for these majors are ongoing. Secondary Education majors have a more even split between males and females.

Table 1: Gender of Admitted Students by Major and Year

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Grand Total
Early Childhood Ed	25	18	9	6	15	73
Female	25	18	9	6	14	72
Male					1	1
Elementary Ed	103	104	85	81	68	441
Female	97	97	80	78	64	416
Male	6	7	5	3	4	25
Secondary Ed	85	100	106	96	73	460
Female	49	51	62	53	46	261
Male	36	49	44	43	27	199
Special Ed	20	28	25	28	28	125
Female	18	27	22	25	23	111
Male	2	1	3	3	5	14
Grand Total	233	250	225	211	184	1103

Ethnicity of admitted students is presented in Table 2. Continual efforts are made through Future Educators Associations in the high schools, particularly the schools in Ogden School district, the TAPT (Teacher Assistant Path to Teaching) program, and targeted scholarships to recruit more educators from diverse backgrounds.

Grade point average (GPA) is used as part of admissions to the program. While there is a minimum required GPA for admission (2.75), students are awarded more points for higher GPA. Tables 3 and 4 display data for cumulative GPA and final 30 hours (representing program

courses) by major and comparative GPA data for secondary teaching and non-teaching majors. These data show that education students are on par with other majors and that education course grades do not substantially change GPA.

Table 2: Ethnicity of Admitted Students by Major and Year

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Grand Total
Early Childhood Ed	25	18	9	6	15	73
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	1				2
Hispanic	1			1	1	3
Other		1		1	1	3
White, non-Hispanic	23	16	9	4	13	65
Elementary Ed	103	104	85	81	68	441
Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native	1			1		2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	1	1	1		6
Black, non-Hispanic				1		1
Hispanic	2	6		3	2	13
Other					1	1
White, non-Hispanic	97	97	84	75	65	418
Secondary Ed	84	100	106	95	73	458
Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native		2				2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	2	2	2		7
Black, non-Hispanic	2		1	1	1	5
Hispanic	4	3	6	1	2	16
Other		3	1	1	3	8
White, non-Hispanic	77	90	96	90	67	420
Special Ed	19	28	25	28	28	125
Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native				1		1
Hispanic	1		1	1		2
Other					1	1
White, non-Hispanic	18	28	24	26	27	121
Grand Total	231	250	225	210	184	1100

Table 3: GPA at Admission by Major

Major	Spring 2012		Fall 2012		Spring 2013		Fall 2013	
	Cum.	Last 30	Cum.	Last 30	Cum.	Last 30	Cum.	Last 30
All Majors	3.36	3.29	3.32	3.16	3.38	3.48	3.46	3.49
Elem	3.35	3.31	3.38	3.21	3.42	3.49	3.42	3.44
ECE	3.12	3.14	3.50	3.43	3.32	3.57	3.10	3.61
Elem/EC	3.37	3.39	none	none	none	none	none	none
SPED	3.31	3.05	3.21	2.96	3.32	3.21	3.36	3.32
Secondary	3.42	3.29	3.31	3.18	3.37	3.45	3.51	3.53

Table 4: GPA at Graduation by Major (2012-2013)

	Teaching Major	Non-Teaching Major
Early Childhood	3.6	3.5
Elementary Education	3.6	NA
Special Education	3.6	NA
English	3.4	3.5
German	3.7	3.9
Spanish	3.3	3.5
Physical Education	3.2	3.5
Chemistry	3.5	3.3
Physics	3.4	3.5
Mathematics	3.2	3.5
History	3.2	3.3
Geography	3.3	3.1

B. Mission Statement

Through the Google Teacher Ed project, a committee considered what we believe about ourselves. The result of this investigation was a new mission statement. The undergirding values and beliefs are still being articulated but consensus was reached regarding the mission of the Teacher Education Department

Mission Statement of the Weber State University Teacher Education Department:

We work within our communities to prepare caring, competent educators and to promote equitable, inclusive, and transformative education practices.

We work within: This language emphasizes the collaborative nature of teacher preparation; we rely on local school districts and we work with other programs on campus.

Our communities: This is plural because we interact within many circles (university, department, city, school district, and profession)

Caring: This term has currency in educational research and theory. Care is a fundamental quality of effective teachers.

Competent: Effective teachers must be competent in content and pedagogy.

Equitable, inclusive, and transformative educational practices: To be effective, educational practices must make a difference for *all* students. We do not introduce practices simply because they are innovative, but because they make positive differences for students. We also actively seek to develop ways to improve practice through research and critical reflection.

C. Curriculum

Based on the recommendations from the self-study, Google Teacher Ed, many curricular changes were implemented. The changes are summarized in the Table 5.

Table 5: Curricular Changes to Teacher Education based on Google Teacher Ed

<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Associated Changes</i>
<p>The Utah Core curriculum has increased rigor, particularly in mathematics and language arts. Teachers at all levels must meet the requirements of this curriculum and the needs of students. There is a continuing need for kindergarten teachers so a track resulting in a K-6 license is needed. Teachers in the upper grades must also have rigorous background knowledge in content, so a track resulting in a Grades 1-8 license is needed as well, Finally, teachers in special education need rigorous knowledge in mathematics to support students in K-12.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-6: 9 credit Early Childhood, 9 credit specialization • 1-8: 18-20 credit (mostly upper division) specialization that supports CCSS created by content departments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Specializations currently available: Math level 2, ESL ○ 1-8 track majors could also elect to pursue a content teaching minor.
<p>There is a desire to rearrange courses within levels to allow faculty and students to collaborate in a common Foundational level for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education majors inasmuch as all teachers in the elementary level work together. This led to rearrangement of courses within levels and blocks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require all Elementary and Special Education students take EDUC 2010 Human Exceptionality (3). Early Childhood Education and double majors in Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education may take either EDUC 2010 or CHF 3500 • Add new course EDUC 3270 Differentiation and Collaboration for Inclusive Settings (3) in the Level I. (Replaces EDUC 3260 (3) for Elem Ed) • Rearrange courses within professional levels to accommodate changes.
<p>Graded practica will allow greater knowledge of prospective teachers' abilities in the classroom without the performance being "hidden" by coursework.</p>	<p>New Courses: EDUC 3210 Elementary Level II Practicum (2), and EDUC 4210 Elementary Level III Practicum (3)</p>
<p>The addition of graded practica should have minimal impact on credit hours required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine HLTH 4300 and PEP 3630 into a new course PEP/HLTH 3620 Methods for Teaching PE and Health for Elementary Teachers (3) • Replace EDUC 2000 with GenEd specific course (GEOG 1300 or GEOG 1520) (3)
<p>Ensure that education students have necessary technology skills, without increasing additional credits</p>	<p>New course EDUC 3115 Media Integration in Elementary School Settings (2) (replaces EDUC 3110 (2))</p>

Education courses were focused on preparing teachers to be effective based on the Utah Effective Teacher Standards. However in 2013, the Utah State Board of Regents implemented the results of the Tuning Project for Elementary Education majors, called the Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes (UPTLO). At Weber State, we made the decision to use the UPTLO in all our majors and licensure programs as they applied to teaching at all levels. The UPTLO are the outcomes that Teacher Education will use to measure the effectiveness of our program and our students. Table 6 shows the relationship between courses and the UPTLO, with specific formative assessments (F) included in each course and summative assessments (S) during student teaching.

Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes

Outcome 1: Learner Development

The teacher:

- a. Creates developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences based on students' strengths, interests, and needs.
- b. Collaborates with families, colleagues, and other professionals to promote student growth and development.

Outcome 2: Learning Differences

The teacher:

- a. Adapts instruction to address each student's learning strengths and needs.
- b. Delivers instruction that provides for different ways of demonstrating learning.
- c. Provides instruction that takes into account the experiences and knowledge of learners *including cultural, linguistic, and academic differences* (italicized portion added by WSU).

Outcome 3: Learning Environments

The teacher:

- a. Uses a variety of effective classroom management strategies to maintain a positive learning environment.
- b. Constructs learning experiences that require students to be actively engaged in learning.

Outcome 4: Content Knowledge

The teacher:

- a. Communicates accurate information and concepts.
- b. Adapts instruction to address students' common misconceptions about subject matter.
- c. Designs instruction based on approved content standards and research.
- d. Provides multiple representations and explanations of concepts.
- e. Selects instructional resources that contain accurate content.

Outcome 5: Assessment

The teacher:

- a. Uses pre-assessments, and formative and summative assessments in a variety of formats that match learning objectives.
- b. Teaches students to identify the elements of quality work.
- c. Uses data to assess student learning to plan for differentiated instruction.
- d. Documents student progress and provides specific feedback to students and other stakeholders in a variety of ways.

Outcome 6: Instructional Planning

The teacher:

- a. Plans instruction based on state core.
- b. Aligns instruction and assessment with learning goals.
- c. Designs instruction at an appropriate level of cognitive complexity for the learning goal.

Outcome 7: Instructional Strategies

The teacher:

- a. Uses a variety of instructional strategies that elicit and build upon students' prior knowledge and experiences.
- b. Constructs learning experiences that require students to use multiple forms of communication.
- c. Systematically includes a variety of perspectives and sources to inform instruction.
- d. Uses technologies appropriate for the learning goal.

Outcome 8: Reflection and Continuous Growth

The teacher:

- a. Participates in professional development.
- b. Recognizes and reflects upon own biases in order to become a more effective teacher of all students.
- c. Reflects on instructional effectiveness to improve subsequent teaching practice.
- d. Accepts and uses feedback from multiple sources.

Outcome 9: Leadership and Collaboration

The teacher:

- a. Participates as a team member in decision-making processes.
- b. Collaborates with school professionals to meet the needs of learners.

Outcome 10: Professional and Ethical Behavior

The teacher:

- a. Adheres to and upholds laws, rules, policies, and directives.
- b. Maintains professional behavior and appearance.

Table 6: Core Courses in the Department by Program

			Learning Outcomes									
			Outcome 1: Learner Development	Outcome 2: Learning Differences	Outcome 3: Learning Environments	Outcome 4: Content Knowledge	Outcome 5: Assessment	Outcome 6: Instructional Planning	Outcome 7: Instructional Strategies	Outcome 8: Reflection and Continuous	Outcome 9: Leadership and Collaboration	Outcome 10: Professional and Ethical Behavior
Elementary Education	Level 1	EDUC 3120: Reading Instruction in the Primary Grades				F		F				F
		EDUC 3140: Educational Psychology	F	F	F					F		F
		EDUC 3205: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching		F						F		F
		EDUC 3270: Differentiation and Collaboration		F							F	F
	Level 2	EDUC 3100: Instructional Planning and Assessment		F	F		F	F				F
		EDUC 3240: Reading Instruction in the Intermediate Grades			F	F		F	F			F
		PEP 3620: Methods of Teaching Physical Education and Health			F	F		F	F			F
		EDUC 4345: Integrating Creative Arts		F	F	F		F				F
		EDUC 3210: Elementary Level 2 Practicum	F	F	F					F	F	F
	Level 3	EDUC 4300: Elementary Mathematics Methods		F		F	F	F	F			F
		EDUC 4320: Elementary Language Arts Methods		F		F		F	F			F
		EDUC 4330: Elementary Science Methods				F			F			F
		EDUC 3280: Elementary Social Studies		F		F	F	F	F			F
		EDUC 3115: Media Integration in Elementary School Settings							F			F
		EDUC 4210: Elementary Level 3 Practicum	F	F	F				F	F	F	F
	S	EDUC 4840: Student Teaching	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		EDUC 4850: Integrated Elementary Education Student Teaching Seminar			S			S				

F=Formative, S=Summative

Special Education	Level 1	EDUC 3120: Reading Instruction in the Primary Grades	F			F		F				F
		EDUC 3140: Educational Psychology	F	F	F					F		F
		EDUC 3205: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching		F						F		F
		EDUC 3270: Differentiation and Collaboration		F							F	F
		EDUC 4515: Foundations in Special Education Practice and Law				F						F
	Level 2	EDUC 4530: Assessment in Special Education					F					F
		EDUC 4540: Managing Student Behavior	F		F		F		F			F
		EDUC 4550: Instructional Planning and Learning Environments	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F		F
		EDUC 4560: Validated Methods: Mathematics	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F		F
		EDUC 4521: Practicum in Special Education	F							F	F	F
	Level 3	EDUC 4555: Validated Methods: Reading	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F		F
		EDUC 4570: Validated Methods: Written Expression	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F		F
		EDUC 4580: Learning Strategies and Transition for Special Ed Students	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F		F
		EDUC 4581: Pre-Student Teaching in Special Education	F							F	F	F
	ST	EDUC 4680: Student Teaching in Special Education	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
EDUC 4686: Special Education Student Teaching Seminar		S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S	S	
Secondary Ed	Pro Core	EDUC 3220: Foundations of Diversity		F			F		F	F		
		EDUC 3265: The Exceptional Student		F	F				F			
		EDUC 3900: Preparing, Teaching, and Assessing Instruction	F				F	F	F			
		EDUC 3935: Reading and Writing Across the Secondary Curriculum	F				F		F			
		EDUC 3315: Media Integration in the Secondary School Setting				F			F			
		EDUC 3910: Secondary Education Practicum		F	F	F			F	F	F	F
	ST	EDUC 4940: Student Teaching in Secondary Education	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		EDUC 4950: Integrated Secondary Student Teaching Seminar	S		S			S	S	S		

Implications and Action Plan

With the curriculum changes recently implemented, there are many similarities across programs including the graded practica, similar lesson planning and diversity courses, and student teaching seminars. Work remains to be done to coordinate outcomes across these similar courses to provide more cohesive outcomes for all students.

D. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Due to program changes and changes in outcomes at the state level, long-term data on specific outcomes are not available. However, the following data sets have been collected over time and do speak to the quality of the program.

Praxis Pass Rates

To qualify for licensure in Utah, students must pass the designated Praxis content knowledge exam. As of Fall 2013, teacher education requires elementary education, special education, and early childhood majors to pass the designated exam prior to admission into the program. Secondary education students must pass before WSU can recommend them for licensure. The number of tests taken and percent passed by major is displayed in Table 7. The colors are used to indicate critical percentages (e.g., red is used for pass rates 70% or below, yellow indicates 71-90%).

Implications and Action Plan

A majority of students pass the Praxis exam in the required time and fully qualify for licensure. Students taking the elementary education exam may need additional support in order to pass the mathematics subtest. Although WSU teacher education students have similar pass rates to other institutions (e.g., in 2011-12 WSU pass rate was 45%, state pass rate was 47%), the current pass rate represents a challenge to our department as it may adversely impact students' eligibility for admission.

Actions: Teacher Education is taking active steps to help support Elementary Education and Special Education majors with Praxis preparation. A summer course is under development to focus on the knowledge and skills included in the mathematics subtest. Additional work is being done to ensure that the content and methods used in required math courses are aligned to the expectations for elementary and special education candidates.

Secondary education majors must also pass the designated Praxis exam prior to recommendation for licensure. Areas of concern include social science, which has the highest number of secondary majors but a relatively low pass rate compared to other subjects, and the secondary programs in the college of education (physical education and health), which have shown increasing pass rates.

Action: The first action is to ensure that faculty in the content areas are aware of the pass rates. This can be done by regularly sharing data through the University Council for Teacher Education (UCTE).

Table 7: Praxis Pass Rates by College and Major/Program

College	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13						
	# Students		# Students		# Students		# Students		# Students						
	# Passing	% Pass	# Passing	% Pass	# Passing	% Pass	# Passing	% Pass	# Passing	% Pass					
Education															
Early Childhood	8	6	75%	3	3	100%	2	2	100%	4	4	100%	4	4	100%
Elementary Education	64	56	88%	106	99	93%	149	138	93%	108	100	93%	6	6	100%
El Ed Reading LA Subtest										22	20	91%	178	156	88%
El Ed Math Subtest										22	10	45%	188	122	65%
El Ed Science Subtest										22	16	73%	183	146	80%
El Ed SocStud Subtest										22	18	82%	182	145	80%
Special Education (M.Ed. And PRIME)	35	34	97%	35	35	100%	10	10	100%	15	15	100%	16	16	100%
Middle School English Lang Arts	1	1	100%	5	4	80%	7	7	100%	8	8	100%	7	7	100%
Middle School Mathematics	2	2	100%	13	13	100%	28	25	89%	17	16	94%	20	16	80%
Physical Education	6	5	83%	8	6	75%	14	12	86%	15	15	100%	12	12	100%
Health Education	7	4	57%	6	5	83%	6	4	67%	7	4	57%	7	7	100%
Arts & Humanities															
English	22	17	77%	38	27	71%	35	28	80%	24	21	88%	32	28	88%
French				2	1	50%				2	2	100%	3	2	67%
German							2	2	100%	1	1	100%	5	4	80%
Spanish	11	10	91%	14	10	71%	13	12	92%	10	8	80%	10	6	60%
Speech Communication				3	3	100%	2	2	100%						
Art	2	2	100%	2	1	50%	5	4	80%	11	11	100%	5	5	100%
Music	1	1	100%	1	1	100%	8	5	63%	8	7	88%	4	4	100%
Theatre				2	2	100%	3	2	67%	2	2	100%	6	5	83%
Science															
Biology	12	11	92%	6	6	100%	6	6	100%	10	10	100%	7	7	100%
Chemistry				1	1	100%	3	3	100%	4	4	100%			
Earth and Space	7	7	100%	5	3	60%				4	4	100%			
General Science	1	0	0%	4	2	50%	8	7	88%	14	9	64%	17	14	82%
Physical Science	2	2	100%	1	1	100%									
Physics	5	3	60%	4	3	75%	1	1	100%				2	2	100%
Mathematics	8	7	88%	13	11	85%	14	12	86%	16	16	100%	9	8	89%
Social Science															
Psychology	3	3	100%	4	3	75%	7	6	86%	6	6	100%	4	4	100%
Sociology										1	1	100%			
Geography	1	1	100%	2	2	100%	4	3	75%	3	2	67%	6	5	83%
Government/Polical Science	1	1	100%	2	1	50%	2	2	100%						
Social Studies	13	10	77%	11	8	73%	14	13	93%	8	6	75%	17	14	82%
World and US History	11	5	45%	19	14	74%	22	16	73%	16	12	75%	15	9	60%
COAST															
Business Education	2	2	100%	3	3	100%	6	6	100%	5	5	100%	7	7	100%

Student Teaching Pass Rates

Student teaching is currently a pass/fail course. The essential culminating experiences in student teaching result in either credit for the course or no credit. Student teachers are evaluated by their cooperating teacher(s) and their university supervisor(s). While consensus is desired, if there is disagreement about whether credit should be awarded, the university supervisors' recommendations, in consultation with the Student Teaching Coordinator, take precedence. Table 8 shows the number of student teachers passing the course by year.

Student Teacher Pass Rates

Table 8: Student Teacher Pass Rates by Program

Major	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Early Childhood or ECE/ELEM	100% (n=20)	100% (n=20)	100% (n=13)	100% (n=14)	100% (n=13)
Elementary Ed	97% (n=86)	99% (n=121)	98% (n=90)	99% (n=84)	98% (n=56)
Special Ed	98% (n=28)	100% (n=15)	100% (n=19)	96% (n=26)	96% (n=23)
Secondary Ed	96% (n=84)	95% (n=77)	96% (n=91)	96% (n=84)	99% (n=87)

Implications and Action Plan

The overwhelming majority of students pass their student teaching course. As a pass/fail course there is limited ability to differentiate between adequate student teachers and exemplary student teachers.

Action: As the graded practica are implemented in formative levels, student teaching will need to become a graded course with scored teaching rubrics.

Student Dispositions

Faculty in each level evaluate student dispositions every semester. The 11 evaluated dispositions are reflective, teachable, ethical, collegial, inquisitive, persistent, self-directed, collaborative, responsible, positive attitude, and respectful. Each student receives a rating of no concern, low concern, medium concern, or high concern for each disposition. Cooperating teachers also rate student dispositions during the student teaching semester. Overwhelmingly, evaluators see no concern relative to the student dispositions as indicated in the Table 9.

Implications and Action Plan

Although most students have no problem with dispositions, the evaluation is an important first step in identifying students for whom teaching may not be an appropriate career choice. Gaps in the data as evidenced by blanks in the graph or unusually low response rates, indicate failure to correctly record disposition data in the database.

Action: Develop the database so that disposition data can be easily and correctly entered into the database. Continue to stress the importance of collecting disposition data at each level.

Table 9: Disposition Data by Program

Major	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Early Childhood	NA (n=22)	100% (n=22)	98% (n=61)	100% (n=54)	100% (n=10)
Elementary Ed	96% (n=25)	99% (n=178)	99% (n=272)	100% (n=155)	99% (n=75)
Special Ed	NA	100% (n=11)	100% (n=18)	100% (n=10)	NA
Secondary Ed	100% (n=14)	100% (n=31)	99% (n=154)	100% (n=140)	100% (n=70)

Assessment Plan

In addition to dispositions and PRAXIS scores, future program evaluation data will be collected according to the UPTLO at each level. All data prior to student teaching is formative for level and program evaluation. Student teaching provides the summative data reported outside the department. As all level courses are upper division, no General Education assessments are collected. Additional lines of evidence that will be collected are exit surveys and alumni surveys to gather perceptions of program quality and self-report of acquired skills and knowledge.

Table 11 shows the assessments used for each program at each level, organized by the UPTLO standards. The assessments are assignments used in courses within the levels, with specific rubrics that are tied to UPTLO standards through Canvas.

Table 11: Assessments by Standard and Program

	ELEM/SPED Level 1	ELEM Level 2	ELEM Level 3	SPED Level 2	SPED Level 3	Pro Core	Student Teaching
Outcome 1 Learner Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory synthesis paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – Intervention plan Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – Intervention plan Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – rationale for design Interest inventory Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 2 Learning Differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-teaching project – adapted lesson presentation Theory synthesis paper SIOP Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – differentiation Observation - differentiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – differentiation Observation - multiple strategies, differentiated assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – IEP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – Transition plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case Study SIOP Workshop Observation form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 3 Learning Environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom management plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – classroom context Observation – learning environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation – learning environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – classroom context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – classroom context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation form Room design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 4 Content Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional reading resource collection Legal brief (SPED) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – content alignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – content, alignment Math interview Science activity critique 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – content, alignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – content, alignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation form Media Enhanced Lesson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 5 Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – analysis of student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum based assessment Functional behavior analysis Intervention plan WJ results and interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum based assessment Functional behavior analysis Intervention plan Case-based analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – Assessments/Analysis Presentation-Diff. Reading assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form

	ELEM/SPED Level 1	ELEM Level 2	ELEM Level 3	SPED Level 2	SPED Level 3	Pro Core	Student Teaching
Outcome 6 <i>Instructional Planning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading mini lesson plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – lesson plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – lesson plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – lesson plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents- lesson plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – lesson plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 7 <i>Instructional Strategies</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – lesson strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – strategies, media enhanced lessons Observation - strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – strategies, media enhanced lessons Observation - strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents – strategies, media enhanced lessons Observation - strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSD Lesson plans – activities, media, and lesson adaptations Lesson observation form IRIS Differentiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 8 <i>Reflection and Continuous Growth</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflective journal Narrative autobiography 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents - reflection Practicum goal setting Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents - reflection Practicum goal setting Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents - reflection Practicum goal setting Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiential learning project Lesson reflection Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching support documents Observation form
Outcome 9 <i>Collaboration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-teaching project – adapted lesson presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation form
Outcome 10 <i>Professional & Ethical Behavior</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Legal brief (SPED) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Cooperating teacher checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposition form Cooperating teacher checklist Observation form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation form Disposition form

E. Academic Advising

The Teacher Education Department has an Advisement Center that accommodates students majoring in Elementary Education, Special Education, and Elementary Education/Early Childhood Education double majors as well as students pursuing licensure through secondary education. We recently added an Associate of Science Degree in Pre-Education and we advise for this program as well. We advise students on general education, support and major requirements as well as providing information and guidance on admissions, graduation and licensure. The staff members who work in the Teacher Ed. Advisement Center include two part-time Receptionists, one Advisor/Admissions and Licensure Specialist, the Coordinator of the Teacher Education Advisement Center, the Coordinator of Student Teaching/Advisor, and the Student Teaching Secretary.

Advising Strategy and Process

WSU's Admissions Office organizes new student orientation sessions for incoming freshman and transfer students. These students come to advising sessions based on their major area of interest. The Teacher Education Dept. has six sessions in the spring and summer with approximately 100-130 students and two sessions in the fall with approximately 30 students. We provide general education and major information and encourage them to schedule individual appointments within the next semester or sooner if they have more questions. In addition, an on-line orientation for new WSU students was designed May 2013 and has information about all departments on campus: <https://weber.instructure.com/courses/219664>

The Student Success Center sponsors the Major Fest every February which is part of WSU's larger Wildcat Welcome event. This event attracts approximately 1700-2000 high school and university students across the state and we have an opportunity to talk to 100-200 potential students interested in Teacher Education.

Various outreach and advising activities within the Teacher Education Department:

- Present to the EDUC 1010 (Exploring Teaching) classes each semester (5 sections x 25-30 students) and talk about TED Program, the various major and licensure options as well as the application process, etc.
- Visit students pursuing TAPT program once a year and then meet with them individually (approximately 100 students in TAPT program).
- Conduct Pre-application Information meetings (approximately 5-8 per year).
- Have an active Teacher Ed. Advising website with program materials, application information, and on-line applications to which we refer students.
- Individual advising appointments which last 30 – 45 minutes where we advise students on their particular needs at the time. We cover general education and major requirements as well as providing information and guidance on admissions, graduation and licensure.
- Phone appointments are also available to students who are not able to come to campus and we go through the same information as listed above.

Effectiveness of Advising

The majority of our students meet with an advisor 3-5 times over the course of time it takes them to graduate and become licensed. The appointments last 30 – 45 minutes and we utilize the degree evaluation system (CatTracks) which shows students all of the courses they are responsible to take to complete their particular program of study. We check to verify that major(s) along with the catalog year are listed correctly and we put notes in the system indicating the date we met with the student and the issues that were discussed during the appointment.

In 2012, we met with a total of 770 students of which 560 students had not yet been admitted into the Teacher Education Program. So far in 2013, we have met with approximately 700 students of which 475 have not yet been admitted into the Teacher Education Program. Advisement is not mandatory at WSU, but we find that most students will seek advising frequently, especially as they begin their program of study. Most of our students will meet with an advisor up to five times throughout their college experience. We have very few cases in the Teacher Education Dept. where miss-advising is an issue and we are normally able to rectify the situation within the department.

Past Changes and Future Recommendations

In 2011, we participated in an extensive project where we took an in-depth look at the Teacher Education Advisement Center and made recommendations to restructure the advisement center as well as increase the number of staff members available for academic advising.

We were able to create an Academic Advisor position in August of 2012 to accept more advising responsibilities in addition to handling admissions and licensure responsibilities. The Student Teaching Coordinator's position was also revised to assume advising responsibilities primarily with students pursuing secondary education.

Implications and Action Plan

Effective advising has been an important element in the Department of Teacher Education. With the implemented changes, there has been some lack of clarity regarding responsibilities within the advisement center.

Action: The Teacher Education Advisement Center staff along with the Department Chair will be reviewing the changes along with various job tasks and responsibilities to ensure equitable distribution of tasks and effective service for students. The Student Teaching Secretary position may be expanded more to take on other responsibilities dealing with admissions and licensure. Other changes in task assignments may be made as responsibilities are clarified to best use the skills of the staff in the Advisement center.

F. Faculty

As part of our TEAC accreditation, we completed an audit of our procedures for hiring faculty and assigning them to classes. The committee audited a sample of faculty using the following checklist:

Faculty Audit Checklist

Yes	No	Criterion
		Met minimum and preferred criteria for position hired
		Course taught match degree/experience
		Current (as of last review) professional file
		Evaluated at appropriate career stage
		2 yr review by chair
		3 yr informal review
		6 yr tenure/promotion review
		Post-tenure/promotion review
		Letters from peer review/ chair /R & T committees/ dean present in file
		Documentation that decision follows channels described in PPM

The sample consisted of two of five full professors, three of nine associate professors, and two of five assistant professors.

Findings

Hiring Procedures and Requirements

Weber State University's Policy and Procedure Manual (www.weber.edu/ppm/Policies/8-6_FacAppt.html) details the requirements for hiring faculty. When starting a new faculty search, the director of Weber's Human Resource department comes and meets with the search committee and explains the procedures that need to be followed. Here is the link for those procedures:

<http://www.weber.edu/wsuiimages/HumanResources/Faculty%20Hiring%20Checklist%202012.pdf>. Upon review of the posted job descriptions since 2005, it was noted that the minimum requirements for faculty positions were: 3 years of teaching experience, a PhD in education or related field and content knowledge in the identified area. The preferred requirements varied depending on the position.

The requirements for the rank and tenure review process and post tenure review are outlined in the PPM 8-12 http://www.weber.edu/ppm/Policies/8-12_DatedGuideRankTenureReview.html

The results of faculty audit found that faculty met the minimum and preferred criteria of the job description when hired and were also teaching in areas for which they were qualified to teach. The professional files were up to date as of their last review and included the required

review letters. All other criteria identified in the checklist were met. It was noted that for faculty hired under the old policy a 2 year review was an informal review and was not documented. One faculty was hired the first year as a temporary position until the Ph.D. was completed and then a tenure track position was offered and another had the appointment delayed a few months until the Ph.D. was completed. Prior to the last review in 2005, the audit revealed one faculty whose hiring did not follow this procedure. However, this hire did follow procedures for accommodating necessary highly skilled individuals in critical shortage areas.

Assignment Strategies for Faculty to Teach Courses

Teacher Education faculty are typically recruited to fill a specific program need (e.g., literacy). Some are recruited as generalists to address several program areas (e.g., EDUC 1010 Exploring Teaching). The department chair, in consultation with program coordinators and elementary level coordinators, assigns faculty to teach courses based on the faculty member's expertise in that particular area. Factors that are considered include (a) terminal degrees, (b) experience teaching similar courses at other institutions, and (c) practical experience in that area (e.g., taught reading in an elementary school). The chair may also consider past course evaluations, recent professional development activities, and faculty requests. When a qualified faculty member is not available to teach a course, the chair will occasionally seek a qualified adjunct. However, the department strives to staff courses with qualified tenure-track faculty, and utilizes adjunct professors on a limited basis (excluding supervision). Table 12 displays the qualifications and experience of current Teacher Education faculty.

Implications and Action Plan

Weber State University Teacher Education department has made a concerted effort to follow university and departmental policy in the past and intends to continue this approach in the future. The PPM and the HR Department have specific hiring procedures with checks and balances to ensure all procedures are carefully followed. The audit revealed policy is being followed.

Faculty Qualifications and Demographic Information

Table 12: Faculty Demographics

Name	Gender	Term. Degree	Institution	Year	Rank	Tenure	Areas of Expertise	Ethnicity	Years K-12/ HighEd	Google Scholar Link
Melina Alexander	F	PhD	Utah State University	2006	Assoc	Ten	Special ed, learning disabilities, math and reading instruction, distance ed and hybrid, service learning	White	9/8	http://bit.ly/MelinaAlexander
Vincent Bates	M	Ph.D.	University of Arizona	2005	Asst	TT	Arts Education	White	12/8	http://bit.ly/VinceBates
Frances M. Butler	F	Ed.D.	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	1999	Full	Ten	Special Education, Math and Written expression methods, Learning Strategies	White	10/15	http://bit.ly/FranButler
David R. Byrd	M	Ph.D.	University of Iowa	2007	Asst	TT	second language writing, teaching culture, journal studies	White	10/6	http://bit.ly/DavidByrd
Michael E. Cena	M	Ph.D.	Utah State University	1995	Full	Ten	Reading/Language Arts, Historical Foundations	White	18/21	
Forrest Crawford	M	Ed.D.	Brigham Young University	1990	Full	Ten	Human Rights and Multicultural Education, Diversity and Cultural Sensitivity, ,Community Linkages and Leadership	African American	3/36	
Shirley Dawson	F	Ph.D.	University of Utah	2013	Asst	TT	Special Education, Special Education Law, Mentoring, Gifted and Talented Education	White	23/2	http://bit.ly/ShirleyDawson
Ann Ellis	F	Ph.D.	Purdue University	1993	Assoc	Ten	Gifted and Talented, Educational Psychology and Assessment, Strategies	White	4/29	
Linda Gowans	F	Ph.D.	University of Utah	1988	Full	Ten	Content Area Reading and Writing, Teaching Writing, Language Arts, Teaching Reading K-6	White	7/23	http://bit.ly/LindaGowans
Kristin Hadley	F	Ph.D.	Utah State University	2005	Assoc	Ten	Mathematics pedagogy, Instructional planning	White	21/9	http://bit.ly/KristinHadley

Name	Gender	Term. Degree	Institution	Year	Rank	Tenure	Areas of Expertise	Ethnicity	Years K-12/ HighEd	Google Scholar Link
Bonnie Hofland	F	PhD	University of Nebraska Lincoln	2011	Asst	TT	Special Education, Instructional Planning and Assessment, Teaching Strategies, Literacy	Native American	6/13	http://bit.ly/BonnieHofland
Patrick Leytham	M	Ph.D.	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	2013	Asst	TT	Autism, Intellectual Disabilities	White	8/1	http://bit.ly/PatrickLeytham
Jack Mayhew	M	Ph.D.	University of Utah	2001	Assoc	Ten	Special Education Mild/Moderate	White	5/20	http://bit.ly/JackMayhew
Anette Melvin	F	Ph.D.	Ohio State University	2010	Asst	TT	Equity and Diversity	African American	16/3	
Louise Moulding	F	Ph.D.	Utah State University	2001	Assoc	Ten	Assessment, Research Methods, Instructional Planning	White	15/10	http://bit.ly/LouiseMoulding
Vicki Napper	F	Ph.D.	Utah State University	1989	Full	Ten	Instructional Design	White	0/17	http://bit.ly/VickiNapper
Richard Pontius	M	PhD	Ohio State University	1993	Assoc	Ten	Science Education	White	15/14	http://bit.ly/RichardPontius
Clay L. Rasmussen	M	Ph.D.	Utah State University	2008	Asst	TT	Curriculum and Instruction, Social Studies Education	White	4/6	http://bit.ly/ClayRasmussen
Peggy J. Saunders	F	Ph.D.	University of Utah	2002	Assoc	Ten	PLC, cooperative learning, classroom management, curriculum and strategies, secondary language arts	White	21/12	
Penée W. Stewart	F	Ph.D.	Brigham Young University	1985	Assoc	Ten	Instructional psychology, Reading instruction	White	1/14	http://bit.ly/PeneeStewart
Natalie A. Williams	F	Ph.D.	Ohio State University	2005	Assoc	Ten	Special Education, Applied Behavior Analysis, Classroom management, Effective group instruction	White	9/9	http://bit.ly/NatalieWilliams

Departmental Teaching Standards and Evidence of Effective Instruction

Teaching excellence is of great importance as the Utah Board of Regents has classified WSU as a comprehensive four-year teaching institution. As such, faculty reviews for rank and tenure require Excellent or Good ratings in the Teaching category. All courses are evaluated every semester and faculty must respond to evaluations in their review documents. Courses taught by adjunct instructors are also part of the departmental mean. Historically, departmental means on each evaluated item are very high, between 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale. Means for each question on the Course Evaluation from Fall 2008 to Spring 2013 are found in Table 13. The lowest item for the semester is shaded blue and the highest item for the semester is shaded yellow. For each semester except one, "Used a variety of teaching techniques" was the lowest rated item. "Used quality instructional time" also tied for lowest during two semesters, with "Provided timely/appropriate feedback" being the lowest during one semester. Items rated highest were "Demonstrated knowledge of the subject," "Provided opportunities to share work and ideas with others," and "Created a positive learning environment." However, it should be noted that no departmental means for any item any semester were lower than 4.31 on a 5-point scale which indicates strong student satisfaction with courses and instructors.

Table 13: Departmental Means for Each Question on the Course Evaluation

Questions		F08 n=949	S09 n=872	F09 n=939	S10 n=727	F10 n=881	S11 n=831	F11 n=755	S12 n=682	F12 n=979	S13 n=797	Item Mean
1	Consistently prepared for class	4.76	4.75	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.76	4.69	4.61	4.67	4.74	4.72
2	Clearly state course objectives and requirements	4.64	4.64	4.62	4.77	4.56	4.67	4.64	4.46	4.63	4.65	4.63
3	Crafted assignments congruent with course objectives	4.63	4.62	4.62	4.78	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.50	4.62	4.65	4.63
4	Used quality instructional time	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.67	4.40	4.52	4.47	4.36	4.41	4.46	4.47
5	Use appropriate assessment tools	4.54	4.58	4.57	4.74	4.50	4.58	4.56	4.40	4.55	4.59	4.56
6	Modeled and reinforced higher-order thinking	4.57	4.58	4.57	4.73	4.52	4.61	4.60	4.47	4.58	4.69	4.59
7	Stimulated thinking about teaching practices	4.60	4.66	4.65	4.77	4.56	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.63	4.67	4.64
8	Provided concrete examples of abstract ideas/ principles and content	4.56	4.61	4.59	4.73	4.50	4.65	4.58	4.44	4.56	4.61	4.58
9	Provided timely/ appropriate feedback	4.47	4.46	4.49	4.63	4.43	4.48	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.52	4.48
10	Used a variety of teaching techniques	4.36	4.44	4.41	4.64	4.33	4.47	4.45	4.31	4.41	4.46	4.43
11	Applied theory to practice	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.66	4.53	4.63	4.53	4.47	4.58	4.55	4.54
12	Demonstrated knowledge of the subject	4.58	4.61	4.57	4.73	4.79	4.84	4.60	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.69
13	Showed enthusiasm/ interest in subject	4.63	4.65	4.57	4.71	4.76	4.81	4.62	4.67	4.77	4.66	4.69
14	Build rapport with students	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.83	4.45	4.52	4.73	4.34	4.47	4.74	4.62
15	Demonstrated sensitivity to diversity and individual differences	4.73	4.68	4.68	4.76	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.48	4.60	4.71	4.66
16	Provided an environment where students could ask questions, disagree, and express ideas	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.81	4.58	4.56	4.73	4.46	4.61	4.73	4.66
17	Provided opportunities to work with others	4.62	4.65	4.63	4.82	4.71	4.72	4.64	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.68
18	Provided, upon request, opportunities to consult with the instructor	4.58	4.62	4.59	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.60	4.63
19	Provided opportunities to share work and ideas with others	4.78	4.83	4.85	4.89	4.70	4.70	4.74	4.58	4.74	4.76	4.76
20	Created a positive learning environment	4.76	4.81	4.81	4.90	4.60	4.59	4.78	4.46	4.60	4.78	4.71
	Semester Mean	4.61	4.63	4.61	4.76	4.57	4.64	4.62	4.49	4.61	4.65	4.62

Recent changes in student outcomes have spurred a re-evaluation of the Course Evaluations that students complete each semester. Fall 2013 we piloted the following evaluation items.

Learning Environment

1. The learning environment was positive.
2. I had multiple opportunities to collaborate with others and share ideas.
3. The instructor demonstrated sensitivity to diversity and individual differences.
4. I felt I could ask questions, disagree, and express ideas.
5. The instructor demonstrated enthusiasm about and interest in the content of the course.

Instructional Practices

6. The course included challenging activities.
7. Course activities were engaging.
8. Course assignments were relevant and had a clear purpose.
9. Assignments and/or assessments allowed me to demonstrate what I know.
10. The instructor demonstrated current and thorough knowledge of the course content.
11. The instructor effectively used technology where appropriate (including Canvas or other course support sites) to support and promote learning.

Professional Responsibilities

12. The instructor was consistently prepared for class.
13. The syllabus included clearly stated course objectives and requirements.
14. The instructor gave appropriate feedback on assignments and/or assessments.
15. Feedback was provided within a reasonable amount of time.
16. The instructor was available for individual consultation.

Adaptations will be made to this scale and the new items will be used beginning Spring 2014.

Mentoring Activities

New faculty are assigned a tenured faculty member as a mentor. The mentor is responsible for familiarizing the new faculty with university and department policies and procedures, assisting with understanding the tenure process, and responding to questions and concerns.

Diversity of Faculty

Of the 21 faculty members, 13 are female and 8 are male. There are 18 faculty who identify themselves as White, 2 who identify themselves as African American, and 1 who identifies as Native American. Increasing diversity is a focus of each faculty search.

Ongoing Review and Professional Development

Faculty are reviewed in the 6th year and the 11th year as part of the rank and tenure process. If a faculty member chooses not to be reviewed for rank in the 11th year, he or she must complete the Moyes College of Education post-tenure review process. The post-tenure review will be completed every five years for all faculty who are not being regularly reviewed in the rank and tenure review process. Part of this review process involves the formation of a peer review team that observes the faculty member in class, reviews syllabi and course websites, and documents commendations and recommendations for the faculty member. The faculty

member then responds to the recommendations and indicates how improvements are being made.

To support faculty and staff professional development, department members are encouraged to attend and present at professional conferences. Support for these conferences comes through department funds for local conferences or through the Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education endowment for national or international conferences.

Implications and Actions Plan

The faculty in the Teacher Education are 85% White. Although this mirrors our student population, it does not mirror the diversity of the wider community of Ogden. Increasing faculty diversity is a first step in recruiting more students of color into our programs.

Faculty are seldom aware of their standing in relation to other instructors on course evaluations. Department means for course evaluations are available but need to be requested. Mean department ratings, including areas that show need for improvement, are not regularly discussed nor are ideas to improve those elements.

Actions: We will continue to pursue faculty from diverse backgrounds in faculty searches. Efforts will be made to advertise faculty position in areas of greater diversity. The department will continue to support, through the Moyes endowment, faculty scholarly travel. Once the new course evaluations are complete, departmental means will be discussed in faculty meeting once per semester.

G. Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library

Adequacy of Staff

The department has adequate staff to accomplish its mission. Some staff responsibilities are currently being realigned for more equitable distribution of work and to better serve our needs.

Adequacy of Administrative Support

There is adequate administrative support for the department. Dean Rasmussen provides guidance and support, but allows autonomy in department decisions. The department chair receives adequate load release for administrative duties.

Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment

The department classrooms have teaching stations equipped with computers, visualizers, and audio/visual equipment. These are regularly updated and maintained by the college IT staff. In addition, SmartBoards are in most classrooms.

The department also has a media lab with a full-time specialist to assist faculty and students with copies, printing, laminating, and production of materials for class. The media lab is adjacent to a Mac Lab, which is used for classes and is open for student use. It is financially supported with department funds.

Adequacy of Library Resources

The library collections continue to grow and improve. More than 5,500 print volumes, nearly 500 videos, and 250 CDs were added in 2012-2013 alone, with the greatest area of growth our electronic resources. WSU students and faculty now have access to nearly 95,000 e-journals, references resources and e-books. The use of these resources is reflected in the number of visitor sessions to our website, totaling more than 1.1 million this past year. The number of requests for reference/research assistance and information literacy instruction also continues to increase. In 2012/13, more than 38,000 questions were answered at the public services desks, and information literacy instruction was provided to more than 7,000 students.

H. Relationships with External Communities

The Department of Teacher Education partners with many local and state educational agencies in our community. A description of several of the organized groups follows.

P-16 Alliance: This committee is comprised of Weber State University President, Provost, Deans, Box Elder, Weber, Ogden, Morgan, and Davis district Superintendents. This committee has worked on creating resources for English/language arts teachers and math teachers.

Ed CAT (Educational Community Advisory Team): The community advisory team consists of district level administrators, principals, and teachers from the surrounding five school districts: Ogden, Weber, Davis, Morgan, and Box Elder. The committee meets twice a year to advise and support teacher preparation efforts.

Weber State Mentor Academy: The mentor academy represents a new approach to student teaching and practicum. In-service teachers will be nominated by principals and other administrators to participate in the mentoring of pre-service teachers. In-service teachers will receive training in mentoring, graduate credit, and other recognition.

University Council for Teacher Education (UCTE): The council is comprised of representatives from the content majors that offer teaching degrees. The monthly meetings address standards, student issues, and collaboration.

NUCC: The Northern Utah Curriculum Consortium is a collaboration of northern Utah school districts – primarily represented by curriculum directors, and Weber State and Utah State. NUCC organizes endorsement courses for teachers, conferences, and other workshops. NUCC meetings provide opportunities for development of other collaborative projects.

EDUC 1010 Concurrent Enrollment and Future Educators Association: EDUC 1010: Exploring Teaching is currently being taught via concurrent enrollment in several high schools in the area. Each of the high schools also have chapters of Future Educators of America which Weber State sponsors and presents a Teachers of Tomorrow all day workshop each semester.

I. Results of Previous Program Reviews

Teacher Education has not previously completed a program review. In prior years the national accreditation process was used in lieu of program review. However, in December 2010 Teacher Education began a process of self-study, Google Teacher Ed, which involved extensive work by teams of faculty and staff to examine aspects of the program. As a result, the following actions were taken at a retreat in December 2011. The following document is the record of the two-day meeting in which teams reported findings, made recommendations, and actions were officially taken with motions and votes by the department faculty and staff.

**Summary of Actions from Google Teacher Education Retreat
December 14-15, 2011**

To do list (tasks for all):

- Syllabus with explicit standards and assessments
- Updated reading list
- Faculty web pages updated - may include links to syllabi, reading lists, etc.
- Mini professional development at lunch with TED

Committees:

Strand Committee: Not yet formed, but need to look at strands and how they will be incorporated.

Multicultural education throughout the program

The Dean mentioned there is a common assumption to just put it in our syllabus because a lot are just surface issues being addressed. The Dean recommends ongoing opportunities to discuss these issues about what is embedded in the coursework (example the lunch with TED). Refresh and renew our commitment to embedding diversity (gender, race, religions) into our classes and conversations. Include social justice.

**Motion by Forrest Crawford that the department engage in a process where we refresh and renew our earlier commitments to multiculturalism and evidence that cultural diversity issues are in our coursework and provide opportunities to discuss and review through meeting with our peers. Addition – Vicki Napper discussed the term of strand and what its actual meaning is. These strands need to be revisited and redefined. Natalie Williams seconds Forrest’s motion.

Discussion – Ann Ellis is concerned about compartmentalizing rather than consolidating. Review the curriculum – how does it look now with all the recommended changes? Is it a committee or an overall process? Issues need to be consistent and covered in every level but may not be appropriate for every course.

A resolution was recommended instead of the original motion on multiculturalism. Forrest withdrew his motion with the idea we will continue this as a resolution. Forrest mentioned the resolution should be for the department to have a higher level of commitment of ensuring that diversity depth and breadth is permanent with the proper indicators in place. Jack Mayhew says this will be addressed in the future and will be an ongoing process. The Dean mentioned from a TEAC perspective that the department might have discovered that we were not doing as well as we would like and show how we are in the process of correcting this.

Portfolio subcommittee (already formed, Chaired by Vicki Napper):

Determine which standards will be used and the purpose of the portfolio.

CBL Designation: Jack Mayhew moves that Melina act as committee chair to create a CBL designation for 1010 (Tutoring, Prepare to Serve Module)

Advising/Student Teaching committee to address issue of group interview and other issues:

- Student Teacher removal process
- Length of Student Teaching
- Additional Advisor: A faculty position may be sacrificed or money will be requested from other areas. (2 + 2, need more support for existing student load). The Dean would like a priority needs list for what is needed to meet the advisement goals. He supports the idea of full time advisors rather than faculty who are not readily available but should still play an essential role in this.

Admission Requirements: Praxis II & CAAP Writing for Elementary and Secondary. Secondary change would require UCTE approval.

- Fran moves as admission requirement that the CAAP be discontinued for Sp Ed and Elementary Ed students and Secondary (will go before UCTE for final approval).
- Jack moves that we wait until fall so that catalog changes can be made. Claudia seconds the motion. Interview scores will need to be recalculated. Fall 2012 is recommended to discontinue the CAAP test for the elementary requirement and writing portion for admissions. Jack calls for a vote, all were in favor.

Approved Actions

1. Student Grades – If a student receives two C- grades in any professional course after admission to the program, automatic termination from the program will result. After termination a student may reapply after one year. This applies to professional coursework.

**Linda Gowans moves that a student who receives two C-'s after admission to the program in professional courses will result in their provisional admission status being revoked in the TED program (pro core and levels and graded field work). Motion was seconded by Forrest. Discussion on the fairness of terminating student from the program after making up a grade followed. Patterns of behavior were discussed and whether to raise the grade requirement. Majority in favor with one nay vote - motion passes.

2. Lab School: Notion of pursuing the viability of a lab school and putting together an exploratory committee to discuss the viability of a charter school with laboratory components. Motion to form the committee was seconded and it was voted on all were in favor.

Jack proposed volunteers for the committee with chairs to be determined at a later date. Members include: Sue Womack, Claudia Eliason, Stephanie Speicher, Kristin Hadley, Natalie Williams, Anette Melvin, Penee Stewart, Judy Mitchell, and CHF new hire or current faculty.

3. Graded Practica: The purpose is to find a way to get a graded practica across the program/levels. Secondary and Special Ed will determine the appropriate hours needed.

Melina proposes to conceptually agree to graded practicum and within levels meet and discuss within the level and across the levels the courses and content. When do we want the graded practica to start and when should it be to curriculum committee? Need a timeline. Kristin mentions it cannot be required until Summer 2013.

4. New Math Proposal Committee members: Melina Alexander, Michelle Nimer, Kristin Hadley, Fran Butler, Sue Womack.
 - Cross-list Math 2010/2020 – Begin discussion with the Math department
 - Three course integrated progression of Math 2010, 2020 and Ed 4300/4640
 - Track CAAP, Praxis, LMT scores

Timeline:

Major Curriculum Changes: 2+2, graded practica, math changes

Admission/retention requirement changes: Praxis for admission, dismissal due to grades

J. Action Plan for Ongoing Assessment Based on Current Self Study Findings

The Google Teacher Ed self-study led to many changes that have had a domino effect on the program. Curricular changes have been described in earlier sections, but there are many programmatic and assessment efforts underway.

Beginning with the foundations, we are working on aligning our mission statement with WSU outcomes, the TEAC quality principles, and the Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes (UPTLO). This alignment will ensure that the department has focused effort.

Admission requirements, including Praxis preparation, have been an area of examination. One aspect that is still being developed is the interview process. We have looked at options for group, rather than individual, interviews. Decisions are forthcoming and will then be examined for validity in predicting program performance.

Formation of an Education Community Advisory Team (Ed-CAT) made up of stakeholders such as superintendents, human resource directors, principals, and collaborating teachers, will assist the department in the current initiatives. This group will inform, advise, and guide us as we implement the mission of WSU teacher education. One of the early issues to be addressed by Ed-CAT concerns practicum and student teaching. We are striving to improve (a) the consistency of quality placements for practicum and student teaching, (b) the quality of observation tools, and (c) the reliability of observation by supervisors.

Another measure that is in revision is course evaluations. We are working to align the program course evaluations with Utah Effective Teaching Standards (outcomes for in-service teachers). This will focus the faculty on modeling the instruction expected of teacher candidates.

The overarching work is to establish the validity and reliability of our measures, beginning with admission criteria, continuing with practicum measures, and concluding with student teaching placement and outcomes. The use of the formative and summative assessments (see Table 6) and described below, show the commitment to continuous improvement by developing data points which allow the program to be refined in an on-going manner.

Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

All assessments collected prior to the student teaching semester are for internal review to make adjustments within the levels. The collection procedures for all formative assessments are outlined below.

Elementary Education: Level 1

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Theory synthesis paper	1, 2	EDUC 3140	Canvas
Co-teaching project – adapted lesson presentation	2, 9	EDUC 3270	Canvas
SIOP project	2	EDUC 3205	Canvas
Classroom management plan	3	EDUC 3140	Canvas
Professional reading resource collection	4	EDUC 3120	Canvas
Reading mini lesson plan	6	EDUC 3120	Canvas
Reflective journal	8	EDUC 3140	Canvas
Narrative autobiography	8	EDUC 3205	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database
Legal brief (SPED only)	4, 10	EDUC 4515	Canvas

Elementary Education: Level 2

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Cooperating teacher checklist	1, 8, 9, 10	EDUC 3210	Canvas
Teaching support documents: differentiation, classroom context, content alignment, analysis of student learning, lesson plans, lesson strategies	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	EDUC 3100, 3240, 4345 PEP 3620	Canvas
Practicum Observation – differentiation, learning environment	2, 3	EDUC 3210	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database

Elementary Education: Level 3

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Cooperating teacher checklist	1, 8, 9, 10	EDUC 4210	Canvas
Teaching support documents: differentiation, content, alignment, assessment, lesson plans, strategies, media enhanced lessons, reflection	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	EDUC 3115, 3280, 4300, 4320, 4330	Canvas
Practicum Observation: differentiation, learning environment, strategies,	2, 3, 7	EDUC 4210	Canvas
Math interview	4	EDUC 4300	Canvas
Science activity critique	4	EDUC 4330	Canvas
Practicum goal setting	8	EDUC 4210	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database

Special Education: Level 2

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Cooperating teacher checklist	1, 8, 9, 10	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Teaching support documents: intervention plan, IEP, classroom context, content, alignment, lesson plans, strategies, media enhanced lessons, reflection	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8	EDUC 4550, 4560,	Canvas
Practicum Observation: strategies	7	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Curriculum based assessment	5	EDUC 4560	Canvas
Functional behavior analysis	5	EDUC 4540	Canvas
Intervention plan	5	EDUC 4560	Canvas
WJ results and interpretation	5	EDUC 4530	Canvas
Practicum goal setting	8	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database

Special Education: Level 3

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Cooperating teacher checklist	1, 8, 9, 10	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Teaching support documents: intervention plan, transition plan, classroom context, content, alignment, lesson plans, strategies, media enhanced lessons, reflection	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8	EDUC 4555, 4570, 4580	Canvas
Practicum Observation: strategies	7	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Curriculum based assessment	5	EDUC 4570	Canvas
Functional behavior analysis	5	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Intervention plan	5	EDUC 4570	Canvas
Case-based analysis	5	EDUC 4580	Canvas
Practicum goal setting	8	EDUC 4581	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database

Secondary Education: Professional Core

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Cooperating teacher checklist	1, 8, 9, 10	EDUC 3910	Canvas
Teaching support documents: rationale for design, assessment, lesson plans, strategies, reflection	1, 5, 6, 7, 8	EDUC 3900	Canvas
Practicum observation: differentiation, classroom context, lesson content, strategies	2, 3, 4, 7	EDUC 3910	Canvas
Practicum student interest inventory	1	EDUC 3935	Canvas
Case study	2	EDUC 3265	Canvas
SIOP Workshop	2, 7	EDUC 3220	Canvas
Room design	3	EDUC 3265	Canvas
Media enhanced lesson plan	4, 7	EDUC 3315	Canvas
Reading assessments	5	EDUC 3935	Canvas
Differentiation presentation	5	EDUC 3220	Canvas
Literacy lesson plans	7	EDUC 3935	Canvas
Differentiation IRIS module	7	EDUC 3265	Canvas
Reflection on experience in diversity	8	EDUC 3220	Canvas
Disposition form	10	End of semester level meeting	Database

Summative Assessments: Student Teaching, Exit and Alumni Surveys

Summative Assessments will be collected during the student teacher semester with follow up materials sent to alumni yearly for three years.

The following are the collection procedures for summative assessments.

<i>Artifact</i>	<i>UPTLO Measured</i>	<i>Where Collected?</i>	<i>Where Stored?</i>
Teaching support documents: context, lessons, reflection	1-8	EDUC 4850/4950/4686	Canvas
Observation form	1-10	EDUC 4840/4950/4680	Canvas
Disposition form	10	Cooperating teacher/University supervisor	Database
Praxis pass rates	4	ETS database	ETS database
Exit survey	2, 5, 6, 7	EDUC 4850/4950/4686	ChiTester
Student teaching grades	1-10	EDUC 4840/4950/4680	Transcripts
Alumni survey	2, 5, 6, 7	Email survey	ChiTester

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary

Teacher Education	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Student Credit Hours Total UG¹	13,058	13,836	14,099	14,580	13,282
Student UG FTE ²	435.27	461.20	469.97	486.00	442.73
Student Credit Hours Total Grad	2,462	3,129	2,767	2,757	2555
Student Grad FTE	123.10	156.45	138.35	137.85	127.75
Total Student FTE	558.37	617.65	608.32	623.85	570.48
Student Majors UG ³					
Composite Elem & Spec Ed	97	67	24	13	4
Elementary Ed	558	547	543	528	505
Special Ed	6	98	122	128	141
Student Majors Grad					
Curriculum & Instruction	139	187	171	162	136
Secondary	0	3	2	0	0
TOTAL	800	902	862	831	786
Program Graduates ⁴					
Associate Degree					
Bachelor Degree	91	144	95	107	84
Master Degree	46	31	48	43	
Student Demographic Profile ⁵					
Female					
Male					
Faculty FTE Total ⁶	25.33	25.77	26.1	23.98	
Adjunct FTE	3.39	3.02	4.85	3.93	
Contract FTE	21.94	22.75	21.25	20.05	
Student/Faculty Ratio ⁷					

In an effort to understand how Teacher Education compares to other programs the following data were provided by the Provost's office.

		FacFTE	InstFTE	DavisCnt	208xxx	Adj_Sbtl	TTL
2013	TED	20.05	2.32	0	2.62	4.94	24.99
	CS	11.41	1.5	3.05	9.18	13.73	25.14
	NRS	34.88	11.48	0	0	11.48	46.36
2012	TED	20.05	0.87	0.72	2.34	3.93	23.98
	CS	11.41	1.25	3.04	11.2	15.49	26.9
	NRS	34.88	11.48	0	0	11.48	46.36
2011	TED	21.25	1.52	0.85	2.48	4.85	26.1
	CS	8.71	1.53	1.81	7.24	10.58	19.29
	NRS	27.79	9.2	0	0	9.2	36.99
		SCH	FTE	Majors	Assoc	Bachelor	S/F Ratio
2013	TED*	13282	442.73	550	0	84	22.83
	CS	11309	376.97	825	52	104	14.99
	NRS	17113	570.43	1829			12.3
2012	TED*				3	167	
	CS				62	79	
	NRS				343	135	
2011	TED*				0	95	
	CS				38	63	
	NRS				327	123	

Appendix B: Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile

Adjunct Faculty: Course Instructors

Name	Ethnicity	Gender	Highest Degree	K-12 Exp.	Higher Ed Exp.	Areas of Expertise	WSU position
Lisa Arbogast	White	F	Ed.D.	22	3	Special education; Educ and SpEd law	
Nancy Bittner	White	F	M.Ed	27	9	Arts Social Studies, Early Literacy	
Brenda Burrell	African American	F	Ed.D	30	6	Culturally Responsive Teaching, Curriculum Design, Educational Policy and Leadership	
Paul Dykman	White	M	M.Ed.	0	1	Instructional design, Educational technology	
Van Hadley	White	M	M.Ed.	34	8	Social Studies	
Adam Johnston	White	M	Ph.D	7	16	Science education Professional learning	Tenured Full Professor, Physics
Marilyn A. Lofgreen	White	F	M.Ed., ASC	19	20	Instruction Design/Assess., Classroom Management	TAPT Director, Retired TED
Judith Mitchell	White	F	Ph.D.	10	30	Reading and writing instruction	Retired TED
Kristin Radulovich	White	F	M.S.	6	10	Classroom Management - Sec. Ed., Intro. to the University, Exploring Teaching	Advisement Center Coordinator
Boyd Whitesides	White	M	M.Ed., ASC	43	7	Business Education , Accounting, Business Law	
Aaron Wolthuis	White	M	M.Ed.	14	8	Second language acquisition	

Adjunct Faculty: Student Teaching Supervisors

Name	Ethnicity	Gender	Highest Degree	K-12 Exp.	Higher Ed Exp.	Areas of Expertise	WSU position
Tom Brady	White	M	M.Ed.	41	0	Business, French, History	
Sally Brown	White	F	M.Ed.	11	5	Special education / resource. - Specifically language arts	
Nancy L Fleming	White	F	Ed.D	43	1.5	Psychology/counseling Physical Education Administration	
Deborah Greenwell	White	F	M.A.	31	3	English, Supervision, Mentoring	
Van Hadley	White	M	M.Ed.	34	8	Social Studies	
Denice Hillstrom	White	F	B.S.	18			
Barbara Johnston	White	F	M.Ed.	21	10	Elem Ed. Admin.	
Connie May	White	F	M. Ed	30	6	English, Physical Ed	
Natalie Niederhauser	White	F	M.Ed.	7	0	Special education	
Kristin Radulovich	White	F	M.S.	6	10	Classroom Management - Sec. Ed, Advising	
Lois Richins	White	F	M.Ed.	48	0	Classroom, administration, curriculum	
Kathy Ann Sedgwick	White	F	M.Ed.	36	3	Mentoring, Behavior management, Curriculum dev.	
Vicki Young	White	F	B.S.	32	1	Social Studies	

Appendix C: Staff Profile

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Job Title	Years of Employment	Areas of Expertise
Michelle Checkman	F	White	Student Teaching Secretary	11	Psychology, administrative tasks
Lynda Goucher	F	White	Secretary III	5	Organization, human resources, scheduling
Dwayne Hansen	M	White	Student Teaching Coordinator	1	Administration, mentoring, supervision
Karen Lindley	F	White	Media/Mac Lab Supervisor	13	Computers, media preparation
Lynda Olmstead	F	White	Administrative Assistant	32	Banner, minutes, finances, scheduling
Kristin Radulovich	F	White	Coordinator of Advisement	16	Admission, advising, licensing, website
Natalie Struhs	F	White	Academic/Admission Advisor/Licensing Specialist	6	Advising, licensing

Appendix D: Financial Analysis Summary

Teacher Education Undergraduate & Graduate (budget combined)					
Cost	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Direct Instructional Expenditure	2,617,615	2,508,617	2,450,641	2,247,911	2,334,109
Cost Per Student FTE	4,688	4,062	4,029	3,603	4,091
Funding	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Appropriated Fund	2,369,601	2,218,967	2,159,844	2,155,147	2,226,639
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts	215,523	264,132	245,309	64,671	64,165
Special Fees/Differential Tuition	32,491	25,517	45,488	28,094	43,306
Total	2,617,615	2,508,617	2,450,641	2,247,911	2,334,109

Note: Data provided by Provost's Office

Appendix E: External Community Involvement Names and Organizations

Weber State is involved in several different external communities. Below is a representative sample of names and organizations of those involved in external communities with the Teacher Education department.

Name	Weber Connection	Organization
Superintendent Bryan Bowles	P-16 Alliance	Davis School District
Superintendent Brad Smith	P-16 Alliance	Ogden School District
Superintendent Jeff Stephens	P-16 Alliance	Weber School District
Superintendent Ron Wolff	P-16 Alliance	Box Elder School District
Marilyn Hales	Ed-CAT	Davis School District
Robert Kilmer	Ed-CAT	Morgan School District
DiAnne Adams	Ed-CAT	Ogden School District
Larry Hadley	Ed-CAT	Weber School District
Rick Call	Weber State Mentor Academy	Davis School District
Belinda Kuck	Weber State Mentor Academy	Davis School District
Terry Jackson	Weber State Mentor Academy	Box Elder School District
Kim Lynch	Weber State Mentor Academy	Box Elder School District
Debra Fenstermaker	Weber State Mentor Academy	Ogden School District
Leanne Rich	Weber State Mentor Academy	Ogden School District
Reid Newey	Weber State Mentor Academy	Weber School District
Shirley Atkinson	Weber State Mentor Academy	Weber School District
Doug Jacobs	Weber State Mentor Academy	Morgan School District
Kip Motta	NUCC	Rich School District
Robin Williams	NUCC	Logan School District
Mary Kay Kirkland	NUCC	Box Elder School District
Sheri Heiter	NUCC	Weber School District
Steve Laing	NUCC	Utah State University
Sandy Coroles	NUCC	Ogden School District
Patty Norman	NUCC	Davis School District
Holly Handy	ED 1010 CE/FEA	Davis School District

Appendix F: External Community Involvement Financial Contributions

The Moyes College of Education Endowment is monies that are administered through the appropriate department chair, the Academic Support and Technology Endowment Committee (ASTEC) and the College Leadership Council (LC). Following department chair approval the LC will review and approve all travel funding requests while non-travel requests will be reviewed by the department chair and then ASTEC before going to the LC for final approval. These monies are used to support faculty, staff, and students in research, professional growth, technology, program development, and travel. Endowment Policy and Procedures have been established and are followed as well as using a rubric for reviewing applications submitted to the ASTEC committee. The ASTEC committee is comprised of representatives from all three

Moyes College of Education departments with the consultation of the College Technology Specialist.

The Boyd K. and Donna S. Packer Center for Family and Community Education helps to enhance the lives of children, individuals and families, enrich communities and promote nurturing environments through campus and educational outreach offerings. It is housed in the Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education and draws upon faculty, staff, students and community members from a variety of disciplines. At the current time, it offers staff support to a variety of programs within the College such as WSU Charter Academy, Melba S. Lehner Children's School, Storytelling Festival, Families Alive Conference, Literacy Project, Teachers Assistant Pathway to Teaching (TAPT), Teachers of Tomorrow Project, and Care About Childcare (CAC).

The following programs within the Packer Center pertain to Teacher Education:

Weber State University Charter Academy is a public charter school within the Moyes College of Education focusing on Kindergarten. The mission of WSU Charter Academy is to provide an educational learning center with an emphasis on student learning and family involvement; where WSU pre-service teachers may observe and practice cutting-edge, research-based educational practices; and where research on various aspects of education may be conducted. WSU Charter Academy is focused on educating the whole child using developmentally appropriate and research supported instructional methods and curricula. WSU students, faculty and staff, especially from Early Childhood, Early Childhood Education, Family Studies, and Elementary Education are impacted.

The Storytelling Festival is held yearly during the last weekend in February. The mission of the WSU Storytelling Festival is to promote the art of storytelling in Northern Utah. This Storytelling Festival is where national, regional, and over 70 student storytellers capture the imagination an audience of over 10,000 individuals. Public education students of all ages, WSU students, and faculty and staff who are fortunate enough to attend the various sessions and be immersed in an unforgettable experience in literacy, culture and the arts. Events are held at a variety of locations throughout the community: Davis Conference Center in Layton, Utah; David Eccles Conference Center and Perry's Egyptian Theater; The Children's Treehouse Museum; local schools and the Weber State University-Main Campus. Most of the Storytelling Festival events are free of charge. There is also a Storytelling Festival Banquet with presentations from national storytellers that is used as a fundraiser for the Festival.

Teachers Assistant Pathway to Teaching (TAPT) supports students who often never dreamed of going to college; or, if they did, never thought they would have the financial means to do so. Many TAPT participants are single mothers and most bear a heavy share of the responsibility for the financial support of their families. The participants must be paid teacher assistants or volunteers working 6-8 hours per week in their respective districts with the desire and commitment to become fully licensed teachers. The program targets those working specifically with ESL, Early Childhood, and Special Education students. Completion rate for TAPT participants is over 90%, and almost all stay and TAPT

participants are provided with full tuition, personalized advisement, and individual, group and family support through monthly meetings that cover such topics as team building, skills for academic success, navigating financial aide, etc. The Teacher Assistant Path to Teaching (TAPT) Program was created by the Teacher Education Department in the 1995-96 academic year.

Teachers Of Tomorrow: An Effective Teacher Pipeline In Northern Utah is an ongoing effort to bridge students from high school to the point of application to the Teacher Education Program. The Student Success Alliance Recruitment Committee has created a teacher pipeline for students pursuing degrees from the Jerry & Vickie Moyes College of Education at Weber State University. The students are involved beginning their Junior or Senior year in high school and participate in the Concurrent Enrollment EDUC 1010 "Exploring Teaching" as well as the Future Educators Association (FEA). After students graduate from high school, they have the opportunity to participate in the "Project Launch: Future Educators Academy" or, as our students fondly refer to it, "teacher camp," is a four-five day on campus experience that jumps the students into an EDUC 2920 "Workshops & Seminars" course. This program follows them through their first semester at the University and allows for the guided involvement in the University FEA-Professional chapter. The program at WSU began in the spring semester of 2008. The first group of student to participate in all aspects of the pipeline (EDUC 1010, WSU FEA Conferences, Project Launch, EDUC 2920, and FEA-Pro) became freshman students fall semester of 2009. This pipeline pilot group consists of 25 students who participated in Project Launch (plus many other students that the Moyes College of Education works with from the Teachers of Tomorrow Program) and are now active members in the FEA-Pro Chapter.