

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

**College of Education, Health, and
Human Sciences**

Institutional Rejoinder

to the

NCATE Board of Examiners Report

Prepared subsequent to the NCATE/SDE Site Visit November 18-22, 2006

Dr. Robert Rider, Dean

brider@utk.edu

**Dr. Lynn Cagle, Associate Dean,
NCATE and SDE Accreditation Coordinator**

lcagle@utk.edu

335 Claxton Complex

Knoxville, TN 37996

www.utk.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Our Assessment System	1
Educational Administrator Licensure Program	2
Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. Programs	3
Overview: Clarifications and Corrections	4
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	
Clarifications and corrections	5
Rejoinder to Areas for Improvement: (New) The unit does not have summarized performance data for candidates in advanced programs for continuing teachers (Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S.) for each of the relevant elements.	10
(New) The unit does not have multiple, summarized performance data indicating candidates in educational administration (M.S. and Ed.S.) have the necessary content knowledge, and professional knowledge and skills and can impact student learning.	10
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	
Clarifications/corrections in text	11
Rejoinder to Revised Weakness: The unit does not utilize the identified assessment system for collecting, analyzing, or reporting candidate or program data at the advanced level.	15
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	
Clarifications and Corrections	16
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	
Clarifications and Corrections	17

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Clarifications and Corrections	17
Rejoinder to Areas for Improvement: (New) The admissions requirements listed in course catalogs are not consistent with the actual practice of how the Track 1 M.S. degree (advanced program) candidates are admitted.	21
(New) Advanced programs are not systematically involved in the unit's operations and decision making.	22
Procedural Concerns	23
Appendices	
Appendix A Advanced Programs and the Assessment System	25
Appendix B Educational Administration course alignment matrix	26
Appendix C Educational Administration course assessments an rubrics	27
Appendix D Sample of Educational Administration candidate disposition summaries	31
Appendix E Membership of Assessment and Other Committees	33
Appendix F. Examples of communications related to programs outside the College	39

Rejoinder to BOE Report

This rejoinder is written in response to the NCATE Board of Examiners' Report on the continuing accreditation visit to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville on November 18-22, 2007. This was a joint accreditation visit by NCATE and the Tennessee State Department of Education.

We would like to thank the members of the Board of Examiners who took the time to participate in our site visit for continuing accreditation in November. The BOE report has recommended that all six NCATE Standards are met for both our initial and advanced programs, and we are pleased to concur with their collective judgment.

The professional education unit at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville is broad-based and complex. Most of our initial licensure candidates receive their subject matter preparation in other colleges across campus, and some of our advanced programs are delivered in other colleges by faculty specializing in those fields. Our Associate Dean for Professional Licensure and Outreach is responsible to the state department of education for coordination of all professional education licensure and degree programs on campus.

Two major areas of concern recur throughout the BOE report and are therefore the targets of all Areas for Improvement cited: 1) the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs and 2) the M.S. and Ed.S. licensure program for educational administrators. These program areas, and advanced programs in general, are cited as Areas for Improvement in Standards 1, 2, and 6. We are pleased to have this opportunity to provide clarification and/or additional information to address some statements in the BOE report to strengthen the documentation of our programs.

Our Assessment System

Our Unit functions in a very collaborative and collegial manner. In such an environment decisions are not made overnight, nor are they implemented rapidly in an organizational configuration such as ours. We have followed an orderly and thoughtful process in developing and implementing our assessment system, which provides information to and seeks input from a wide variety of stakeholders on an ongoing basis rather than rushing precipitously to put something in place that ineffectively addresses diverse programs and generates data of questionable value that is useful/used by few, if any. At each level and program we seek quality data that are systematically collected, analyzed, reported, and advanced through the feedback loop documented in our Institutional Report so that meaningful changes emerge over time. This is helpful to our faculty, candidates, and administrators, and it is our interpretation these are the characteristics of the process intended by NCATE.

Our priorities for implementation of the assessment system were and are as follows:

- 1) initial licensure programs
- 2) educational administrator and reading specialist licensure programs
- 3) alternative licensure programs
- 4) M.S. Track 1 and Ed.S. programs

Priorities 1 and 2 are operational and being used. Our initial licensure program is by far our largest program with a common set of assessments. The educational administrator Personal Learning Portfolio system (PLP) was demonstrated to at least two BOE members on Monday afternoon of the site visit. In addition to the information in Table 9 of the IR (page 42), we provided the BOE more extensive written documentation of our plans for priority 4 during the site visit (Appendix A).

The BOE has raised no concerns about our initial licensure program. That system is sophisticated and has been years in the making. Although assessments were identified and in place at the portals as shown in Table 8 of our Institutional Report for years before a common electronic portfolio system was established, we did not have common rubrics for them. Nor did we have a centralized data system in which the artifacts could be housed and scores could be recorded, aggregated, and reported in various configurations. Coming to agreement on which portfolio system to use in itself took over two years of research, exploration, trials, and many committee discussions. Our electronic Personal Learning Portfolio (PLP) system is maintained by an outside organization (for a fee) and customized to meet our needs. Any additions, deletions, and other alterations must be done by that agency on its own timelines. In addition, extensive training was provided for both faculty and candidates. In-house training and support will continue as long as we use this system.

Neither did we have an administrative database that could extract protected data from the University student information system. We are very grateful to the University information technology support staff who developed the system for us at no cost. This is not their highest priority, however, and their projected timeline for having the system operational was delayed by approximately six months. After it became operational, there have been continuing needs for modifications.

Each time we add a program to our database systems, both systems require modification – again on timelines over which we have no control. Our first priority was our initial licensure system. We now have the databases modified to meet the needs of the educational administrator licensure program (our second priority) and reading specialist program.

Educational Administrator Licensure Program

The educational administrator program is a two-year cohort program, with the first cohort group in the process of completing its program in spring of 2007. Program structure calls for candidates to select artifacts (from those already posted) demonstrating mastery of standards before program completion, so timing of the site visit did not find evidence of final postings and their scores. BOE examiners were shown examples of candidate work in the educational administrator PLP system dating back to October 2005 at the time of the visit. Artifacts are scored by instructors as course assignments. Those artifacts selected by the candidate near program completion to represent that the candidate meets one or more standards will be scored a second time using a different rubric that indicates adequacy in addressing the standard. In our PLP system, scores cannot be summarized until they are labeled “completed.” Being labeled as

“completed” locks the document from change or alteration. Artifact scores will be summarized upon program completion by the candidates.

There is evidence that the program is not only successful but is also seeking and responding to evaluative data regarding the program. The most recent PRAXIS test scores for educational administrators showed a 100% pass rate. The follow-up survey of program completers who are employed as administrators suggested adding work related to finance, and this has been done. The PLP for educational administration is fully operational, and artifacts and rubrics are available and being used. Program faculty confer at the end of each semester to evaluate the progress of each candidate and provide feedback to candidates. The data at this time do not indicate a need for major programmatic changes.

Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs

We are working toward inclusion of the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs in our comprehensive assessment systems, but we are not there yet. Data regarding applicants and candidates for M.S. Track 1 and Ed.S. are housed electronically within the departmental records, from which information can be provided when requested. Information for the NCATE annual report is partially drawn from this database. Transitioning of these data into the master administrative database will occur as soon as the university technology support staff who created the master database can make the necessary adaptations to the database structure.

Program faculty in advanced programs for continuing teachers are the same faculty who lead our programs for initial licensure, serve on multiple committees, and fulfill research expectations of a Carnegie Research 1 institution. Part of our consideration in prioritizing was that faculty be clear about the task they were undertaking and be allowed to focus on one particular program at a time, rather than being confused between multiple program needs (initial licensure and the M.S. Track 1 and Ed.S.) simultaneously.

The Track I M.S. and Ed.S. programs in our unit are not amenable to a cookie-cutter approach. Individuals seek out these programs for their own reasons. 1) The majority are already licensed educators, wanting to either (1a) extend their expertise in their areas of licensure or (1b) add another licensure area to their credentials. 2) A second group includes those individuals who are seeking initial licensure. While the program was designed for practicing educators, it does not bar others from admission. 3) The third group of applicants for these programs are individuals seeking the advanced degree but who are neither licensed nor seeking licensure, such as those in postsecondary settings.

In the Track 1 M.S. and in those Ed.S. programs that are not cohort programs, candidates apply and enter at various times, enroll in and complete their programs of studies on their individual timelines, and complete comprehensive exams based on their individual programs of study. Candidates for initial licensure are assessed for dispositions and PLP artifacts since these are part of the program of studies. Those who are seeking add-on or initial licensure must pass the appropriate PRAXIS examination(s) to be recommended for licensure, but they can receive the degree without being recommended for licensure. Degree candidates not seeking any type of licensure have their own objectives for entering the program.

Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs for continuing preparation of educators are highly individualized and tailored to the student, thus raising concern about what data can be meaningfully aggregated or summarized across programs or even across individuals within a program area. Samples of student produced projects/documents reflecting “learning” were provided the team during the site visit. Candidates are primarily licensed educators (all but three of those admitted in 2005-2006) for whom no external examinations are mandated unless the candidates seek to add a licensure area. Both programs meet state requirements.

While the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs appear large (104 and 18, respectively, admitted in 2005-2006), the numbers are fairly small when listed by program area in the attachment to Institutional Report Revised Table 1. Track 1 M.S. candidates represented 14 program areas, with one of the highest numbers of applicants to a cohort program in Special Education. In the Ed.S. five programs are represented, again with Special Education having the largest number of admissions.

In this report we first attempt to correct or clarify statements in the various sections of the Report that may have led BOE members to the conclusions on which they based their recommendations for improvement. We then respond to the Areas for Improvement in the BOE Report. We have included few documents as appendices to this document because of our extensive documentation in the Institutional Report, Addendum to the Institutional Report, Exhibits in the Exhibit Room, and other documents created while the team was here. Some of the corrections offered on the pages that follow are marked with an asterisk (*) to denote that they were brought to the attention of the BOE in response to their draft report.

We sincerely hope that our manner of presenting the information in this report meets with the approval of the Unit Accreditation Board and makes it easy for the UAB to link our comments with the respective sources in the BOE Report.

OVERVIEW

Corrections, Clarifications in the Overview

1. Page 6, School Psychologist listing, correction

This program should have been identified as having APA accreditation in the right hand column under National Recognition Status by NCATE. We accept responsibility for this error by not recognizing it in the BOE Draft.

2. Page 8, first bulleted item, clarification

The report states we had “*two interim deans,*” whereas we had a dean who was appointed to a three-year term and continued in that position two additional years, followed by an interim dean at the time of the merger.

3. Page 8, 4th bulleted item, correction which we overlooked in the draft BOE Report

This should read the “five licensure programs” rather than “*five degree programs.*” This was another error for which we accept responsibility as we did not notice it in the draft BOE report.

4. * Page 8, last bulleted item, correction

This states “*Closure of the University Evening School resulted in elimination of off-campus programming.*” A more accurate description would be the elimination of “satellite programs.” Off-campus courses are offered, but not complete programs.

STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

- 1.* Page 14, Element A. Content knowledge for teacher candidates, next to last line at the bottom of the page, correction

“*for program completion*” should read for “*degree*” completion

Passage of Praxis II is required for licensure recommendation but not for degree completion.

2. Page 16, Element B. Content knowledge of other school personnel, first full paragraph, line 6, clarification

"It is assumed that the internship log (which includes weekly reflections) and numerous course-based assessments are used to verify content knowledge, although the program (educational administration) did not provide aggregated data to document candidates' content knowledge."

Courses and course-based assessments are aligned with standards, as shown in Appendices B and C. When educational administration students complete their program, they will have a minimum of two assessments showing mastery of each standard. Rubric scores verify that the selected assessments do show mastery of the standards.

Candidates' mastery of content knowledge was acknowledged in the next statement in the paragraph (*"In 2004-2006, 100 per cent of candidates passed the comprehensive exam and 100 per cent passed the PRAXIS SLCC"*). This recognizes that using the most recent data available all candidates passed the PRAXIS as well as the comprehensive exam that is based on the aligned course content. (This should refer to the PRAXIS SLLA rather than SLCC.)

- 3.* Page 16, second full paragraph, correction

“The unit is in the process of designing and implementing the use of an electronic portfolio for assessing candidates in educational administration on course-based work samples. Rubrics have been or are in the process of being developed.”

The electronic portfolio assessment system specifically for the educational administration program, including rubrics for all artifacts, was complete and in operation when the BOE team was here. It was demonstrated on request to the two BOE members assigned to Standards 1 and 2 on Monday afternoon. Rubrics were available for view for all required artifacts as were samples of student submissions. The matrix in Appendix B lists the assignments candidates are required to submit for each course. Summaries of candidates' self-assessments of dispositions were printed out during that session for BOE members. (See examples in Appendix D.) This correction was submitted upon receipt of the Draft Report.

- 4.* Page 17, Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers, 1st paragraph under this subheading, 1st sentence clarification

“Pre-internship candidates complete core courses in cultural studies, educational psychology, special education, instructional technology, and field experiences.”

Technically, the field experiences are part of the specialized coursework because candidates are assigned within their licensure areas. The four core courses are taught unilaterally across programs with class composition including candidates from any of the initial licensure programs.

5. Page 18, 3rd full paragraph, 1st sentence, clarification

“Faculty believe that advanced candidates for continuing teachers in the Track 1 M.S. and the Ed.S. programs already possess and can demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge.”

Continuing teachers enrolled in the Track 1 M.S. and the Ed.S. programs are already licensed and have already met the state standards for pedagogical and content knowledge by virtue of their licensure through the State of Tennessee. This cannot be granted without passing scores on the relevant PRAXIS examinations and completion of a B.S. degree.

- 5b. Continuation – 2nd sentence, correction.

“There are no data for assessments of candidates in these programs other than grades for course-embedded assignments and comprehensive exams (Track 1 M.S.) or project (Ed.S.).”

If candidates are seeking to add a licensure area, they are required to complete the coursework approved by the State Department of Education as well as take and pass the appropriate PRAXIS examination(s) before being recommended for that licensure. These data were available at the time of the visit. PRAXIS pass rates for those candidates adding

licensure areas are included in the Institutional Report Table 6 on pages 24-26 that satisfied the NCATE standards and the BOE.

6. Page 18, Element D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers, line 10 in the paragraph under this topic, clarification

“observations and evaluations are completed by mentors in the unit as well as school-based mentor teaches from the unit and principals (or designees) at least three times – once during the fall semester, once during the spring semester, and a summative evaluation”

Formal observations and evaluations are completed by mentors in the unit in collaboration with school-based teacher mentors and principals (or designees) at least three times during the year. In addition, formal midyear and end-of-year summative evaluation documents are prepared collaboratively, discussed with candidates, and recorded in candidates’ files.

7. Page 18, Element D, Line 16 - addition

“Candidates complete self-assessments of their professional year . . . “

Candidates complete self-assessments and extensive program evaluations of their professional licensure year . . .

8. Page 19, paragraph 3, line 1

“The faculty assumes that advanced candidates for continuing teachers in the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. enter these programs with professional and pedagogical knowledge as they are already licensed teachers..”

Please see our comment above (#5) in response to a similar statement that appears on Page 18, paragraph 3, line 1.

- 9.* Page 19, paragraph 3, line 5, correction

“No assessment data was provided to demonstrate that candidates in either program achieve the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills expected by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards as suggested in the program specific conceptual framework.”

While NCATE has endorsed National Board Certification, this is not mentioned in our conceptual framework as was stated in the quotation above. Nowhere in our unit’s Conceptual Framework do we make any reference to the National Board. While we admire and respect those who strive to achieve National Board certification, we do not have this as a focus in our M.S. Track 1 or Ed.S. programs, nor do we specify the particular areas of professional knowledge and skills to be addressed in these programs that are referenced in the first statement of this quote.

- 10.* Page 19, Element E. Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel, line 3 under this heading, correction

“No information was provided to verify that the comprehensive exam in educational administration includes content directly related to professional knowledge and skills.”

The comprehensive exam in educational administration is based on coursework, which is aligned with the standards. Please see comment number 2 and the matrix in Appendix B.

- 11.* Page 20, line 1, correction

“Candidates in this program are beginning to post personal artifacts plus required work samples on the PLP.”

Educational administration candidate work in the PLP (beginning in October 2005) was demonstrated to members of the BOE addressing standards 1 and 2 in an unscheduled session Monday afternoon. Not all PLP components are posted because this is the first cohort to use the PLP and they have not yet completed the program.

12. Page 20, Element F. Dispositions, paragraph 3, clarification

“Faculty assume that advanced candidates in the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs hold teaching licenses, know and have previously demonstrated the 15 Unit dispositions. As a result, dispositions are not assessed for candidates enrolled in the programs that do not have teaching licenses.”

Licensure status is verified prior to program admission. Of the 104 individuals admitted to Track 1 programs in 2005-2006, only three were neither already licensed nor seeking licensure. These data were on file in departmental records at the time of the visit. See also comment 5.

If there were candidates in these programs who did not already hold teaching licenses but who were seeking initial licensure, they would (as part of their programs of studies) enroll in the core courses in which dispositions are assessed. Anyone being recommended for initial licensure would also have dispositions assessed in the classroom.

- 13.* Page 20, Element F, 4th paragraph under this topic, 2nd sentence, correction

“There are 42 dispositions aligned with the six ISLLC standards for the educational administration program. However, no data associated with these were provided ...”

BOE members who were responsible for standards 1 and 2 were provided summary data from the candidate self-assessments of dispositions during the Monday afternoon demonstration. (See Appendix D for a sample of the information they were provided).

14. Page 21, Element H. Student learning for other school personnel, paragraph 1 under this topic

“While specific data were not provided as to how candidates in the school counseling and school psychology programs are assessed as to their ability to support and impact student potential for learning within the context of their programs, these programs have meet (sic.) the appropriate standards of CACREP and APA.”

By the very nature of their roles and functions, school counselors and school psychologists support student learning and adjustment to maximize opportunities for learning for all students. Their nationally accredited licensure programs demand not only passing of written PRAXIS examinations, but also acceptable performance in field settings in which they demonstrate and apply the knowledge gained in their respective programs. We would welcome examples that demonstrate conclusively the effects of school counselors and school psychologists in this area.

15. Page 22. **Overall Assessment of Standard**

“There are limited data to substantiate the performance of advanced candidates, especially those in the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs for continuing teachers.”

The Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs are only a small part of the advanced programs offered through our unit. Advanced programs listed in Table One of the BOE report include the following:

- Social Work, (School Social Worker)*
- Teacher Education (Special Education Speech Language P-12)*
- Information Science (Library/Media Specialist)*
- School Counseling (School Counselor)*
- School Psychologist*
- Educational Administration (Administrator P-12)
- Teacher Education (Reading Specialist)
- Teacher Education (MS Track 1)
- Teacher Education (Ed.S)

Those programs marked with an asterisk (*) are accredited by their national professional accrediting bodies. The Teacher Education (Reading Specialist) is a new program that has a fully developed and implemented assessment system but has had only one individual to complete the program. The Educational Administration program also has a fully developed assessment system that is being implemented for the first cohort group of students in this revised program, resulting in limited aggregated data being available for this program at the time of the visit.

Please see our introductory description of the Track 1. M.S. and Ed.S. programs and our comment number 9.

Areas for Improvement - New

“The Unit does not have summarized performance data for candidates in advanced programs for continuing teachers (Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S.) for each of the relevant elements”

Rationale: “The faculty within the unit stated that they assumed that advanced candidates already possess content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions and had shown that they create environments that impact student learning. Even though course-based assessments and some systematic program data may exist, the unit provided limited data to verify that candidates in these advanced programs meet the expectations of this standard.”

Nearly all of the candidates in advanced programs for continuing teachers are already licensed (comment 12). It is our position that these candidates have already had to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and dispositions through the licensure process (comments 5a and 5b). The comments in the BOE Report on pages 20 (comment 12) and 19 (comment 9) may reflect a basic inaccuracy in implying that we propose to prepare our advanced program candidates for National Board certification.

Regarding their ability to impact learning, our statewide P-12 assessment system annually documents the performance of a teacher’s students in many of the teaching positions and provides this information to the employing school system and school principals. We do not have access to this information on an individual teacher basis, but the school district does and can facilitate improvement in this area if needed.

In our assessment system, we strive to identify 1) what to assess, and 2) what measures to use that will reliably document candidate mastery. We try to limit the numbers of pieces of evidence to those that will best accomplish what needs to be done and are within our resources to organize, manage, and process through our feedback loop in a timely manner.

We respectfully request that this be removed as an Area for Improvement.

Areas for Improvement - New

“The unit does not have multiple, summarized performance data indicating candidates in educational administration (M.S. and Ed.S.) have the necessary content knowledge, and professional knowledge and skills and can impact student learning.”

Rationale: “While this program is beginning to use an electronic portfolio for posting and assessing the performance of candidates, there are limited aggregated data about the effectiveness of this program. While some evidence exists, the lack of summarized data indicates that this program fails to collect, report, and utilize assessment data for candidate learning and program enhancement.”

The educational administrator cohort program was operational in fall of 2005, and the PLP electronic portfolio system was available for that program. Having weathered the storm of initial needs for training, “fixes” for errors discovered when using the system, and necessary changes to the system as used in the initial licensure programs beginning in spring 2005, the tech staff were ready to begin initiating the additions/modifications to the system to accommodate the educational administrator program. The candidate requirements were in place prior to 2005-2006 but could not be uploaded into the PLP system until fall of 2005.

In addition to PLP entries and other documents, program faculty meet at the end of each semester to evaluate the progress and development of each candidate in the program. Results of the evaluation are then shared with each candidate in the program, and plans for remediation are formulated as necessary.

Based on the most recent data available when the Institutional Report was prepared, the educational administration licensure program has a 100% pass rate on the appropriate PRAXIS examination. This information was presented in the Institutional Report, and PRAXIS score reports were available in the Exhibit Room. We would submit that this aggregated data reflects the effectiveness of the program. The follow-up survey of program completers indicated a need for enhancing the program, which has been acted upon.

We feel that the statement “*this program fails to collect, report, and utilize assessment data for candidate learning and program enhancement*” overlooks or does not fully take into account the activities that are documented and were reported in our Institutional Report, in the meeting of program faculty with BOE members, the demonstration and exploration of the educational administrator PLP for BOE members, and supplementary documents provided the BOE team during the site visit. The statement is unfounded and inaccurate. We are surprised and disappointed, and we vigorously object to the choice of language that pronounces a demeaning indictment that the program “*fails.*”

We would respectfully ask that this Area for Improvement be removed.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

16.* Element A, Assessment System, Page 24, Section A, line 6, correction

”It (assessment committee) includes faculty representing all initial programs as well as a representative from the advanced educational administration programs.”

Representatives for program areas with Track I MS and Ed.S. degrees as well as counselor education are also members of the Assessment Committee and were prior to the site visit.

17. Page 24, line 8, correction

“At the time of the site visit, members of the Committee did not see a role for the committee in assessing the M.S. and Ed.S. (Track I) programs due to the individualized nature of the programs.”

It is not clear to us how this assertion can be made. Not only is there every intention of Assessment Committee involvement in reviewing the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs, results from the follow-up survey had already been presented to the Assessment Committee for review and action as noted in Assessment Committee minutes.

Page 42 of the Institutional Report outlines basic information for the M.S. Track I and Ed.S. programs to be monitored. These data are currently housed in the departmental database and not yet in place as part of the master database and PLP because this represents phase/priority 4 of our assessment system developmental plan. A more detailed plan, shown in Appendix A, was provided in writing to the BOE when they were present for the site visit. The procedures depicted in Figure 2 on page 39 of the Institutional Report (Assessment System Data Flow) apply to these programs as well as the others in the unit.

18. Page 25, line 15, correction

“PRAXIS exam scores are required before being recommended for licensure but not for program completion.”

Candidates do not complete the program until they are recommended for licensure. They can, however, complete the internship without having achieved passing PRAXIS exam scores. Recommendation to the state of Tennessee for licensure cannot be done until candidates are program completers.

19. Page 25, line 16, clarification and addition

“The unit surveys initial candidates subsequent to graduation and after graduation.”

This should read, “The unit surveys initial candidates prior to completion of the internship and after program completion (including recommendation for licensure).”

- 20.* Page 26, paragraph 3, last statement, correction

“The process resulted in a seat on the Assessment Committee for a faculty member from the program.”

There was no connection between the two events. The addition of a faculty member from educational administration was one of several made at the same time to broaden representation on the Assessment Committee.

21. Page 27, second full paragraph, line 5, correction

“While they have identified decision points, members of the committee do not plan on collecting summary data for these programs as they are so individualized, nor do members of the assessment committee see a role for the unit assessment system in reviewing these programs. Unit administrators see a role for the committee in assessing these programs in the future, but the plans have not yet been shared with the committee.”

Please see comment number 17. The Institutional Report included the information mentioned in the above response. The Institutional Report was shared not only with members of the assessment committee but also with everyone on the teacher education listserv that includes faculty, staff, and administrators both within and outside the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences related to licensure programs.

22. Page 28, Element B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation, paragraph 5.

“Data collected for the Track I. M.S. or Ed.S. programs within the unit are limited to one follow up study for Track I M.S. covering program completers for three years done in June 2006.”

PRAXIS scores are available for all who complete either initial or add-on licensure requirements through these programs and are included in our Institutional Report in Table 7.

23. Page 28, paragraph 5, continuing

“Committee members and program personnel report there are no additional data for these programs nor is there a plan for such since these programs are so highly individualized and differentiated. Unit administrators anticipate that CIPE will begin to look at these programs in the near future, but this has not yet occurred.”

Please see comments 17 and 21.

24. Page 29, Element C. Use of data for program improvement, paragraph below bulleted statements

“There is no evidence that data driven improvements have been made at the program level in the Track I M.S. or Ed.S. programs. Unit representatives report that assessment occurs only at the individual student level in these particular programs at the present time.”

Results of the follow up survey have not indicated a need for change. The assessment committee will continue to review data regarding these programs and consider recommending changes when there is a sufficient body of evidence that supports such action.

25. Page 30, Overall **Assessment of Standard**

“While the identified assessment system is in place and operating successfully at the initial level, implementation of the unit assessment system at the advanced level is uneven as several of the programs are still in the first year of implementation. More importantly, the Track 1 and Ed.S. programs in teacher education are completely disenfranchised from the assessment system, and program assessment data developed for other school personnel are not incorporated into the unit’s assessment system. With the exception of the M.S. Track 1 and the Ed.S. program changes for the continuing preparation of teachers, data are used to inform and make programmatic changes.”

“. . . several of the programs (at the advanced level) are in the first year of implementation.”

Only the reading specialist Ed.S. program is in its first year of operation. The educational administrator program is in its second year of operation, however because it is a two-year cohort program, the first cohort of candidates in the program have not yet completed the program, the point at which they must provide evidence in their portfolio that they have met the standards (page 27 of the IR, paragraph 3 under Element 2, and page 33 of the Institutional Report, Element 5). Although assessments are posted throughout the program, the candidates decide at or near the end of the program which assessments best represent their accomplishment of the standards. Candidates in this program are reviewed at the end of each semester by the four program faculty jointly, with mentoring provided the candidate when warranted.

**** “the Track I and Ed.S. programs in teacher education are completely disenfranchised from the assessment system”***

We find this statement to be inaccurate and the language to be offensive and prejudicial. To the contrary, program area faculty who guide Track I and Ed.S. candidates are active and integral members of the Assessment Committee (Institutional report, page 37, first paragraph, beginning with line 7), Council for the Improvement of Professional Education, and various committees related to the unit and assessment system. Documentation of membership on the Assessment Committee and other intra-unit groups appears in Appendix E. When Track 1 and Ed.S. candidates are also licensure candidates, the data regarding their progress is captured along with other licensure candidates.

“program assessment data for other school personnel are not incorporated into the unit’s assessment system.”

The other school personnel programs include school counselor, school psychologist, library/media specialist, special education speech/language, reading specialist and educational administrator. Of these, all but the reading specialist program and the educational administrator program are exempt from Standard 2 because they are accredited by another accrediting body that has been approved by NCATE. The NCATE policy governing the use of materials from other accrediting agencies expressly excludes these programs from NCATE Standard 2 review. (Please see Institutional Report Table 3 on

page 12.) All but one of the examples of communications regarding this policy in Appendix F of this Rejoinder were in the Exhibit Room at the time of the visit.

The Associate Dean for Professional Licensure and Outreach is responsible for all approved licensure programs and is actively involved in accreditation activities for those programs accorded accreditation from other NCATE approved agencies.

The unit is also responsible to the state for the School Social Worker program that is outside the scope of NCATE (page 7 of BOE report, second paragraph).

Both the reading specialist program and the educational administrator program are fully incorporated into our assessment system. With this in mind, we find no support for this statement.

“With the exception of the M.S. Track 1 and the Ed.S. programs for the continuing preparation of teachers, data are used to inform and make programmatic changes.”

The student’s goals and objectives for entering the programs are taken into consideration when the student is admitted and the program of studies planned. Follow-up survey responses demonstrate that participants enter these programs for various reasons, and most, if not all, successfully achieve their objectives (page 21, paragraph 5 of the Institutional Report, and Exhibits 1.5.1 – 1.5.3). Objectives that relate to employment, however, are not within the control of the unit. Based on the data available, the Assessment Committee is not considering changes to the nature or operation of these programs at this time.

(Revised weakness) The unit does not utilize the identified assessment system for collecting, analyzing, or reporting candidate or program data at the advanced level.

Rationale: “The unit has developed an assessment system that addressed this area for improvement. Since the earlier visit, initial programs have addressed this previous area of weakness. However, it continues to be an area for improvement for advanced programs, particularly for the M.S. Track 1 and Ed.S. teacher education programs where summary data are not available.”

“for advanced programs” Most of our advanced programs are accredited by their respective national accrediting bodies that have been approved by NCATE and thus are not subject to NCATE standard 2. The only advanced programs subject to standard 2 are the educational administrator, and reading specialist programs, and the M.S. Track 1 and Ed.S. degree programs. Data are being collected in both the educational administrator and reading specialist programs through the PLP. The reading specialist program has had only one program completer and has not yielded sufficient data on which to make judgments about the program.

The educational administrator program is a two-year cohort program, with the first cohort group in the process of completing its program in spring of 2007. Program structure calls for candidates to post artifacts demonstrating mastery of standards before program completion, so timing of the site visit did not find evidence of final summarized postings. BOE examiners were

shown examples of student work in the PLP system at the time of the visit. The most recent Praxis test scores for educational administrators showed a 100% pass rate. The follow-up survey of program completers did point to a need for coursework to address a particular area (finance), and this has been added. Again, there is insufficient data at this time on which to base the need for major programmatic changes.

Please see our description of the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs on page 3 of this document. At present, the follow-up survey of Track 1 M.S. degree recipients did not provide evidence of a need for programmatic changes.

Based on the exemption of the majority of our advanced programs from Standard 2 and our use of the Assessment System for the educational administrator and reading specialist programs, our follow-up studies, and our plan for inclusion of the Track 1 M.S. and Ed.S. programs, we feel we have processes in place to provide the information needed for program improvement in the future.

We, therefore, respectfully request that this be removed as an Area for Improvement.

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

26. Page 31, Element B. Design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, 1st paragraph, last three lines, correction.

“In addition, field experiences are embedded in core courses to extend content learned in the classroom to observation of these principles and theories in practice.”

This should read, “field experiences are embedded in the program” rather than in the core courses.

27. Page 32, Element B. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, 2nd full paragraph, line 3, clarification

“an initial program”

This should read “an initial licensure program.”

- 28.* Page 33, lines 1 and 2 below the graphic, correction

“Mentor teachers must have at least four years of teaching in a licensure area before being eligible to serve as a mentor teacher (a state requirement).”

The Tennessee State Department of Education mandates mentor teachers within the school district for all new teachers, as stated above. This can be waived if there is a mentor team in place to serve this purpose.

Our interns are not included in this mandate. Our unit’s signed agreements with partner schools specifies three years experience for teachers who mentor interns, but there is no formal state requirement in place for the school-based mentors for our interns. Nevertheless, there are mentoring teams in place in schools where our interns are placed.

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

29. Page 43, Element A. Qualified Faculty, paragraph 3, last sentence, correction

“While this is an exception to the state policy, which demands a minimum of four years of classroom teaching experience”

Please see comment 28 relating to this same issue.

30. Page 45, Element D. Modeling best professional practices in service, 3rd paragraph, line 2, clarification

“faculty leaders” should read “faculty”

STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

The Unit agrees with the BOE finding that Standard 6 is met at both the initial and advanced levels. However, within the text of Standard 6 in the BOE report there are a number of statements with which we as an institution take exception. These statements are reflected in the overall assessment of the standard and the two areas cited for improvement.

- 31.* Page 49, Element A. Unit leadership and authority, paragraph 2, line 10, correction

“. . . faculty from advanced programs are not actively involved in the committee structures of the unit In addition, the educational administration program is the only advanced program housed in the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences with representatives on the Council.”

All levels of programming are represented and participate in ongoing unit operations and decision making. The unit welcomes, encourages, and in fact requires participation at all levels in unit operations and decision making.

First it should be noted that the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences is the center of the Unit and coordinates Unit activities across campus. The Associate Dean of Professional Licensure and Outreach has been directed by the Dean to oversee operations. Communication and oversight across all colleges and licensure programs at all levels is ongoing through that office.

The Tennessee State Board of Education legislates licensure requirements. The State Department of Education translates the action of the State Board into Standards and issues them to institutions of higher education approved to offer programs. The Standards are directed to a specific program officer at the institution (at UTK this individual is the Associate Dean for Professional Licensure and Outreach). The program officer distributes the Standards to the program coordinators and/or department heads whose programs are affected. This structure ensures collaboration with and coordination through the unit administration and assessment system.

As the appointed leader of the Professional Unit the Associate Dean is a member of the Assessment Committee and Council for the Improvement of Professional Education and works closely with all committees, both standing and ad-hoc, including the Technology Committee, Portfolio Committee, Curriculum Review Committee, Elementary Committee and Secondary Committee among others. Additionally he works closely with programs outside the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences to ensure their participation in overall unit operations. Examples of communications, etc. related to programs outside are presented in Appendix E.

Participation by faculty at advanced levels is shown in part by the make-up of committees created to inform decision making at the unit level in Appendix E. It is important to remember that the lists of faculty involved in initial and advanced programs are not mutually exclusive. Faculty members often play dual roles representing programs at both the initial and advanced level.

The make-up of the **Assessment Committee** includes representatives not only from Educational Administration but also from School Counseling which is also an advanced level program. In fact 12 of the 13 committee members represent and work with initial and/or advanced programs. Membership of this and the other committees discussed below can be found in Appendix D. While the Assessment Committee plays a pivotal role in the oversight of the unit it is by no means the only committee providing input and influence in the decision making process.

The **Portfolio Committee** put in place during the assessment system development process includes members from School Counseling(Advanced), Educational Administration (Advanced), School of Social Work (Advanced; Outside the College), Music Ed (Advanced; Outside the College), as well as Agriculture Education (Advanced; Outside the College). 15 of the 21 members of this committee worked with initial and/or advanced programs.

The **Curriculum Review Committee** plays a critical role in reviewing and approving curricular changes. Any response to new or revised Program Standards that necessitate curricular changes must be reviewed and approved by the College's Curricular Review Committee (CRC). Actions taken by this committee are forwarded to the University's Undergraduate or Graduate Council, University Faculty Senate, and in the case of new majors and/or degrees, the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

At the same time proposed changes are sent to the College's CRC for approval, they are also forwarded to the Associate Dean for Program Licensure and Outreach, who transmits them to the State Department for operational authority and approval to implement them when they have completed the prescribed University process. 6 of the 12 CRC members come from Child and Family Studies, Theory and Practice in Education, Educational Psychology & Counseling and Instructional Technology, Health and Educational Studies and are linked to advanced programs.

The **Council for the Improvement of Professional Education (CIPE)**, which was formed in 2000 to advise the unit on issues, related to program improvement meets three times a year to review assessment data and discuss issues and concerns across all programs. This committee is made up of a cross section of stakeholders that include representatives from initial and advanced programs. 17 of 33 committee members are associated with advanced programs.

Internship Committee

The Internship Committee is made up of members from various programs within the college.

Elementary Education Committee

This committee serves as a clearinghouse for information related to elementary education and as a deliberative body to address issues that cut across instructional teams preparing elementary teachers. Representatives are selected from elementary instructional teams by those teams, including one special education representative. At least 4 members represent both initial and advanced programs.

Secondary Education Committee

This committee serves as a clearinghouse for information related to secondary education and as a deliberative body to address issues that cut across instructional teams preparing secondary content teachers. Representatives come from secondary content instructional teams and are selected by instructional teams. 6 of the nine members of this committee are linked to advanced programs.

Technology Committee

The technology committee is made up of members from departments within the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences. There is a staggered enrollment with members serving two-year appointments. The committee is charged with needs assessment and making recommendations on technology budget expenditures. Many of these members (7 of 11) work with initial and/or advanced licensure programs.

32. Page 49, paragraph 2, last sentence

“This may account for the uneven implementation of the unit’s assessment system at the advanced level.”

Please refer to the description of our assessment system and our priorities in its development on page 1 of this Rejoinder and our response to the Revised Weakness on pages 15-16 of this Rejoinder

- 33.* Page 50, continuing paragraph at the top of the page, line 11

We are unclear what the BOE is referring to in the term *“community assistance.”*

- 34.* Page 50, continuing paragraph at the top of the page, last sentence, correction

“With the exception of one department, the unit has a student representative that works directly with the unit leadership.”

Every department is represented.

- 35.* Page 50, first full paragraph

“Faculty from advanced programs are not actively involved in the committee structures of the unit Most of these programs are housed in departments outside the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences.”

Please see comment 31 above.

Additionally all but one of the programs outside the College of Health, Education, and Human Sciences (and some within) are accredited by their national professional accrediting bodies. This process falls under the oversight of the Associate Dean of Professional Licensure and Outreach and consequently any reports or reviews including documentation, and results are shared with the unit. As with any program, areas of weakness resulting in recommendations for change or improvement are vetted through the Associate Dean as the head of the Office of Professional Licensure. The Associate Dean, at his discretion, may seek input or counsel from the Dean of the College, the state department of education, or others before making recommendations involving curricular or program changes to the Assessment Committee. Improvements involving curricular changes are passed on to the Curriculum Review Committee. All faculty and administrators connected to the unit across all levels and programs are kept informed, on an ongoing basis, of unit activities and are encouraged to respond with comments and concerns through our Professional Licensure listserv.

36. Page 51, 1st full paragraph, line 3, clarification

“Information gathered from interviews indicated that academic catalogs were not consistent with practice. For example, faculty members stated in interviews that the Track 1 M.S. degree is only for licensed teachers; however, the Graduate Catalog states that the program is available for (1) licensed teachers, (2) individuals going into post-secondary education, and (3) those that are not pursuing a career in education.”

A review of actual candidates enrolled in the Track I M.S. program reveals participants from all three categories as listed in the Graduate Catalog. During the 2005-2006 academic year there were three (out of 104) candidates admitted without licensure. Many of our faculty are fairly new here and may have not yet encountered Track 1 candidates who are not licensed.

During the admission process, when someone applies who does not have a license, advising confirms that the applicant has career goals outside P – 12 teaching. Once it is confirmed that the candidate does not want or need licensure, discussions move to how the program might support them. For example, a Track I master's student intended to work in a museum as their education director (presentations for field trips, Saturday classes, etc.) and had no intention of teaching in a classroom situation. Her program was tailored toward this objective by choosing courses in media production, technology, and literature/social studies that will help her in this non-classroom teaching career. Another candidate who did not seek licensure was interesting in working with an agency like the Southern Poverty Center. The third was that of a student seeking a Masters degree with the intent of teaching at the post secondary level. In this case a Masters was required to qualify for the position, but no P-12 licensure was necessary. This candidate was accepted without a license based on program guidelines as described in the Graduate Catalog.

37.* Page 52, Element B. Unit Budget, 1st full paragraph, line 4, correction

“there are currently no off-campus programs being offered by the unit.”

This should read “off-campus degree programs.”

38. Page 55, **Overall Assessment of Standard**, line 5, correction

“Minor inconsistencies are reported in the operation of admissions’ standards for the Track 1. M.S. program”

Please see comment 36.

Areas for Improvement - New

“The admissions requirements listed in course catalogs are not consistent with the actual practice of how the Track 1 M.S. degree (advanced program) candidates are admitted.”

Rationale: “Candidate data and survey results indicate that enrollees in Track 1 M.S. programs are available to three distinct populations, yet faculty indicate that they limit enrollments to licensed teachers only.”

Please comment 36 above.

This points to a need for better informing new faculty about this option. Efforts to put such information into the hands of all faculty, particularly new hires, has been discussed and was

already in preparation prior to the BOE visit. We appreciate the BOE for calling this to our attention.

Regardless of whether the perceived discrepancy was the result of misstatements or lack of information on the part of faculty, citing of areas of improvement should be based on actual practice. In this case practice is consistent with policy.

Based on this information and that presented in comment 36, we respectfully request that this be removed as an Area for Improvement.

Areas for Improvement - New

“Advanced programs are not systematically involved in the unit’s operations and decision-making.”

Rationale: “Discussion pertaining to the assessment of advanced programs does not occur at the unit level, in particular in the Assessment Committee (the body charged with overseeing the unit’s assessment system.”

The second area cited for improvement is based on the perception that advanced programs are not systematically involved in unit operations and decision making. This is not an accurate statement. All levels of programming are represented and participate in ongoing unit operation and decision-making. The unit welcomes, encourages, and in fact requires participation at all levels in unit operations and decision making and we offer the following documentation in support of that position. (Please see comment 31 and Appendix E referenced in comment 31.)

The documentation above highlights a myriad of ways in which advanced level programs both inside and outside the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences are incorporated into the structure and decision making process of the Unit. Balanced representation, participation and input from programs at all levels are valued and an integral part of our processes here at The University of Tennessee.

With consideration of the information and supporting documentation provided we request that this Area for Improvement be removed.

Procedural Concerns

When we were ready to send an electronic copy of our Institutional Report to NCATE within the prescribed NCATE timelines, we sent an email asking to whom it should be directed. We received no reply and ultimately sent the report to the generic NCATE address. When we recently received information about submission of our Rejoinder, the message stated that NCATE had not received our Institutional Report, and we were to send it along with the Rejoinder.

Some members of the BOE had not read the IR before arriving on campus. Unit members were still being asked questions about the programs and their operations after a general presentation about these topics on the morning of the first day, after examiners had been on campus for two full days. Answers to questions that were asked were clearly present in the IR and in the presentation on Saturday morning, as well as in posters on display in the Exhibit Room.

It was unfortunate that no members of the BOE team seemed to be familiar with a fifth year initial licensure program, nor with a context and operational structure similar to ours. The BOE members struggled to understand our initial licensure program and to see how we function effectively and maintain communication and oversight with regard to programs delivered in other colleges on campus.

The visit template was changed. At the pre-visit, the chair extended the on-site visit another day, requesting BOE members arrive on Friday so they could begin work on Saturday, rather than Sunday for the visit that concluded Wednesday noon. This not only increased the cost of the visit to the host institution, but it could have caused problems if housing had not been available a day earlier at the hotel with which arrangements had already been made. While we accept the authority of the BOE chair to make such changes, meticulous planning had already gone into preparing for the site visit well in advance of the pre-visit, taking into consideration the budget allocated for the visit. While we put forth valiant efforts to accommodate all requests at that late date and during the visit for the benefit of visiting team, we found ourselves unprepared and not anticipating this. Perhaps through oversight, the NCATE handbook for preparation for the site visit does not suggest the nature or extent of changes that are allowed.

Despite all efforts by both unit technical support staff and the hotel staff, one BOE member's hotel room lacked Internet connectivity.

The BOE chair requested information from team members be sent to her regarding food restrictions, arrival times, etc. While this relieved the host institution from doing this, it also delayed the host's receipt of such information and did not allow us to pursue lack of response on the part of some team members.

Requests for food went beyond dietary restrictions. The chair sought to keep team members from being inconvenienced.

During the visit, team members asked for documents that were already available in the Exhibit Room and were found there when the replacement documents were provided.

The extreme secrecy – having lunch behind locked doors, needing paper shredders at both the hotel and in the workroom – detracts from the credibility of the whole experience.

The primary emphasis during the visit appeared to be on finding problems or areas that needed to be strengthened. It would have been encouraging to hear something positive about what we were doing in some area.

Neither the NCATE nor the state team seemed to fully understand (or correctly use and apply) the NCATE policy addressing accreditation of programs by other national accrediting bodies and exempting those programs from standards 2 through 5. This was apparent due to repeated requests for data regarding these programs throughout the visit.

Appendix A

Advanced Programs and the Assessment System

Our primary focus has been to start with our largest program, the initial licensure program, and to use that as a model for the assessment system. The Educational Administrator program, which is a cohort program, is being added to the online assessment system.

Our Track I Masters program and the Ed.S. programs are, in many cases, highly individualized. Upon admission to the program, the student's program of studies is determined collaboratively by the student and the program area faculty member who is advising the student.

Entry-level data on MS and Ed.S. candidates is currently collected by the departments in which they are accepted. In the future, such data can be added to our administrative database.

Because of the nature of the student's program, individual courses will be listed in the student's PLP.

- Major adviser or committee chair
- Program of studies developed (Yes, No)
- Designation of thesis or non-thesis option
- Research course as part of program of studies
- List of courses to be completed (program of studies) and grade and date upon course completion
- Artifacts (one per course to be uploaded into PLP; documents in some fashion the application of course content to classroom setting)
- Date of comprehensive examination
- Result of the comprehensive examination (Pass, Fail)
- Further action recommended

- For thesis option, title of thesis
 - Date of oral defense of thesis
 - Result of oral defense
 - Additional activities related to thesis, if specified

- Student's faculty committee
- Date degree awarded (Student information System)

Appendix B

Matrix of EAS Courses, Required Assignments, and ISLLC Standards

COURSE NUMBER/TITLE	SEMESTER OFFERED	ISLLC/STATE STANDARD	ASSIGNMENTS RELATED TO STANDARDS
EA 583 Educational Leadership-Principalship	Summer 1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	In-basket 20 item set, Course reflection log, Position paper
EA 515 Human Relations and Communication in Administration	Summer 1	1, 3, 4, 5, 6	Profiles I, II, III: Understanding of Self, Understanding Self in Relation to Others, Understanding of Self as a Leader
TPTE 516 Research Methods	Fall 1	1, 2, 4	Collection and analysis of school level data
TPTE 595 Special Topics: Curriculum for Administrators	Fall 1	1, 2	Vision and Mission Statements; Platform Development: Curriculum
EA 553 Strategic Planning	Spring 1	1, 4	School Improvement Planning Documents
EA 580 Internship in Educational Administration	Spring 1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Reflections, Internship Log of Activities
EA 523 Administration of Special Services in Schools	Summer 2	1, 2, 4, 5	Platform Development: Special Services; Problem Paper
EA 548 Supervision and Personnel Administration	Summer 2	1, 2, 3, 5	Lesson Observations; Teacher Evaluations
EA 554 Policy Issues in Educational Law, K-12	Summer 2	5, 6	N/A (No Rubrics for developed assignments)
EA 513 Admin. and Organizational Theory	Fall 2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Leadership story, School culture paper
EA 580 Internship in Educational Administration	Fall 2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Reflections, Internship Log of Activities, Resume
EA 544 School Finance and Business Management	Spring 2	3, 4, 5, 6	School Plan/Budget
EA 553 Strategic Planning	Spring 2	1, 4	School Improvement Planning Documents
EA 596 Seminar in School Leadership	Spring 2	1,2,3,4,5,6	Site visit reflections

Appendix C

Rubrics - Active

Educational Administration				
Category	Rubric Name ▲	Rows	Cols	Criteria
▼EA 513				
	EA 513 Autobiography/Leadership Story	2	4	Leadership Story Theoretical Support
	EA 513 Shaping School Culture	4	4	Major Points Expressed by Author Comparative analysis with other readings Personal reaction to concepts presented Implications for Ed. Ad.
	EA 513 Site Visit Reflections	3	4	Leadership Style/Theory Program Observation Journal References
▼EA 515				
	EA 515 Human Relations in Organizations: PBL	4	4	Data Analysis Data Application Data Synthesis Written Quality of Findings and APA Format
▼EA 516				
	EA 516 Research for the School Administrator	5	4	Data Analysis Data Application Data Presentation Data Synthesis Written Quality of Findings and APA Format
▼EA 523				
	EA 523: Special Services Platform	8	4	Vision of the leader/administrator and the organizational context Organizational metaphor Role of leaders/administrator in the organization of special services Image of the learners Curriculum and instructional delivery model Role of the leader/administrator in

				<p>teacher development Role of the leader/administrator in the integration of the program delivery model Written quality of platform and use of APA format</p>
▼EA 548				
	Principal: Comprehensive Assessment Project	5	4	<p>Pre-observation Conference Scripting/Note Taking CAAR Comprehensive Assessment Appraisal Record Future Growth Plan CASR Comprehensive Assessment Summative Report</p>
	Rubric for Lesson Analysis	9	4	<p>Content Speakers Symbols/Abbreviations Legibility Punctuation Time Notations Instrumentation Verbatim/Anecdotal/SCORE Non-judgmental Analysis/Feedback</p>
	Teacher: Comprehensive Assessment Component	6	4	<p>Pre-observation Conference CAPIR Comprehensive Assessment Planning Information Record CARIR Comprehensive Assessment Reflection Information Record CAEIR Comprehensive Assessment Education Information Record CAFGP Comprehensive Assessment CASA Comprehensive Assessment Summative Assessment Worksheet</p>
▼EA 553				
	PBL PowerPoint Presentation	5	4	<p>Introduction of speaker(s), purpose of presentation, and background Poise and confidence as a professional Knowledge of TSIP components/ content and level of preparation</p>

				Clarity of information, relationship of data discussed and slides presented at a given point in time. APA/ format and overall quality of written and verbal presentation
	SIP Component 1: School Profile and Collaborative Process	3	4	1.1 School Profile and Collaborative Process 1.2 Subcommittee Formation and Operation 1.3 Collection of Demographic Data and Analysis
	SIP Component 2: Beliefs, Mission, and Vision	5	4	2.1 Collaborative Process 2.2 Clarity of Belief Statements 2.3 Comprehensive Belief Statements 2.4 Clarity of Mission Statement/Focus on Student Success 2.5 Clarity of Vision/Focus on School Success
	SIP Component 3: Academic and Non-Academic Data Analysis	5	4	3.1 Variety of Academic and Non-Academic Data Analysis 3.2 Data Collection and Analysis 3.3 Report Card 3.4 Narrative Synthesis of All Data 3.5 Prioritized List of Targets
	SIP Component 4: Curricular, Instructional, Assessment, and Organizational Effectiveness	5	4	4.1 Collaboration 4.2 Evaluation of the Decision-making Process 4.3 Resource Allocation 4.4 Curriculum Analysis and Support 4.5 Instructional Analysis and Support
	SIP Component 5: Action Plan Development	3	4	5.1 Goals 5.2 Action Steps 5.3 Implementation Plan
▼EA 583				
	EA 583 Position Paper	3	4	Topic choice Literature Your position
	EA 583 Principal's Inbasket	3	4	Follows directions

				Problem Identification Solution and Action
▼Ed Admin				
	Internship Rubric	5	4	Selection of Artifacts Reflections Captions Intern logs Course Assignments
▼Reflective Practice				
	Reflective Practice	5	4	Description of action or incident Feelings or beliefs about the action or incident Analysis of action or incident; related to models, theories, or concepts; tells lesson learned Evaluation (positive/negative) of the action or incident Action taken or future plan of action
▼TPTE 595				
	TPTE 595: Curriculum Platform for School Administrators	8	4	Vision of the leader/administrator and the organizational context Organizational metaphor Role of leaders/administrator in the organization of curriculum. Image of the learners Curriculum and instructional delivery model Role of the leader/administrator in teacher development Role of the leader/administrator in the integration of the program delivery model Written quality of platform and use of APA format

Appendix D

Search Criteria for Surveys: Example of Report

Result Set	ISLLC Standard I Knowledge & Performance Self-Assessment
Date Range	11/20/2005 to 11/20/2006
Selection Criteria	By Learner
Learner	
User Group	
Program	Ed Admin

Results for Survey "ISLLC Standard I Knowledge & Performance Self-Assessment"

Number of eFolio databases that match search criteria:	37
Number of Surveys taken between the specified dates	25
Authors who took Surveys for this report:	

Your degree of knowledge and understanding of:

(1) Learning goals in a pluralistic society

Answer	#	%	Chart
High Degree	4	16.0%	
Some Degree	19	76.0%	
Low Degree	2	8.0%	
None	0	0.0%	

(2) Principles of developing and implementing strategic plans

Answer	#	%	Chart
High Degree	13	52.0%	
Some Degree	11	44.0%	

Low Degree	1	4.0%	
None	0	0.0%	

(3) Systems theory

Answer	#	%	Chart
High Degree	7	28.0%	
Some Degree	13	52.0%	
Low Degree	3	12.0%	
None	1	4.0%	

(4) Information sources, data collection, and analysis strategies

Answer	#	%	Chart
High Degree	19	76.0%	
Some Degree	4	16.0%	

Appendix E

Membership of Assessment and Other Committees

Assessment Committee - Membership

Name	Representing	Level
Sherry Bell	TPTE Special Education	Initial / Advanced
Susan Benner	TPTE Dept Head Special Ed / Urban Mult	Initial / Advanced
Judy Boser	Office of Prof Lic/Assessment & Eval	Advanced
Lynn Cagle	Dean Office of Prof Lic	Initial / Advanced
Carrie Fritz	Agriculture Ed	Initial / Advanced
Mary Humphrey	Office of Field Based Exp	Initial
Cheryl Kershaw	Great Schools Partnership	Initial / Advanced
Mary Jane Moran	Early Childhood Education	Initial / Advanced
Faye Patterson	Ed Admin	Advanced
Dulcie Peccolo	Director Student Services	Initial / Advanced
Jeannine Studer	Ed Psych School Counseling	Advanced
Mark Taylor	TPTE Math Ed	Initial / Advanced
Bill Wishart	Office of Prof Lic	Initial / Advanced

Council for the Improvement of Professional Education (CIPE) – Membership

Name	Representing	Level
Pam Angelle	Ed Admin	Advanced
Susan Benner	TPTE Dept Head	Initial / Advanced
Janet Bledsoe	Alcoa Schools	Initial
Judy Boser	Office of Prof Lic/eval & assmt	Advanced
Patti Bounds	Knox Co Teacher	Initial
Amy Broemmel	TPTE EI Ed	Initial / Advanced
Melissa Brookes	Student	
Lynn Cagle	Dean Office of Prof Lic	Initial / Advanced
Lynn Champion	College of Arts & Sciences	
David Cihak	TPTE Spec Ed	Initial / Advanced
David Dupper	College of Social Work	Initial / Advanced
Carrie Fritz	College of Ag	Initial / Advanced
Dorothy Hendricks	TPTE Social Sciences	Initial / Advanced
Thomas Hodges	Student	
Mary Humphrey	Office Field Based Ex	Initial
Montina Jones	Knox Co Schools	Initial
Cheryl Kershaw	Great Schools Partnership	Initial / Advanced
Lisa Luna	Knox Co Schools	Initial
Mary Jane Moran	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced

Skip Overstreet	Lenoir City Schools	Initial
Dulcie Peccolo	Director Student Services	Initial / Advanced
Kristen Rearden	TPTE Science Ed	Initial / Advanced
Sallee Reynolds	Knox Co Schools	Initial
David Royse	School of Music Instr	Initial / Advanced
Rodney Russell	Knox Co Schools	Initial
Tom Shamblin	Alcoa Schools	Initial
Anne Stinnet	Knox Co Schools	Initial
Jeannine Studer	Ed Psych School Counseling	Advanced
Rebecca Johnson	Student	
Jeanna Swan-Cole	Knox Co Schools	Initial
Jinx Watson	College Comm & Information	Initial / Advanced
Martha Wiley	State Dept of Ed	
Bill Wishart	Office of Prof Lic	Initial / Advanced

Portfolio Committee

Name	Representing	Level
Carrie Fritz	Agricultural Ed	Initial / Advanced
Faye Patterson	Ed Admin	Advanced
Cheryl Kershaw	Secondary PDS	Initial
Sherry Bell	Special Ed	Initial / Advanced
David Dupper	College of Social Work	Initial / Advanced
Diana Moyer	Cultural Studies	Initial / Advanced
David Royse	School of Music	Initial / Advanced
Julia Malia	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Susan Groenke	TPTE English Ed	Initial / Advanced
Debra Tegano	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Jeannine Studer	Ed Psych School Counseling	Advanced
Brenda Stephenson	TPTE Deaf Ed	Initial
Mary K Bordner	El Lyndhurst	Initial
Glennon Rowell	TPTE Individualized	Initial
Michael Bentley	TPTE Science	Initial / Advanced
Sharon Judge	TPTE Urban Multicultural	Initial / Advanced
Judy Boser	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial / Advanced
Ann Miller Stott	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Paula Gumpman	TPTE Special Ed	Initial
Bill Wishart	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial / Advanced

Technology Committee Membership

Name	Representing	Level
James W Bailey	Nutrition	
Michael L Bentley	TPTE Science Ed	Initial / Advanced
Lynn Cagle	Dean Office of Prof Lic	Initial / Advanced

Rachel Chen	Retail, Hospitality & Tou	
David Cihak	TPTE Special Ed	Initial / Advanced
Joel Diambra	Ed Psych School Counseling	Advanced
Blanche O'Bannon	Instr Tech Health & Ed Stds	Advanced
Trena Paulus	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Deborah Tegano	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Scotty Warden	Technology Coordinator	
Songning Zhang	Exercise Sprrt & Liesr Stdy	

Internship Committee

Name	Representing	Level
Anne Miller Stott	ECE	Initial / Advanced
Amy Broemmel	TPTE EI Ed	Initial / Advanced
Brenda Stephenson	TPTE Deaf Ed	Initial
Gwen Kyle	TPTE Math	Initial / Advanced
Cheryl Kershaw	PDS / Urban Spec	Initial / Advanced
Glennon Rowell	TPTE Lyndhurst	Initial
Darlene Justice	ECE	Initial / Advanced
David Cihak	TPTE Spec Ed	Initial / Advanced
Dorothy Hendricks	TPTE Social Sci	Initial / Advanced
Stehpanie Taylor	TPTE Art Ed	Initial / Advanced
Kristen Rearden	TPTE Science Ed	Initial / Advanced
Mary Ann Blank	TPTE EI Ed	Initial
Mary Humphrey	Offc Field Based Ex	Initial
Nancy Williamson	TPTE EI Ed	Initial

Elementary Education Committee

Name	Representing	Level
Amy Broemmel – chair	TPTE EI Ed	Initial / Advanced
Amy Wormsley – Neighborhood	TPTE	Initial
Amos Hatch - Urban/Multicultural	TPTE EI ED	Initial / Advanced
Jane Qualls - Small Schools	TPTE	Initial
Mary Ann Blank - Small Schools	TPTE EI Ed	Initial / Advanced
Nancy Williamson – Rural	TPTE	Initial
Glennon Rowell –	TPTE EI Ed	Initial
Sherry Bell –	TPTE Special Ed	Initial / Advanced

Secondary Education Committee

Name	Representing	Level
Susan Groenke	TPTE English	Initial / Advanced
Mark Taylor	TPTE Math	Initial / Advanced
Patti Davis-Wiley	TPTE Foreign Lang	Initial / Advanced
Claudia Melear	TPTE Science	Initial / Advanced

Dorothy Hendricks	TPTE Social Science	Initial / Advanced
Stephanie Taylor	TPTE Art Ed	Initial / Advanced
Shannon Coulter	TPTE English	Initial
Andrea Stairs	TPTE	Initial
Matthew Perkins	TPTE	Initial

Curricular Review Committee (Undergraduate)

Name	Representing	Level
Sandra Twardoz	Child & Family Studies	Initial / Advanced
Steve Morse	Retail, Hospitality, & Tour	
Rob Hardin	Exercise Sport & Leisure	
Jung Han Kim	Nutrition	
Jeff Davis	TPTE Deaf Ed	Initial / Advanced
Tom George	Assoc Dean	Ex-Officio

Curricular Review Committee (Graduate)

Name	Representing	Level
Gary Ubben	TPTE Ed Admin	Advanced
Greer Fox	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Ann Fairhurst/Rachel Chen	Retail, Hospitality & Tour	
Jung Han Kim	Nutrition	
Bob Williams	Ed Psych & Counseling	Initial / Advanced
Michael Waugh	Intruc Tech Health & Ed Stud	Advanced
Craig Wrisberg	Exercise, Sport & Leisure	
Tom George	Assoc Dean	

Professional Licensure Listserv

Name	Representing	Level
Richard Allington	TPTE Reading	Advanced
Vincent Anfara	Ed Admin	Advanced
Pamela Angelle	Ed Admin	Advanced
Sherry Bain	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Brian Barber	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Sherry Bell	TPTE Special Ed	Initial / Advanced
Karen Benedict	TPTE	Initial
Susan Benner	TPTE Dpt Head	Initial / Advanced
Michael Bentley	TPTE Science	Initial / Advanced
Mary Ann Blank	TPTE	Initial / Advanced
Diane Booker	Office of Prof Lic	
Mary Kay Bordner	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial
Judith Boser	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial / Advanced
Amy Broemmel	TPTE El Ed	Initial / Advanced
Clara Lee Brown	TPTE ESL	Initial / Advanced

JoAnn Cady	TPTE Math	Initial / Advanced
Lynn Cagle	Assoc Dean Prof Licensure	Initial / Advanced
Lynn Champion	Assoc Dean Arts & Sciences	Initial / Advanced
David Cihak	TPTE Special Ed	Initial / Advanced
Mary Jane Connelly	ITHCS Instr Tech	Advanced
Ed Counts	ITHCS Instr Tech	Advanced
Jo Lynn Cunningham	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Patricia Davis-Wiley	TPTE Foreign Lang	Initial / Advanced
Joy DeSensi	Exercise Sprt Leisure Studies	
Sarah DeYoung	CEHHS Advising	Initial / Advanced
David Dupper	College of Social Work	Initial / Advanced
Lisa Emery	CEHHS Advising	Initial / Advanced
Patricia Fitchpatrick	TPTE	Initial
Kathy Fitzgerald	Early Childhood Ed	Initial
Nina Fox	CEHHS Admissions	Initial / Advanced
Russell French	ITHCS Assess & Eval	Advanced
Carrie Fritz	College of Agriculture	Initial / Advanced
Thomas George	Assoc Dean CEHHS	Initial / Advanced
Colleen Gilrane	TPTE El Ed Lang Arts	Initial / Advanced
Katherine Greenberg	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Susan Groenke	TPTE English Ed	Initial / Advanced
Rena Hallam	Child & Family Studies	Initial / Advanced
Charles Hargis	TPTE Reading Ed	Initial / Advanced
Amos Hatch	TPTE Urban Multicultural	Initial / Advanced
Dorothy Hendricks	TPTE Social Science	Initial / Advanced
Terri Hopkins	TPTE Math	Initial / Advanced
Schuyler Huck	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Mary Humphrey	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial
Darlene Justice	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Cheryl Kershaw	TPTE Secondary PDS	Initial
Lester Knight	TPTE	Initial / Advanced
Gwen Kyle	TPTE	Initial
Vena Long	Assoc Dean CEHHS	Initial / Advanced
Joellen Maples	TPTE	Initial
Jennifer Martin	CEHHS Advising	Initial / Advanced
Steve McCallum	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Anne McGill-Franzen	TPTE Reading	Initial / Advanced
Gina Barclay McLaughlin	TPTE Urban Multicultural	Initial / Advanced
Linnie McMillan	TPTE	Initial
Claudia Melear	TPTE Science	Initial / Advanced
Norma Mertz	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Marvalene Moore	School of Music	Initial / Advanced
Mary Jane Moran	Early Childhood Ed	Initial / Advanced
Diana Moyer	ITHCS	Initial / Advanced
Susan Newsom	TPTE	Initial
Glenda Noe	Staff	Initial / Advanced

Mick Nordquist	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Blanche O'Bannon	ITHCS Instr Tech	Advanced
Terry Osborne	TPTE	Initial
Faye Patterson	TPTE	Advanced
Trena Paulus	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Dulcie Peccolo	Director Student Services	Initial / Advanced
Marla Peterson	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Jay Pfaffman	ITHCS Instr Tech	Advanced
Jane Qualls	TPTE	Initial
Kristin Rearden	TPTE Science	Initial / Advanced
Donna Redwine	TPTE	Initial
Bob Rider	Dean CEHHS	Initial / Advanced
David Royle	School of Music	Initial / Advanced
Brian Russell	CEHHS Advising	Initial / Advanced
Brenda Simmons	TPTE Deaf Ed	Initial
Christopher Skinner	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Gary Skolits	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Delores Smith	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Karen Sowers	School of Social Work	Advanced
Heidi Stolz	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Anne Miller Stott	Early Childhood Ed	Initial
Terrel Strayhorn	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Jeannine Studer	Ed Psych & Counseling	Advanced
Mark Taylor	TPTE Math Ed	Initial / Advanced
Stephanie Taylor	TPTE Art Ed	Initial / Advanced
Debbie Tegano	Child & Family Studies	Initial / Advanced
Barbara Thayer-Bacon	ITHCS Cultural Studies	Initial / Advanced
Thomas Turner	TPTE El Ed Social Sciences	Initial / Advanced
Gerald Ubben	TPTE Ed Admin	Advanced
Tracy Van de Vate	TPTE	Initial
Kathleen Warden		
Scotty Warden	OIT Support	
Tara Wass	Child & Family Studies	Advanced
Randol Waters	College of Agriculture	Initial / Advanced
Jinx Watson	College of Comm & Info Sci	Initial / Advanced
Lida Waugh	TPTE Art Ed	Initial / Advanced
Michael Waugh	ITHCS Instr Tech	Advanced
Robert Williams	Ed Psych & Counseling	Initial
Nancy Williamson	TPTE	Initial
Elaine Wilson	TPTE	Initial
Bill Wishart	Office of Prof Licensure	Initial / Advanced
Deborah Wooten	TPTE Reading	Initial / Advanced
Amy Wormsley	TPTE	Initial

Appendix F

Examples of Communications Related to Programs Outside the College

Email Exchange Relative to NCATE's Policy on Relationship with Other Accreditors

April 28, 2005

To: Donna Gollnick, Senior Vice-President, NCATE
 From: Lynn Cagle, Associate Dean and NCATE Coordinator
 Subject: Query about Other Accrediting Bodies

Hello Donna:

Hope you are well and still having fun. I have a question about Relationship with Other Nationally Recognized Accrediting Bodies. I have the Fall, October '04 summary of Board action. This summary does not list the accrediting groups that NCATE recognizes. There is only an "e.g." list of three such groups. I went to your website and found policies under which I see the same heading of "relationship with other....." and found a list of "recognized" accrediting organizations. There are 10 such bodies listed.

Question 1: If we have programs that have been accredited by these organizations we need only present (a) evidence of the successful accreditation and (b) compliance with Standard 1. Other standards do not apply. Is this correct?

Question 2: Later in the website policy (but not in the summary document) it states that nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and social work are not included in the review. Does this mean, for example, that social work is excluded even for a and b in Q1? In other words, our school social worker program is excused from any activity under scope of NCATE review?

Appreciate some clarity on this issue please, please!

Thanks,
 Lynn Cagle
 Associate Dean

Dear Lynn:

See my answers in bold following each of your questions:

Sincerely yours,

Donna M. Gollnick
 Senior Vice President

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
(202) 466-7496

(Q1) You are almost correct. You do have to provide evidence of accreditation by one of the groups listed in our policy on the website (e.g., a letter of accreditation with the applicable time of accreditation). You also have to show evidence that candidates are being assessed and meet their national standards. This evidence may be available in the materials presented for their accreditation by the other agency. The part that you missed is evidence that Standard 6 is met. We will want to know that the education unit is involved in the coordination of the accredited program.

(Q2) This is correct at this time. Our colleagues in these fields indicated that their standards are generic and not specifically related to schooling. We agreed that for now we will not include these programs in the NCATE review.

June 17, 2005

To: Antionette S. Mitchell, Associate Vice President, NCATE
From: Lynn Cagle, Associate Dean, College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
Subject: Query for Clarification

Antoinette:

Based on a discussion with Martin Nash yesterday I am seeking to verify my understanding and my actions already in place relative to the policy on “relationship with other nationally recognized accrediting bodies.” As I understand the policy, there are 10 such accrediting bodies representing the professional organizations that are recognized by NCATE. If we have programs that have been accredited by these organizations we need only present (a) evidence of the successful accreditation including the appropriate timeframe, and (b) documentation of compliance with NCATE standards 1 and 6 including evidence that their candidates are assessed and meet the standard of the organization.

Acting on this understanding which I think is pretty clearly stated in NCATE policy, I have communicated this to the appropriate faculty and heads in the programs affected in our unit. I am collecting the necessary documentation from the accreditation reviews and archives to meet the policy intent for standard 1. Compliance with standard 6 will be part of our unit documentation for all programs relative to governance and resources.

My request to you is to assure me that we are in line with NCATE policy by these understandings and actions.

Thanks so much for your assistance. Hope things go well for you.

Lynn Cagle
Associate Dean
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

June 20, 2006

To: Lynn Cagle
From: Antoinette S. Mitchell
Subject: Query for Clarification

Lynn:

Your interpretation of NCATE's policy on our recognition of the accreditation of other accreditors is correct in that for programs accredited by one of the recognized agencies listed in the policy, NCATE expects proof of accreditation and data pertaining to Standard 1 attesting that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in the standard have been learned by the candidates. In addition, NCATE expects that the program be included in Standard 6. These are the NCATE requirements and, in my opinion, your actions are in line with the policy. I do not know what your discussion was with Martin or if TN is requiring additional information. I hope my comments are helpful.

Antoinette

Antoinette S. Mitchell
Associate Vice President, Accreditation
NCATE
2010 Mass. Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

June 20, 2006

To: Antoinette S. Mitchell
From: Lynn Cagle
Subject: Query for Clarification

Antoinette:

Thanks for your prompt reply. Martin Nash visited with me one day last week at my request. Our site visit is scheduled for Fall of '06. I always stay in touch with Martin to learn from his experience gained from other visits in Tennessee. I am especially curious about things that crop up representing misinterpretations, confusion, pitfalls and also what he has seen relative to good practices in organizing for the visit. We never talk about the confidential stuff. So, I brought up this policy regarding other accrediting bodies to ask how this is being handled at other institutions that he might know about. He was unfamiliar with the policy and said it had not come up in his other visits. I had pulled and printed the policy statement off the NCATE website. I discussed it with my colleagues on our Assessment Team. To make sure of my understanding, I emailed Donna G. simply because I have known Donna for a long time and she trained me for BOE in the early nineties. She gave me the same answer you gave.

Nevertheless, Martin wanted me to check with you for corroboration. The responses are consistent. However, I still have one follow-up question. One part of the policy statement is still fuzzy to me. It is the statement listed as (2) "data demonstrating that candidates in these programs meet professional and state standards as expected in NCATE's Unit Standard 1." Donna G.'s email response to me when I asked for clarification states, "you also have to show evidence that candidates are being assessed and meet their national standards. This evidence may be available in the materials presented for their accreditation by the other agency." So, my fuzziness is centered on what standards are being referred to in the above statement under (2). Is it the standards of the "other" professional organization or specifically NCATE's elements under Standard 1? If it means the same as NCATE standard 1, what is the point of allowing another organization's accreditation review?

Thanks for your help in clarifying this. If you can think of institutions who have displayed good documentation in this arena please let me know. Sorry to go on so long.

Lynn Cagle
Associate Dean
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences

June 22, 2006

To: Lynn Cagle
From: Antoinette S. Mitchell
Subject: Query for Clarification

Lynn:

I spoke with Donna about your very good question in reference to our policy on outside accreditors and we agreed on the following: the unit should provide data indicating that candidates (in programs accredited by another accrediting agency) meet professional and state standards. This means that you need not be concerned about the specific elements in Standard 1 because the policy is referring to the standards of the other professional accrediting agency. Thank you for writing and asking this question. I was not quite interpreting the policy correctly and answering your question helped clarify things for me.

Antoinette

Antoinette S. Mitchell
Associate Vice President, Accreditation
NCATE
2010 Mass. Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

From: Antoinette@ncate.org
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 5:35 PM
To: Cagle, Lynn C.
Cc: Donna@ncate.org
Subject: Re: FW: More clarification needed

Lynn,

In response to your question about comment 2, Donna was referring to the standards of the other agency. So the policy is that the unit should have assessment data demonstrating candidate mastery of the other agency's standards. This is sufficient for Standard 1 for the relevant programs. A problem that sometimes arises is that some agencies require assessment data and some do not. If you have assessment data demonstrating candidate knowledge of the other agencies' standards, then you have sufficient data for that program. We sent out some confusing messages in one of the BOE Updates, so I understand the mix-up. Because we recognize that the BOE members are not experts in the given program areas, we do not expect them to do a thorough review of data for every standard, but rather, through their review of assessment data, to be assured that the candidates have actually learned rather than just been taught. As to why we have this relationship: it helps. Many institutions like the lesser reporting requirements.

Please let me know if I should talk with the state and BOE chair. I would be happy to do so.

Antoinette

Antoinette S. Mitchell
Vice President, Unit Accreditation
NCATE
2010 Mass. Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

From: "Cagle, Lynn C" lcagle@utk.edu
Sent: 10/26/2006 10:46 AM
To: Antoinette@ncate.org, Donna@ncate.org
cc:
Subject: FW: More clarification needed

Hi to you both. I am resending this inquiry in the event it didn't make it through the first time or got lost in the shuffle.
Thanks, Lynn Cagle

From: Cagle, Lynn C
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2006 4:41 PM
TO: Antoinette@ncate.org
Subject: More clarification needed

Hi Antoinette,

Sorry to bug you about this again but I am raising a clarification question regarding “other accrediting bodies recognized by NCATE”. We exchanged email correspondence in June of 2005 about NCATE’s policy in this regard.

Below is the operative excerpt of our email exchange (I do have the originals).

From me to you (June 20, 2005) (I had received essentially the same answer from Donna G. and from you about meeting Standard 1 through other accrediting organizations.) “Martin (Nash) wanted me to check with you for corroboration. The responses are consistent. However, I still have one follow-up question. One part of the policy statement is still fuzzy to me. It is the statement listed as (2) “data demonstrating that candidates in these programs meet professional and state standards as expected in NCATE’s Unit Standard 1”. Donna G. “email response to me when I asked for clarification states, “you also have to show evidence that candidates are being assessed and meet their national standards. This evidence may be available in the materials presented for their accreditation by the other agency.” So, my fuzziness is centered on what standards are being referred to in the statement under (2). Is it the standards of the “other” professional organization or specifically NCATE’s elements under Standard 1? If it means the same as NCATE Standard 1, what is the point of allowing another organization’s accreditation review?

From you to me (June 22, 2005) “Lynn, I spoke with Donna about your very good question in reference to our policy on outside accreditors and we agreed on the following: The unit should provide data indicating that candidates (in programs accredited by another accrediting agency) meet professional and state standards. This means that you need not be concerned about the specific elements in Standard 1 because the policy is referring to the standards of the other professional accrediting agency. Thank you for writing and asking this question. I was not quite interpreting the policy correctly and answering your question helped clarify things for me.”

Now, fast forward to our NCATE/State previsit on September 14. This topic came up and our NCATE chair stated something like this - - - “you will need to have evidence in the other accreditors materials that your students meet Standard 1”. (I can’t be sure of the exact words and don’t wish to unfairly or incorrectly misstate what she said, but Martin Nash and one of my colleagues who was in the meeting both believe that the statement above captures her message.) So, my question is what exactly is a BOE person to look for in these materials? If we have the unit’s report to the other accrediting body in evidence, the other accrediting body’s report back to the unit, a rejoinder from the unit if applicable and the letter of accreditation from the other accrediting body covering the time frame of our unit accreditation what more could we have? If our candidates didn’t “meet professional and state standards’ of the other accrediting body it is not likely that our programs would be accredited by those agencies. It just seems to me there is a bit of illogical and circular reasoning possible in the interpretation of the policy. If then an

examiner looks for evidence that candidates meet professional and state standards but the other accreditors' standards and their format for reporting compliance vary greatly so as to complicate the question of what specific "things" are being examined and how does one determine that for that particular program the candidates "meet" or "do not meet" the equivalent of Standard 1. Further, if NCATE has "accepted" the accreditation process of other agencies wouldn't you assume that candidates in a fully accredited program (with proof of accreditation) have met relevant performance standards. If NCATE were to be displeased by the standards of other agencies as to meeting the intent of NCATE Standard 1, why did NCATE agree to accept and honor the accreditation of those agencies?

Sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative but this whole area begs for better guidance and since our visit is now one month away I want to be in line but I also wish that we can have some level of agreement about this issue before the visit. I also don't want to upset our Chair but there was a certain level of disagreement between the NCATE Chair, the State Consultant, the State Chair and myself (the unit NCATE coordinator) on this policy. I would like for it not to be a huge issue at the time of the visit.

Thanks for your time and consideration (of this very long epistle!).

Lynn Cagle
Associate Dean and NCATE Coordinator
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences The University of Tennessee