

Institutional Report

University of Missouri-St. Louis

College of Education

Prepared for the

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

October 16-20, 2004 Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview of the University of Missouri-St. Louis	1
History	1
Institutional Mission and Character	1

Characteristics and Demographics of Service Area	2
University Structure	2
Overview of the College of Education	3
College of Education Mission	3
College of Education Vision	3
College of Education Students	3
College of Education Background	4
Future Directions	9
Major Changes Since Last Visit	10
College of Education Changes	10
The Conceptual Framework and Knowledge Base	13
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions	17
Content Knowledge of Teacher Candidates	17
Career Transition Certificate Program	21
Special Education Transition Program	23
Special Education Innovative Certification Program	24
Content Knowledge for Other School Personnel	24
Counselor Education	25
Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates	28
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates	31
Professional Knowledge and Skills for other Professional School Personnel	33
Dispositions for All Candidates	34
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates	39
Student Learning for other Professional School Personnel	41
Standard 2: Assessment System & Unit Evaluation	42
Overview	42
Ongoing Program Improvement (OPI) System Procedures	43
Procedures for Communicating Data and Decisions	47
Strengths and Successes of the OPI System	48
Challenges for the OPI System	48
Candidate Assessment System	49
Technology and the COE Assessment System	54
Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	55
Overview	55
Collaboration between the Unit and School Partners	57
Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	60
Candidate's Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skill and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn	64
Standard 4: Diversity	66
Overview	66

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences	68
Experiences Working With Diverse Faculty	71
Experience Working With Diverse Candidates	73
Student Recruitment Plans and Initiatives	75
Experience Working With Diverse Students in P-12 Schools	76
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development	
78	
Qualified Faculty	78
Modeling Best Professional Practice in Teaching	80
Integrating the Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base in Coursework	80
Modeling Best Professional Practice in Scholarship	81
Modeling Best Professional Practice in Service/Collaboration	82
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance	83
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development	83
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	84
Unit Leadership and Authority	84
Unit Budget	85
Personnel	85
Unit Facilities	86
Unit Resources Including Technology	86
Appendix A	88
Appendix B	89
Appendix C	94
Appendix D	95

Table of Figures

Figure 1	18
PRAXIS Tests Scores for Teacher Education Program Completers	
Figure 2	20
Portfolio Scores for MoSTE Quality Indicator 1: Content	
Figure 3	21
Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Content Knowledge	
Figure 4	23
Career Transition Certificate Programs Praxis Scores	
Figure 5	24
Institutional Report on School Leaders Licensure Assessment Scores Testing Period: 9-1-2002 through 8/31/2003	
Figure 6	25
Selected Issues from Survey of Employers of Graduates of the M.Ed. in Administration (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004)	
Figure 7	27
Counselor Education Comprehensive Examination Scores	
Figure 8	27
School Counselor Praxis Scores	
Figure 9	28
Graduate Survey Data Related to Counselor Education Content Knowledge	
Figure 10	28
Employer Survey Results Related to Content Knowledge	
Figure 11	29
Teacher Education Portfolio Results on MoSTEP Beginning Quality Indicators Related to Pedagogical Content Knowledge (Winter 2002-Winter 2004)	
Figure 12	30
Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Pedagogical Content Knowledge	
Figure 13	30
Percentage of portfolios containing different types of technology artifacts	
Figure 14	31
Beginning Teacher Professional Preparation Program	
Figure 15	32
Teacher Preparation Portfolio Scores on MoSTEP Quality Indicators Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	
Figure 16	33
Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)	
Figure 17	33
Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	
Figure 18	35

Teacher Preparation Portfolio Scores on MoSTEP Quality Indicators Related to Dispositions	
Figure 19	36
Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)	
Figure 20	37
Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)	
Figure 21	38
Survey of Employers of Graduates of the M.Ed. in Administration (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004)	
Figure 22	39
Employer Survey Results Related to Counselor Dispositions	
Figure 23	39
Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)	
Figure 24	42
Employer Survey Responses Related to Student Learning	
Figure 25	42
Employer Survey Results Related to Counselor Dispositions	
Figure 26	43
On-going Program Improvement System Roll-out Plan	
Figure 27	44
OPIS Annual Calendar	
Figure 28	44
Areas of Review and Quality Targets	
Figure 29	47
OPI Procedures for Communicating Data and Decisions	
Figure 30	50
Teacher Education Candidate Assessment Plan	
Figure 31	51
Timeline for Completing and Implementing the New Teacher Education Candidate Assessment Plan	
Figure 32	52
School Counselor Candidate Assessment Plan	
Figure 33	54
School Leader Candidate Assessment Plan	
Figure 34	72
Composition of Faculty	
Figure 35	72
COE Staff Development Activities on Diversity Issues	
Figure 36	73
Annual Unduplicated COE Majors by Fiscal Year, Gender, and Ethnic Origin	
Figure 37	74
Female Student Ethnic Mix	
Figure 38	75

Male Student Ethnic Mix	
Figure 39	78
Survey of Employers of Novice Teachers	
Figure 40	85
College Of Education Expenditures\	
Figure 41	85
Ward Barnes Education Library Report	

Institutional Report
University of Missouri-St. Louis
College of Education

This report has been prepared to provide the visiting team with documentation of the UM-St. Louis College of Education's ongoing growth and development since the previous visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in 1998 and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in 1999.

Overview of the University of Missouri-St. Louis

History

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is one of four campuses that constitute the University of Missouri system. Established in Columbia in 1839, the University of Missouri became a land-grant institution upon passage of the Morrill Act by Congress in 1862. The newest campus was instituted in St. Louis in 1963.

UM-St. Louis has become a large modern campus of almost 300 acres with 58 buildings housing academic and other University activities. Student enrollment has grown from 600 in 1963 to now more than 15,000. It is the largest university serving St. Louisans and the third largest university in the state. The university faculty has increased from 30 in 1963 to more than 900 members, committed to teaching, research, and service.

Institutional Mission and Character

Each university defines itself by the connection of its vision and mission to our global society. In the St. Louis region the College of Education prepares the largest number of educators and is one of the two institutions preparing the largest numbers of educational professionals in Missouri. The faculty of the University of Missouri-St. Louis and the College of Education have a responsibility to prepare students for the challenges they face now and in the future as professionals, as lifelong learners, and as members of the state and regional communities.

In addition to the university's comprehensive role as a research university to advance knowledge and understanding, the University of Missouri-St. Louis has a special mission determined by its urban location and its shared land-grant tradition, working in partnership with other key community institutions to help the St. Louis region progress and prosper. In recent years, however, the diversity of the local and state economies, the complexity of the political and social structures, and the emerging needs of the local community have all

exerted pressures on the university toward expanded “communiversity” roles. Thus, through a careful melding of strengths in scholarly research, teaching, and community engagement, the College of Education plays a leadership role in advancing scholarship, and providing quality undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction for the large numbers of diverse students in the St. Louis area, while also contributing to economic development throughout the state and region.

Globalization has brought another kind of pressure to the university. New partnerships go beyond the local neighborhood and St. Louis region. University of Missouri-St. Louis reaches out to other parts of the country and other parts of the world, bringing skills and knowledge to bear on wider problems and bringing back to the campus greater understandings of a rapidly changing world. Faculty in the College of Education see these changes as a natural evolution and growth of the institution, and they support these developments by creating new partnerships and experimenting with new forms of community engagement. Yet they are concerned about overextending the campus role and overtaxing the human and physical resources of the College of Education. The University of Missouri-St. Louis and the College of Education need to be responsible and responsive to emerging educational needs for all its constituents if we intend to remain an “engaged university” (Kellogg, 1999) for the 21st century.

Characteristics and Demographics of Service Area

More than 2.6 million people live in the Greater St. Louis region, which includes 12 counties covering 6,375 square miles in Missouri and Illinois, making it the 18th largest metropolitan area in the United States.

Percent of Population by Age Group (2003)

	United States	St. Louis
17 & Under	25%	26%
18-24	10%	9%
25-34	14%	13%
35-49	23%	24%
50+	28%	28%

Race, Ethnic and Gender-2003

Caucasian	81.5%
Black or African American	17.0%
Hispanic	1.1%
Asian/PI	1.0%
American Indian/Eskimo	0.2%
Other Races	0.9%
Male	48.1%
Female	51.9%

Source: Regional Chamber and Growth Association

University Structure

The UM-St. Louis campus curriculum offers more than 40 undergraduate programs, 30 master's programs, seven preprofessional programs, 12 doctoral programs, and one professional degree program. UM-St. Louis consists of the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business Administration, College of Education, Evening College, College of Fine Arts and Communication, Graduate School, Pierre LaCledé Honors College, Barnes College of Nursing and Health Studies, College of Optometry, UM-St. Louis/Washington University Joint Engineering Program, School of Social Justice and Continuing Education.

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is a public institution, accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Mission Statement

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is the land-grant research institution committed to meeting the diverse needs in the state's largest metropolitan community. It educates traditional and nontraditional students in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs so that they may provide leadership in health professions, liberal and fine arts, science and technology, and metropolitan affairs such as business, education, and public policy. University research advances knowledge in all areas, and through outreach and public service, assists in solving, in particular, problems of the St. Louis region.

Academic programs are enriched through advanced technologies and partnerships that link UM-St. Louis to institutions and businesses locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. Its special commitment to partnership provides UM-St. Louis with a leadership role among public educational and cultural institutions in improving the region's quality of life, while its relations with two- and four-year colleges and universities in the St. Louis region promote seamless educational opportunities.

University Vision Statement

UM-St. Louis strives to strengthen its educational programs at all levels, enhance the research capacities of its faculty and students, and serve the region's needs through research and technology transfer, cooperative and educational outreach programs, and workforce development.

The University of Missouri-St. Louis aspires to improve its ranking among its peer group. Specifically, as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Intensive Institution, the University of Missouri-St. Louis seeks a national reputation for the high quality of its faculty in research and teaching, the eminence of its programs, the success and satisfaction of its students and alumni the importance it represents to the state's most populous metropolitan area. The University will pursue its vision within an environment that embraces diversity, integrity, respect, trust, openness, fairness, performance, and accountability.

Overview of the College of Education

College of Education Mission

The Mission of the College is directly tied to that of the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The College maintains and supports that mission as well as the strategic plan developed by the campus faculty, students and administration.

College of Education Vision

The University of Missouri-St. Louis 21st Century College of Education will be a national leader in education research and scholarship that supports education professionals within an expanding collaborative community. The college is committed to significantly advancing the quality of teaching and learning as it serves a dynamic, technologically advanced, and diverse community. The College of Education at UM-St. Louis provides a collaborative teaching and learning environment which prepares and provides support to professional educators for instructional, leadership, research and other professional roles in school and non-school settings to serve a dynamic, technologically advanced and diverse community.

The COE vision is captured in our theme, “**Educators for the Future: Diversity, Community, Excellence.**”

College of Education Students

Approximately 84% of the teacher education undergraduates are transfer students. Freshmen and sophomores declaring education as their major are assigned to the unit for advising but are not admitted to the teacher preparation program until requirements are met. These include completing 60 credit hours, a minimum of a 2.5 GPA, score of 235 on the CBASE test and an ACT score of 20 or higher.

College of Education Enrollment

Program	Fall 2003	Winter 2004
Undergraduate (and post-baccalaureate) 1,445		1,325
Graduate	806	835
Doctoral	172	167

College of Education Background

The College of Education is accredited by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education of the State of Missouri (DESE) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In the St. Louis region the College of Education prepares the largest number of educators and is one of the two institutions preparing the largest numbers of educational professionals in Missouri.

Teacher education has always been a high priority on the campus. A Division of Teacher Education was established in 1964 and a professional School of Education in 1966. In 2000, the School applied for and received standing as the “College” of Education. From the very beginning of teacher education on this campus, a unique feature has been the faculty “joint appointment,” that is, a faculty member with an appointment in the College of Arts & Sciences and an appointment in the College of Education. The College has 11 joint appointment faculty and 14 endowed professors.

The reorganized college consists of four divisions, established in 1998. These include Teaching and Learning, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Counseling and Family Therapy, and Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation. The overall governance structure is illustrated in [Appendix A](#). There are 69 full-time faculty members teaching in the COE.

Programs and Certificates

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level (ITP or ADV)	Number of Candidates	Agency or Association Reviewing Program (State, SPA, or Other)	Status of National and State Program Review (yes or no)	Status (First Rejoinder, Complete)
Early Childhood (B-3)	ITP		127	State	no	Concurrent visit
Elementary (1-6)	ITP	497	State	no		Concurrent visit
Middle School (5-9) Including Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science	ITP	64	State	no		Concurrent visit
Art (K-12)	ITP	2	State	no		Concurrent visit

<p>English (9-12)</p>	<p>ITP</p>	<p>111State</p>	<p>no</p>			<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>
<p>French (K-91, K-12)</p>	<p>ITP</p>	<p>17State</p>	<p>no</p>			<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>
<p>German (K-91, K-12) Post-bac only</p>	<p>ITP</p>	<p>3State</p>	<p>no</p>			<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>

Spanish (K-91, K-12)	ITP	28State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Health (K-9, K-12) 1	ITP		State no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Mathematics (9-12)	ITP	66State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

Music: Instrumental; Music: Vocal (K-12)	ITP	3State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Physical Ed. (K-9, K-12)	ITP	90State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Social Science (9-12)	ITP	163State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

Speech/Theater (9-12) <i>Endorsement only</i>	ITP	6State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Biology (9-12)	ITP	28State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Chemistry (9-12)	ITP	14State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

<p>Physics (9-12)</p>	<p>ITP</p>	<p>8State</p>	<p>no</p>		<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>
<p>Unified Science: Biology (9-12) <i>Endorsement only</i></p>	<p>ITP</p>		<p>State no</p>		<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>
<p>Unified Science: Chemistry (9-12) <i>Endorsement only</i></p>	<p>ITP</p>		<p>State no</p>		<p>C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t</p>

Unified Science: Physics (9-12) <i>Endorsement only</i>	ITP		State no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Early Childhood Special Ed. (B-3)	ITP	10 State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Mild/Moderate: Cross Categorical (K-12)	ITP	114 State	no		C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

Counselor (K-8, 9-12, K-12)1	ITP	60State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Principal (K-8, 5-9, 9-12)1	ADV	45State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Special Reading (K-12)1	ADV		State no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

School Psychologist (K-12)1	ADV	17State	no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Special Education Director (K-12)1, Inactive	ADV		State no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t
Superintendent (K-12)	ADV		State no			C o n c u r r e n t v i s i t

Office of Advising, Professional Experiences and Certification

The office provides services such as recruitment, admission procedures and documentation, student advising, tracking of program requirements and student teaching for undergraduate and/or certification as well as non-certification programs. The Division of Teaching and Learning works closely with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education who is responsible for the administration of the APEC Office (APEC). The office also works with the campus advising center, transfer and articulation issues, certification changes and community and stakeholder groups. The Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP), Council on the

Improvement of Education (CIE) and Student Advisory Group (SAG) were initiated by APEC since Fall, 2002.

Students are advised by three advisors, including a certification officer. Student teaching and clinical experiences are overseen by two clinical experience directors who are also faculty members and teach courses. The office staff also includes an Administrative Assistant and Word Processor. An informational handbook regarding all information necessary for graduation and certification is provided in hard copy to all students who make appointments and on line.

Office of Graduate Education

The office is administered by the Associate Dean and a staff of three personnel, including a Coordinator of Graduate Advising and a Department Assistant. The Graduate Education Office monitors the recruitment, admissions, advising, registration, retention, tracking, and graduation of all graduate students in the College of Education. It disseminates information to graduate students regarding degree and graduate certificate programs and requirements. The office also coordinates the applications and selection of doctoral assistants, awarding of the dissertation fellowships, awarding of the dissertation grants, awarding of the doctoral student travel grants, and awarding of the metro Illinois scholarships. It provides a liaison to the Graduate Education Committee and coordinates the flow of course and degree proposals through the appropriate approval steps. Exit and employer surveys are conducted through the Graduate Education Office.

Graduate Programs - Masters degrees are offered in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education, Counseling and Educational Administration. Doctoral programs include a PhD in Education, with emphasis areas in Counseling, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Educational Psychology and Teaching-Learning Processes. Also offered is an EdD in Education with an emphasis in Behavioral-Development or Learning-Instruction.

Proposed New Degree Programs and Certifications - In order to meet the goals of its Strategic Plan, UM-St. Louis will introduce a series of degree and certificate programs. Listed below are new academic programs for which UM-St. Louis plans to seek approval. These programs represent "late stage" programs that are listed in the campus's Academic Plan for the College of Education: 1) Master of Education in Adult and Higher Education, 2) Education Specialist in Education Administration, and 3) Education Specialist in School Psychology.

Off-Campus Programs

The elementary education program is offered off-campus at Jefferson College in Hillsboro, Missouri. The first cohort of 22 students began the program in Fall, 2002 and graduated in May, 2004. Twenty-two courses were conducted through Summer 2004. All sections involved face-to-face teaching by full time and adjunct College of Education faculty. There are 18 confirmed enrollments for Fall 2004 in the second cohort which began in Fall, 2003. Ten students have enrolled thus are for the third cohort to be initiated in Fall, 2004.

Online Learning

Through the establishment of the E. Desmond Lee Technology and Learning Center in April 2000, along with a PT3 grant and internal support, the College has developed a culture of technology-enhanced

teaching and learning with an unmatched level of sophistication in tech support and service. The following is a list of programs and courses offered via distance learning technologies:

- New masters in Adult Education is offered online
- First of a series of online courses available to public school administrators is online
- Undergraduate and graduate early childhood courses are offered on-line

Campus Wide Offices and Centers

- Career Services -Career Services works in partnership with employers and the campus community by assisting students and alumni to develop, implement, and evaluate job search strategies.
- Center for Academic Development - The Center offers a variety of academic support services designed to assist students in their mastery of course contents and the efficient and successful completion of their academic programs. The Center's Assessment unit assists students, faculty, and community by providing group and individual academic testing, including make-up exams, admission and qualifying exams, CLEP and correspondence course exams, and a range of certification tests in service to the community. The Assessment unit implements the campus assessment plan.
- Center for Teaching and Learning - The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), a division of the Office of Academic Affairs, exists to promote high-quality teaching at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The center offers a place for all involved in instruction to meet formally and informally so as to learn and support each other in the scholarship of teaching. The center's services are voluntary and confidential.
- Counseling Services – has a mission to assist students, staff and faculty to define and accomplish their personal, career and academic goals through counseling, consultation, educational outreach programs, teaching and training. They are committed to tailoring their services to the needs of a culturally diverse campus population.
- Financial Aid - provides scholarships, grants, & student loan information.
- International Student Services - works to successfully integrate international students into the UM-St. Louis community.
- Technology Support Center - provides Help desk and student account information.
- University Health Services - promotes wellness through care and education for the university community. University Health Services (UHS) is a nurse-driven ambulatory clinic. The director is a Nurse Practitioner with a doctoral degree. Care is provided by a Nurse Practitioner, a Registered Nurse, and a Medical Assistant.

Joint Campus Centers, Offices

- Center for Human Origin and Cultural Diversity - established in Fall, 1995, as a joint venture between the College of Education, Anthropology Department (the College of Arts and Science), and the May^obuye Center (Archive of the African National Congress) at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. It is housed in the Anthropology Department but will be moved to a COE facility during the 2004-2005 academic year. Its director is a faculty member in the College Education. The College of Education provides expertise in designing curriculum for elementary through high school students; the Anthropology Department provides expertise in understanding human origin and cultural diversity.
- Campus Libraries - two campus libraries serve the needs of students, faculty and visitors. The Thomas Jefferson Library is located on north campus, and the Ward E. Barnes Library is located on the south campus in the College of Education.

COE Centers, Resources, Services

- Educational Materials and Recycle Center - established in 2000 to provide UM-St. Louis education students and classroom teachers with supplies for creative play and art activities, math manipulatives, and hands-on science. The UMSL Educational Materials and Recycle Center is connected to the St. Louis Teachers Recycle Center and to a National organization of Recycle Centers. Students and teachers visit the Center to find recycled materials donated by local businesses. Each year approximately 2000 pounds of materials are given out to hundreds of students and teachers. In addition to the creative supplies, the Educational Materials and Recycle Center houses the print library for the Reading Center, a laminating machine, die cut machine, teaching supplies and professional resources. Students and teachers may check out books, supplies, and resources for a nominal fee which is used to purchase additional books and materials. In the last year, faculty in early childhood and reading have voluntarily taken on the role of managing the Center for interested students and teachers.
- Mathematics Education Lab - a resource lab, located in the lower level of Marillac Hall, contains a wide variety of mathematic manipulatives, resource activity books, K-12 mathematics series, journals, mathematics content books and teacher guidebooks. The materials are utilized in several ways. Instructors borrow the teaching aids and written materials for class demonstrations and individualized and/or small group work. Education students check out the items to use as resource for writing lesson plans and activities to fulfill course assignment requirements. The resources are also used to work with K-6 students in field experience small group tutoring settings, as required in the mathematics education courses. The lab provides education students the opportunities to reflect upon their success teaching with the manipulatives, gain valuable teaching ideas for real world situations and analyze many published source materials.
- Reading Center - provides reading assessment and instruction to children and families in the community. It is a free service carried out by graduate students enrolled in Master's level reading courses and working toward a Missouri Special Reading Certificate. Currently graduate students enrolled in Ele Ed 6486, 6488, 6493 and 6494 work closely with families in the Reading Center. The UM-St. Louis Reading Center is funded by prior grants, connection to the Educational Materials and Recycle Center, and fund raising, such as annual book fairs run by students and reading faculty. Approximately 600 families from across the St. Louis Metropolitan area, especially Normandy and St. Louis City, are on the mailing list and receive applications for enrollment at the start of each of the three UM-St. Louis semesters – Fall, Winter, and Summer. In each semester session, the Reading Center is able to serve between 60-80 families in areas of reading.
- University Child Development Center (UCDC) - a campus-based child-care center serving the University of Missouri-St. Louis and surrounding communities. The purposes of the Center are to provide high quality programming for children and their parents; staff development and teacher training; and a site for child study/research.

Memberships in Professional Organizations

The College maintains the following professional accreditations and institutional memberships:

Accredited by:

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs

Member of:

Holmes Partnership

Council of the Great City Colleges of Education

Great Cities Universities

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

University Council for Educational Administration

Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and
Affiliated Private Universities

Future Directions

The 2003-2004 Futures II Vision, compared to the preceding Futures I Vision, is a significant extension and refinement of the vision and a deepening of the commitment to the core focuses expressed in the Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base document. Futures II represents a continuum from strategic planning that first took place in 1997, Futures I designed in 1999 that looked forward 5 years, development of the Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base statement in 2002 to the current vision statement created in the past academic year.

The formal Futures II strategic planning process for the College began in 2003 with input from education stakeholders throughout the community, and in consideration of current education challenges, policies and influences. Aligned with the Knowledge Base Statement and Conceptual Framework, the following vision statements for the future were adopted by the College of Education faculty at their October 17, 2003 meeting:

Collaboration and Partnerships: Creates and supports programs and partnerships with and among a broad range of community organizations, university colleagues, College of Education faculty, alumni and students.

Educator Preparation: Prepares educators with the content knowledge, instructional tools, skills, strategies, and dispositions necessary to engage culturally diverse students in active learning and critical inquiry in order to maximize their academic achievement and promote social justice.

Innovative and Collaborative Graduate Programs: Offers innovative, technology-enhanced and practice-based graduate programs that attract quality applicants to a diverse and active community of scholars-leaders.

Faculty Development: Acts as a community of responsible scholar-practitioners who engage in professional renewal by applying an informed knowledge base to themselves, their students, the campus and the larger community.

Professional Development and Lifelong Learning: Promotes and supports the professional development and lifelong learning of educators, university faculty, and learners in the workplace for the benefit of the broader community.

Social Justice: Prepares and supports ethically minded individuals who engage the culture in ways that bring about social justice, equal access, and culture change at all points of contact with the community and educational system.

Technology: Creates models for technology enhanced instruction to serve developing and practicing professionals and to provide widespread and equitable access to quality learning opportunities for all learners.

Leadership: Demonstrates leadership in the profession and advances good practice through research, collaboration, and the exchange of knowledge and innovation with internal and external communities.

Advocacy for the College of Education: Keeps the College of Education, its strengths and

accomplishments, in the public eye and aggressively works to improve the work and public perceptions of the College of Education.

Diversity: Creates a culture that affirms and embraces diversity and challenges oppressive attitudes and environments.

Research: Values and promotes the diversity of scholarly inquiry to contribute to shared understanding of all aspects of education.

Documenting Impact of College of Education Endeavors: Demonstrates to the public, through strong scholarship and collaborative partnerships, the positive impact of the College of Education and its faculty on student achievement in the schools, on the quality of life in the community, and on the professional performance of its graduates.

Alumni Relations: Cultivates a collaborative and reciprocal relationship with its alumni as a means to building, refining, and extending the vision of the College of Education.

Over the past six years, the College of Education has undergone a wide variety of fundamental changes in its organizational structure, curriculum, program design and relationship with area schools, agencies and communities. The process and products of these shifts have been closely connected to the theme of our mission, vision and conceptual framework which not only serve to guide the efforts but also help us assess their effectiveness. The impact of the major directions and accomplishments are listed below.

College of Education Changes

Reorganized, Renamed College: The College of Education was reorganized and named in 2000 with four divisions to better serve the student community and reflect the depth and breadth of our areas of study. The divisions are: “Teaching and Learning,” “Educational Leadership and Policy Studies,” “Counseling And Family Therapy,” and “Educational Psychology, Research, and Evaluation.”

Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base: Shared Vision and Coherence: This document was produced in 2002 and represents a consensus of our faculty and community partners on fundamental belief and educational issues. These guide all programs and curricular decisions and have been disseminated to stake holders groups, students, partners and community agencies. A detailed description is contained in the next section of this report.

Technology Learning Center: The College of Education Technology and Learning Center was created as a full-service, continually staffed facility to support, mirror and model technology integration in teaching practice by faculty and students. The TLC offers help on demand to faculty and students, runs a drop-in computer lab for members of the community, supports integration of technology into course work, and provides consulting and services to area schools and educational organizations. Additionally, the TLC has a technology checkout program available for workshops and special projects.

Increased Community Partnerships and Service: K-12 Partnerships and community collaboration involve over 200 schools and school districts, particularly the St. Louis Public Schools, the 12 community college districts in Missouri, and St. Louis community institutions like the Science Center, Art Museum, Symphony, Opera Theatre, Youth Organizations and Variety Club.

Additional examples include the St. Louis Gear-Up (Gaining Early Awareness And Readiness for Undergraduate Programs). It is a 6-year project bringing together four institutions of higher education, Missouri's Coordinating Board for Higher Education, and three community based agencies to improve teaching and learning, parental involvement and student achievement with a cohort of over 1000 students from five high need middle schools. The Urban Achievement Alliance (UAA) engages public and private school teachers and administrators in reflective practice around common urban education problems. The mission of the Urban Achievement Alliance (UAA) is to involve urban education stakeholders in a public discussion and information exchange, to engage teachers and administrators in reflective practice around common urban education problems.

The most recent collaborations include:

- Partnership with Francis Howell School District promoting the character development and academic achievement of their students
- The National Character Education Partnership
- Undergraduate program internships in St. Louis City schools
- Formation of an online network for the region's principals

COE Assessment System: The Ongoing Improvement System (OPI) enables the COE to document student progress, faculty, student and unit records in a database that accessible to all faculties. Findings are regularly analyzed and reflect upon and, when appropriate, acted upon by faculty. Data is gathered not only on student knowledge, dispositions, gate information, student and employer survey results, but also on advising reports and surveys as well as clinical experience information.

External Funding and Private Giving: External giving totaled 21 million dollars from 1998-2003,. The many grants, gifts and contracts helps the College extend its resources and expertise to directly reach thousands of K-12 students and educators in the St. Louis region and the state with programs to increase student achievement and provide lifelong learning opportunities for teachers.

Endowed Professorships: The College of Education has 14 endowed professors holding rank and specializing in various aspects of children's education, including science education, character education, art education, urban education, and disabilities education. Each professorship has formalized connections with the region's public cultural and science learning institutions.

New Facility for Connecting Education to Workforce: In 2001, the College opened the St. Louis Regional Center for Education and Work to help connect the region's economic and educational goals. One of its main purposes is to connect K-12 classrooms with the world of work. The Center is a data and information resource for regional research and planning efforts in workforce development, career preparation, employment trends, job forecasting, serving economic development organizations, K-12 education, school counseling, labor force training, and social service providers.

Stakeholder Groups: Three new stakeholder groups have been established to provide forums for feedback on all programs and curricula. Data gathered at the meetings have been used to inform faculty of constituents'

opinions, impressions and recommendations. The groups include:

1. *Council for Improvement of Teacher Education*: This organization includes alumni, teachers, administrators and students. Meetings were held in spring semester and Fall Semester 2003 and Winter Semester 2004. During the fall, 2003 meeting, the focus was broadened to include Counselor Education as well. Faculty presented synopsis of their programs and discussions were held on their goals, achievements and issues related to their mission.
2. *Beginning Teachers Assistance Program*: UM-SL College of Education graduates in their first or second year of teaching attended a year long program designed to support their professional careers.
3. *Student Advisory Group*: Students from all programs in the COE were invited to belong to the Student Advisory Group. Meeting in February 2004, students from elementary education, early childhood education, graduate programs and special education met to reflect on their experiences and courses. Feedback was communicated to the Division of Teaching and Learning by Helene Sherman and to the Graduate Dean, who attended the meeting.

Diversity/Social Justice Professional Development: The faculty is heavily engaged in dialog concerning issues of social justice and their relationship to the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Study groups, discussion groups and professional development sessions have taken place to infuse the programs with the concepts outlined in our FUTURES document as well as Knowledge Base/ Conceptual Framework positions.

Undergraduate Education Program Changes

- Redesigned Undergraduate Teacher Education Program: The undergraduate teacher education program has been completely redesigned as of 2002. In the new "Metro Learning Communities Program," education students immediately begin working in school settings with experienced teachers in their earliest Level I exploratory courses. An informational brochure is included in the document exhibit.
- Teacher Education Program On-Line Application: This electronic process became fully digitized in February 2004. Application data is submitted by students and captured so that records are documented in the COE database. Students are informed in an electronic response, of their acceptance or denial and reasons for the latter. Deficiencies are listed and students must submit their plans for remediating them, if they exist, prior to reapplying.
- Electronic Certification Portfolios: By Spring, 2005, all certification portfolios will be submitted electronically. Students and faculty are participating in professional development workshops to prepare for the implementation. Pilot groups of students have been utilizing the technology since fall, 2003. E-portfolios are held to the same standards and assessed by the same rubrics as paper portfolios.
- Community College Transfer and Articulation Agreements: Since the Winter 2001 semester, community college education transfer liaisons have met regularly with COE Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, undergraduate advisors and faculty. Agreements have been established with the St. Louis Community College District regarding courses to be transferred from community colleges to UM-SL teacher education programs.

New Programs to Reduce Teacher Shortages: The College established several alternative certification programs which include:

- The Career Transition Certification Program was created to address critical need teacher shortages in

the St. Louis Public Schools. Certification is offered in math, science and technology, art, music and special education. This program is designed to prepare mid-career professionals for teacher certification and is jointly sponsored by the St. Louis Public Schools, the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

- Special Education Innovative Certification Program (SEICP) is a 24-36 month program designed for those wanting certification in: K-12 Mild/Moderate Cross-Categorical Special Education. It is offered to post-baccalaureate candidates seeking to obtain initial teaching certification in special education.
- Special Education Transition Program (SET) is a 18-24 month program designed for individuals who have an initial teaching certificate who want to add certification in K-12 Mild/Moderate Cross Categorical Special Education.

Graduate Program Changes

- Increased Programming for Professionals in Higher Education:
 - New Higher Education PhD/EdD areas of study for individuals planning careers in higher education administration.
 - New on-line Adult/Higher Education and Early Childhood Education Master's Degree programs.
- Increased Support and Opportunities for Post-Graduate Education: The number of research assistantships available to doctoral students was increased from 6 teaching-only assistantships to 14 teaching or research assistantships (expressed in terms of .5 FTE positions). The Doctoral Student Dissertation Grants program provides assistantships for students for additional research experience and facilitates the scholarly activities of our own faculty, as well.
- Revised Masters Degree Program: The Master of Education degree program provides a range of opportunities for practicing teachers and other educators to develop their unique skills in order to increase teachers' impact on students. This degree has been developed to build a solid foundation of knowledge, skills, and understanding for dedicated experienced professionals.
- Division of Counseling and Family Therapy: The Division of Counseling and Family Therapy performed a comprehensive self-study designed to ensure that the program continued to meet the standards of excellence established by this accrediting body. Changes included the addition of new full-time faculty members, including specialists in school counseling. A number of changes designed to improve the faculty evaluation process, in order to maximize the value of input provided by our students, were also initiated.

In 2001, the Faculty of the College of Education recognized that after years of change, its existing Conceptual Framework and Knowledge Base no longer reflected the direction and impetus of the College and its new identity. As a result, the College formed a faculty task force, representing all divisions of the College. This task force gathered to develop a new conceptual framework, one better reflecting the character of the unit. A committee of fourteen faculty members representing the various program areas and one student of the College of Education met on October 22, 2001 to begin developing a Knowledge Base Statement for the COE in order to communicate the bases of our educational programs. We organized our thoughts into six categories and connected them to the value statements of our Vision for the Future document, which was developed in collaboration with community members through a series of conversations and deliberations over a period of one year. We also used state and national guidelines for developing conceptual frameworks, the Philosophy

Statement of the College and the Visions for the Future document of the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Committee members were assigned in pairs to address the six categories identified in the first meeting: Mission and Character, Engagement in Multiple Contexts, Individuals and Communities, Social Justice, Educational Practice and Partnerships. Later, we added a category: Recent Historical Background. Committee faculty led small groups of COE faculty through discussions of the principles and concepts. The committee met 10 times over four months to revise the drafts in response to the feedback from the faculty. The document was approved by a vote of the College of Education faculty on February 15, 2002. Each of the Divisions in the College developed a more specific Knowledge Base and Conceptual Framework that connects to these adopted principles.

The resulting Knowledge Base and Conceptual Framework, representing shared and collective knowledge, serves as a foundation for the specialized knowledge in education for each of the College's four Divisions charged with the work of educating administrators, counselors, teachers, specialists and researchers. This document describes the foundational knowledge for the educational programs of the College.

Because the Conceptual Framework and Knowledge Base have grown out of our Futures I visioning and strategic planning process and because it was instrumental in the creation of the Futures II process, it is a mindset shared not only by all faculty and staff but also by our partners and stakeholders who have been represented in each Futures effort, as well as our recent curriculum re-designs and implementations.

The Conceptual Framework and Knowledge Base Statements are organized into five areas and connected to the value statements of our strategic plan contained in the *Vision for the Future* document and our more recent Futures II work. In each and across all, we describe who we are, what we believe, and what we do.

- In the *Engagement in Multiple Contexts*, we describe the interaction of the faculty of the College of Education with the communities of our world through organizations and collaborations. The goal of these collaborations is simultaneous renewal for all involved in the partnerships.

"In addition to creating knowledge at the university and then disseminating it later, we seek to integrate opportunities for simultaneously advancing teaching, learning, and research through a 'scholarship of engagement,' rather than maintaining the traditional boundaries between teaching, research, and service."

- The complex challenge of valuing individuality within the democratic community is discussed in the section, *Individuals and Communities*.

"Our goal is to simultaneously value individuals with their idiosyncrasies . . . while also upholding the commonality of human identity and dignity across communities of local, national and international scope. . . . [and] to support the creation and maintenance of educational efforts that wholeheartedly and thoughtfully accept the complex challenge of valuing individuality while continuing the American project of extending democratic community."

- In the category of *Social Justice* we discuss the dynamics of schools and their effects on the capacity of students to determine who they become as adults.

"Educating agencies play an important role in preparing individuals who engage in democracy and have the requisite employment knowledge, skills, and attitudes. . . . Our desire as a College of Education is to

counter [certain] realities [economic interests, social ideologies, potential hegemonic impact on student self-determination] by equipping teachers and administrators to critique social conditions, language, and structures of policies."

- The complex connection between field-based inquiry and knowledge formation are discussed in the next category on **Educational Practice**. *"Students and faculty must be engaged in inquiry--the complex process of constructing understanding through building models, explaining phenomena, and validating experiences through socially defined community. . . . New teachers especially must be prepared to talk about the responsibly teaching a diverse population, solving perplexing educational problems, and reflecting on their actions."*
- In the last section we show how **Partnerships** between the College of Education and the community provide a synergistic tension in negotiated dialogue that results in clarifying objectives, arriving at new insights, and extending solutions beyond the status quo. *"Relationship building and creative problem-solving should be modeled by College of Education faculty, as they provide opportunities for reflective apprenticeship learning with partner schools, youth service agencies, cultural institutions, unions, community businesses, and others."*

We are now engaged in the process of realizing this conceptual framework in all areas of the College's work.

Evidence of the Conceptual Framework

The Conceptual Framework has both grown out of our vision for the College of Education and informs the College's on-going work. Initially, one will find a summary of the Conceptual Framework on all syllabi and on the MyGateway system used for on-line course management by faculty and students. Moreover, the CF has been the subject of conversations and presentations with our partners, stakeholders, and community. It has been the lead document to guide the recently completed Futures II process and has been instrumental in the recent development of new undergraduate and graduate programs.

Coherence

Again, because our Conceptual Framework and Knowledge base both reflect and inform what we do in the College of Education, one can see the coherence between it and the work of the College. In particular, our programs embrace diversity and social justice, as well as the commitment to working with and within our community to improve not just teaching and learning but also the quality of life of the community. Moreover, the many partnerships we have forged and supported over the past seven years attest to our commitment to the vision put forth in the Conceptual Framework. Furthermore, the 2003-2004 Futures II Vision, compared to the preceding Futures I Vision, is a significant extension and refinement of the vision and a deepening of the commitment to the core focuses expressed in the Framework document. The Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base statement is infused in the COE curricula through its course instructors and syllabi, specifically assignments which support and infuse the Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base are integrated in coursework and classroom. The Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base "lives" in the COE because students engage in work that involves them in multiple contexts, provides diverse opportunities in which to learn and work, includes academic preparation related to communities, individuals and the content the teachers, future students, counselors and administrators need to succeed in their own lives.

Professional Commitments and Dispositions

Within each of the standards sets guiding the programs and assessment of its candidates are significant disposition statements for our candidates. In addition, expressed in our Futures II Vision are the following commitments and dispositions for educators, which we are now in process of infusing into our assessment plan and more fully into our programs and initiatives:

- Understand, embrace, and celebrate diversity.
- Recognize inequities and act in ways that bring about social justice.
- Use diverse, culturally responsive strategies to provide for the individual needs of all learners.
- Practice and model ethical behavior
- Practice and model active research
- Are reflective and make decisions about best practice informed by existing and emerging research
- Engage in self-reflection, critical inquiry and creative endeavors
- Know that active engagement is vital to learning
- Recognize and seek lifelong learning and professional development as they are critical to success as a professional in a constantly changing world
- Practice collaboration and partnership among educators, other professionals, parents, students and the community at large as an essential part of the learning process.

In addition to these statements, each division of the College, which is engaged in the preparation of education professionals, has its own Professional Code of Ethical Behavior which it enforces. At present, programs are only assessing the commitments and dispositions defined by the standards sets upon which we have built our programs. Conversations are currently underway exploring ways to better assess commitments and dispositions as part of each program's assessment plan.

Commitment to Diversity

The past seven years in the College of Education have been years of tremendous growth in our commitment to and embracing of diversity. This growing commitment has come with the newness and the increased diversity of our faculty, as well as with the culture change we have undertaken since the Futures I Vision was established. On the surface, all of our foundational documents clearly express this commitment:

Within Our Vision

The University of Missouri-St. Louis 21st Century College of Education, as part of Missouri's public, metropolitan, land-grant, Research University, will be a leader in developing educators for instructional, leadership, research and other *roles in traditional and non-traditional learning communities*. The College is a collaborative teaching and learning environment for educators and is committed to significantly advancing the quality of teaching, learning, and research as it serves a dynamic, technologically advanced, and *diverse metropolitan community*.

Among Our Expressed Beliefs

- Effective educators understand, embrace, and celebrate diversity.
- Effective educators recognize inequities and act in ways that bring about social justice.
- Effective educators use diverse, culturally responsive strategies to provide for the individual needs of all learners.

Among Our Futures II Big Ideas

- **Educator Preparation:** Prepares educators with the content knowledge, instructional tools, skills, strategies, and dispositions necessary to engage culturally diverse students in active learning and critical inquiry in order to maximize their academic achievement and promote social justice.
- **Innovative and Collaborative Graduate Programs:** Offers innovative, technology-enhanced and practice-based graduate *programs that attract quality applicants to a diverse and active community of scholars-leaders.*
- **Social Justice:** Prepares and supports ethically-minded individuals who engage the culture in ways that bring about social justice, equal access, and culture change at all points of contact with the community and educational system.
- **Diversity:** Creates a culture that affirms and embraces diversity and challenges oppressive attitudes and environments.
- **Technology:** Creates models for technology-enhanced instruction to serve developing and practicing professionals and *to provide widespread and equitable access to quality learning opportunities for all learners.*
- **An Environment for Well-being:** *Assists in creating teaching, learning, working, and creative environments that contribute to the well-being of all individuals, thereby maximizing human potential.*

This commitment to diversity is further demonstrated in our students and faculty in COE programs, as well as, the College's strong commitment to diversify our faculty and to promote women and minorities to leadership positions.

Commitment to Technology

The College of Education has a demonstrated commitment to technology in the service of teaching and learning. Virtually all faculty have access to and use the latest technology to assist in their own instruction; moreover, the curriculum is designed with a technology strand running through each course to ensure that all candidates are prepared to use this same technology to support their students' learning.

The heart of the COE's technology emphasis is the new E. Desmond Lee Technology and Learning Center (TLC). The TLC was created to serve as a model for technology training and support, providing services not only to our own teachers and students but also to teachers and students in school buildings and classrooms across the Metropolitan St. Louis Region.

Content Knowledge of Teacher Candidates

The teacher education program at the University of Missouri – St. Louis is aligned to and meets the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education competency standards for teacher certification, including the subject specific competencies in each area of certification. This alignment to standards and competencies prescribed by the state ensures that COE candidates the subject matter they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts.

<p>It must be noted that the College of Education implemented its new teacher education program in the Fall 2002. Therefore, the data reflected in this report is primarily from students completing the old program. Only portfolio scores for Winter 2004 reflect the performance of the first cohort of the now program. PRAXIS II data and follow-up survey data are not yet available for the 2003-2004 cohort of students.</p> <p>All teacher education candidates meet high standards for content knowledge. Undergraduates must meet the following content knowledge standards for admission to the teacher education program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scores of 235 or higher on College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (C-BASE) in all areas (English, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies). • Scores of either 20 on the ACT Composite (18, when taken prior to 11-1-89) or 800 on the SAT (verbal plus math). • Completion of 60 hours of college or university courses (at UM-St. Louis or another accredited school). • Completion of General Education requirements • grade point average of 2.5 or higher. <p>Post-degree teacher candidates must meet the following admission standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of Bachelor’s degree from accredited college or university • Scores of either 20 on the ACT Composite (18, when taken prior to 11-1-89) or 800 on the SAT (verbal plus math). • Completion of General Education requirements • A grade point average of 2.5 or higher. <p>All secondary education, Music, and Foreign Language teacher candidates must also demonstrate proficiency in the subject area content appropriate to their areas of certification. Course requirements in the content areas are extensive, meeting and sometimes exceeding the credit hour expectations for comparable subject area majors without teacher certification.</p> <p>These admission standards, consistent with and exceeding those prescribed by MoSTEP, ensure that candidates entering the program possess a rigorous general education background in the liberal arts and have the potential to succeed as a knowledgeable professional educator.</p> <p>Evidence of teacher candidate content knowledge competency, and for some certification areas the pedagogical knowledge associated with teaching content, is demonstrated in candidates’ scores on the PRAXIS II Subject Assessments (see Figure 1).</p>	<p>1999-200</p>	
---	------------------------	--

Figure 1: PRAXIS Tests Scores for Teacher Education Program Completers

Missouri Certificate	Test Code	State AVG. 02-03	UMSL Average Range	State Minimum Score

	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	

Early Childhood Education (Birth-Grade 3)	10020	654	650-710	640-710	700 660-720 N = 57	680 660-710 N = 64		600
Early Childhood Special Ed. (Birth-Grade 3)	10690	633	No program	No Program	710 660-740 N = 13	655 640-680 N = 12		620
Elementary Education(1-6)	10011	173	170-189	172-188	177 168-185 N = 199	175 165-184 N = 183		164
Middle School Education (5-9)								
Language Arts	10049	175	PLT	PLT	188 181-195 N = 11	173 164-185 N = 23		163
Mathematics	20069	166	PLT	PLT	174.5 152-189 N = 24	166 161-176 N = 40		158
Science	10439	158	PLT	PLT	171.5 164-177 N = 12	157.5 144-174 N = 20		149
Social Studies	20089	173	PLT	PLT	173 164-184 N = 13	180 167-189 N = 14		154
Other Middle School Endorsements Principles of Learning and Teaching (5-9)	30523	172	173-183	168-179	1 tested 1 passed	3 tested 3 passed		160
Secondary Education (9-12) (except as noted)								
Art (K-12, 9-12)	10133	167	No Completers—New program					153
English	10041	176	168-194	175-190	182 173-187 N = 25	180 172-191 N = 37		158
Foreign Language:								
French (K-12) 20173		173	0 tested	1 tested 1 passed	0 tested	4 tested 2 passed		161
German (K-12) 20181		166	3 tested 3 passed	2 tested 1 passed	3 tested 3 passed	3 tested 2 passed		161
Spanish (K-12)	10191	164	6 tested 4 passed	5 tested 4 passed	7 tested 7 passed	6 tested 5 passed		158
Health (K-12, 9-12) 20550		695			670-760			480
Mathematics	10061	146	137-174		149 142-156 N = 13	151.5 121-163 N = 10		137
Music (Instrumental, Vocal) (K-12)	10113	162	156-168	163-169	157 154-169 N = 10	149.5 137-159 N = 10		151

Physical Education (K-9, K-12, (9-12)	10091	156	153-165	153-162	158 150-162 N = 27	159.5 154-164 N = 30		153
Science:								
Biology	20235	159	169-184	160-180	170 162-177 N = 11	155 147-171 N = 11		150
Chemistry 20245		161	3 tested 3 passed	5 tested 5 passed	3 tested 3 passed	3 tested 2 passed		152
Physics	10265	147	0 tested	0 tested	3 tested 1 passed	1 tested 0 passed		141
Social Science	10081	167	160-182	161-179	162.5 154-178 N = 32	172 164-181 N = 34		152
Special Education K-12								
Mild Moderate Cross-Categorical Disabilities	20353 and 10542	550	590-670	560-670	600 560-650 N = 88	590 560-660 N = 47		148
					169.5 16-179 N = 22	179.5 175-188 N = 20		172
Speech/Theater 10220		679	7 tested 7 passed	2 tested 2 passed	4 tested 4 passed	2 tested 2 passed		530
Unified Science:								
Biology	20235	159	169-184	160-180	170 162-177 N = 11	155 147-171 N = 11		150
Chemistry 20245		161						152
Physics 10265		147						141
K-9 or 9-12 certificate of license to teach for which no specialty area test or content knowledge test is designated. 30524		171	173-183	168-179	1 tested 1 passed	3 tested 3 passed		160

While the last year has seen a dip in the PRAXIS II scores for some programs, all programs still meet and exceed the Missouri minimum passing score for PRAXIS.

Portfolios are also required of candidates as part of their certification. Below are the portfolio scores for MoSTEP Quality Indicator 1: Content Knowledge (aligns to INTACS Principle 1):

Figure 2: Portfolio Scores for MoSTE Quality Indicator 1: Content

	1 Content
--	--------------

Winter 2002	225 (93%)
Fail	17 (07%)
Total	242
Fall 2002	
Pass	141 (92%)
Fail	12 (08%)
Total	153
Winter 2003	
Pass	219 (99%)
Fail	3 (01%)
Total	222
Fall 2003	
Pass	118 (97%)
Fail	4 (03%)
Total	122
Winter 2004	
Pass	141 (94%)
Fail	9 (06%)
Total	150

These data reveal that COE candidates have an average first-time pass rate on Quality Indicator 1 of 95%, with a range of 92% to 99%.

Follow-up Surveys of Employers

The following survey data was obtained from supervisors/principals of those ‘program completers’ currently in first year teaching positions, during the 2003-2004 school year. There were 239 program completers in our 2002-2003 cohort. In order to gain an understanding of ‘teacher competency’ for program completers, we elected to survey supervisors of those in current educational settings. In most cases, the supervisor was the building principal but may have been a department head or curriculum coordinator. We mailed surveys with a postage-paid return envelope to each of the 239 supervisors/principals. The number who responded was 134, or a 56% rate of response.

The survey consisted of 17 items based on the MOSTEP Quality Indicators. Supervisors/principals were asked to indicate whether our program completer, compared with other novice teachers, had developed a level of Mastery, Nearing Mastery, Progressed in Last 2 Years, Weak, Unprepared, Unable to Judge. Supervisors could also indicate if they had no opportunity to observe the novice teacher on a particular aspect of teaching. The survey was anonymous. The name of the program completer was indicated in the initial cover letter, but was not a part of the actual survey, unless volunteered by the supervisor. School Districts and/or schools were also not identified because of the “postage-paid” envelope added to the initial cover letter and survey.

Survey data for the most recent cohort leaving the program also indicates that candidates possess the content knowledge and knowledge of inquiry demanded by their certification area:

Figure 3: Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Content Knowledge

Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	4.22
Uses a variety of tools of inquiry in teaching	4.09

The survey asked employers to rank candidate performance on a 5-point scale, with 5 (Mastery) being the highest ranking and 1 (unprepared) being the lowest ranking. In both areas, students scored above the 4 level (nearing mastery).

Career Transition Certificate Program

The Career Transition Certificate Program is a two-year program designed to provide the skills, knowledge and dispositions/beliefs necessary to achieve a high level of teaching standards that will result in students in the St. Louis Public Schools increasing their performance on the Show Me Standards. Using a cohort organization, the CTCP provides a standards-based, reflective practice, performance oriented immersion model of preparation for participants.

While completing the academic components of the Program, candidates are assigned to an appropriate teaching position in a St. Louis Public Schools. Teacher Coaches are selected for all first year CTCP teachers in consultation with the school principal and Program directors. The Teacher Coaches assist with the day-to-day issues of teaching, planning and assessment, and conduct clinical teaching observations. During this time, participants are provided coursework, seminars and professional development experiences that will lead to attaining at least a proficient level of performance on the Missouri Teaching Standards.

The CTCP is designed to meet the needs of the participants involved by adhering to the principles of adult learning and meeting standards consistent with the National Staff Development Council. The curriculum for the program is purposefully sequenced for teacher development and is tailored to meet individual needs for special methods courses needed for specific certification requirements. Students are provided with access to technology through MyGateway – a university web-based service and the Technology and Learning Center in the College of Education.

The CTCP differs from the traditional program in delivery and student support. The courses provide the same competencies, but are adjusted to meet the needs of those who are experiencing the realities of teaching rather than field-based participation

Minimum Qualifications - The CTCP applicant must possess these minimum qualifications:

- Hold a B.S./B.A. (or higher) degree from an accredited college or university (or minor in the case where the completed coursework is substantially the same as a major)
- Are not currently certified to teach in elementary, middle or high schools
- Have successful experience in working with adolescents/young adults
- Demonstrate a passion for teaching
- Possess the skills, attitudes and dispositions necessary to succeed in an intensive collegial immersion model for teacher certification
- Qualify to work in a public school
- Minimum 2.5 GPA in final degree and major
- Commit to 5 years teaching in St. Louis Public School (3 years after the program)

Alignment with Certification Competencies – The CTCP program is aligned to both the MoSTEP

Quality Indicators for beginning teachers and the Missouri Subject-specific Competencies for Beginning Teachers. (See Curriculum Matrices documents) As a means of ensuring that all candidates have the requisite content knowledge for their professional positions, each must receive the state-mandated passing score on an appropriate PRAXIS II exam.

Figure 4: Career Transition Certificate Programs Praxis Scores

Missouri Certificate	Test Code	Average Score /Score Range			State average Score Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	Cohort 5
		State Mini-mum Score							
Middle School Education (5-9)									
Mathematics		2006 9			196			158	
		161							
Science		1043 9		153	150	166		149	
Secondary Education (9-12) (except as noted)									
Art (K-12, 9-12)		1013 3			165	160		153	
Science:									
Biology		2023 5	173	150	158	154		150	
Chemistry		2024 5		178		152		152	
		154							
Physics		1026 5				171		141	
Special Education K-12									
Mild Moderate Cross-Categorical Disabilities		20353				160			
		and Students in this program have not yet taken PRAXIS II.							
		10542				172			

Special Education Transition Program

Participants in the Special Education Transition Program (SET) have a minimum of a bachelor’s degree in education and initial certification in elementary education, middle school education, or secondary

education. They are in the program to add additional certification in K-12 Mild/Moderate Cross-Categorical Special Education. A program of study of a minimum of 20 credit hours in special education is required.

Seven new courses have been developed for this special program, which had to be approved by the special education faculty, the College of Education faculty, and the campus Senate. Courses continue to be refined based on input from the participants and their mentors, directors of special education, and school administrators. The Special Education Transition Program advisory board meets regularly to review all aspects of the program (including course content). These individuals are surveyed each semester as an ongoing attempt to refine the courses and meet the needs of participants. All participants in the Special Education Transition Program are required to pass the special education PRAXIS II exam before being recommended for certification. Students in the first four cohorts had a pass rate of 93% on their first attempt.

School Leaders Licensure Assessment

Participants in the Special Education Innovative Certification Program (SEICP) have a minimum of a bachelor's degree and do not have initial teaching certification. They take a program of study of approximately 35 credit hours to earn initial certification in K-12 Mild/Moderate Cross-Categorical Special Education. They work full time in a special education classroom with Missouri DESE Temporary Authorization Certification.

Seven new courses have been developed for this special program, which had to be approved by the special education faculty, the College of Education faculty, and the campus Senate. The Special Education Innovative Certification Program advisory board meets regularly to review all aspects of the program (including course content). These individuals are surveyed each semester as an ongoing attempt to refine the courses and meet the needs of participants. All participants in the Special Education Transition Program are required to pass the special education PRAXIS II exam before being recommended for certification. No students have yet taken the PRAXIS exam since they are only in their second year of the program.

Content Knowledge for Other School Personnel

K-12 Leadership The Education Leadership Programs provide course content to ensure that candidates preparing to be administrators have the knowledge, skills and dispositions they need to be successful leaders. The *knowledge base* of the K-12 Leadership program reflects not only the ISLLC standards but also the mission of the COE and the University. The educational experience results in and from inquiry at all professional levels. Academic programs in K-12 Leadership are grounded in philosophy, history, political, social and economic theory. Certification programs are informed by exemplary practice.

The Leadership Programs are tied to the MoSTEP Quality Indicators (ISLLC Standards) which present an ambitious range of content knowledge for candidates. Candidates are prepared for the licensure test through in-baskets, case studies, class discussions, and simulations intended to model the roles and behaviors expected of effective school leaders. Candidates engage in class lectures, reading of textbooks and related literature, Socratic discussions, studying of vignettes, simulations, and presentations by practicing administrators. Five themes that cross all of the division's programs include *democratic ideals of access, citizenship, community, equity, and free speech*.

The culminating clinical experience represents an opportunity to incorporate theory into practice in a real-world environment under field-based and University supervision. Candidate performance on the SLLA exam indicate a cohort of professionals with the content knowledge necessary to perform in their professional roles as school leaders.

Figure 5: Institutional Report on School Leaders Licensure Assessment Scores Testing Period: 9-1-2002 through 8/31/2003

Test Name	Test Code	State Minimum Passing Score	UMSL Students Median Ave. Range	Students Nationally Median Ave. Range
-----------	-----------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------

School Leaders Licensure Assessment	1010	164	176 171-181 N = 56	177 172-181 N = 4,125
--	------	-----	--------------------------	-----------------------------

The results show that COE Education Administration graduates are meeting and exceeding the state required minimum score (164) for this test of administrator content knowledge.

Survey of Employers of Graduates of the M.Ed. in Administration (Fall '03 & Spring '04)-

Our interest in improving our M.Ed. program in Ed Administration led us to survey the employers of our Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 graduates. Of 31 students filing their “Intent to Graduate” form on time, 23 (74.2%) elected to provide employer information. We surveyed those 23 employers and 14 of the 23 (60.9%) returned the survey information. This report, then, represents the responses of employers of 45.2% of the graduates.

The following tables and results for issues directly tied to content knowledge for beginning school leaders indicates that employers believe candidates leaving the UMSL program are well-qualified for administrative work.

Figure 6: Selected Issues from Survey of Employers of Graduates of the M.Ed. in Administration (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004)

Survey Item	Mean 6-Point Scale
Initial skills in administration	5.3
Written and oral communication skills	5.6
Ability to build rapport with the community	5.8
Ability to work with parents to improve organization	5.6
Ability to plan, organize, coordinate, direct and control	5.4
Ability to interpret and use data	5.5
Ability to set vision, provide leadership skills to help staff achieve vision	5.0
Knowledge of legal issues	5.4
Knowledge of finance	5.3
Mean of the means	5.5

Overall rating: 9 highly competent; 5 competent; none incompetent
Site: 3 elementary school; 3 middle school; 2 high school; 3 “other”; 3 did not indicate
Is this teacher/leader currently in an administrative position: 4 (28.6%) Yes, 10 No
If no and an administrative position became available, would you recommend this individual for the position? 8 (80%) Yes, 2 (20%)No

Results – The mean response for each item on a 6-point scale appears in Figure 6 above. The ratings were very favorable. The lowest rating on any item was “mildly satisfied” and that was only given for one graduate on each of 8 items and three graduates on the “vision” item. No responses were given to any of the “dissatisfied” ratings. The mean scores ranged from 5.0 to 5.8, so that most had a mean rating between “generally satisfied” and “very satisfied.” Supervisors judged nine of the graduates to be highly competent and the remaining 5 to be competent. Only 4 of the graduates were in an administrative position, but the

supervisors of 8 of the 10 who were not in administrative positions indicated they would recommend the graduate if an administrative position became available.

Counselor Education

The Division of Counseling has a statement of "Counselor Program Objectives" (see below). This statement is an umbrella set of objectives that relates to the training of counselors in general. We have developed program objectives for the Community Counseling program, the School Counseling program, the Community Counseling with Career Specialization program, and the Doctoral program. The entry-level (MED) School Counseling and Guidance program prepares school counselors for positions in public or private elementary, middle, or secondary schools. The program is designed to fulfill entry-level program standards of preparation. It also is intended to enable program graduates to obtain Missouri Department of Education Certification in School Counseling.

Emphasized in the program is the use of developmental perspectives by school counseling and guidance practitioners as outlined by the Missouri Department of Education, the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), and the most innovative school counselor training standards as described by the professional literature. That is, guidance and counseling services are considered appropriate and necessary for all students in schools, not just those with problems or in crisis. Remedial and crisis intervention theories and strategies are covered in the curriculum; however, facilitation of "developmental" conditions needed for students' learning, re-learning, and effective coping are viewed as most important. The objectives of the school counseling program are to prepare graduates who can conceptualize and organize a school-based program around the eight goals which characterize developmental guidance and counseling program. Therefore, the program is intended to prepare graduates who:

1. understand school environments.
2. understand self and others.
3. understand students' attitudes and behaviors.
4. understand students' decision-making and problem-solving skills.
5. have effective interpersonal and communication skills.
6. understand students' school success skills.
7. understand students' career awareness and educational planning.
8. understand community pride and involvement.

Each of these objectives is further delineated by a set of general objectives, described through expected observable outcomes. While each of these objectives are applicable to all grade levels, particular attention is given to objectives related to developmental stages and tasks for appropriate age groups. Program graduates are expected to be competent in and be able to:

1. Provide individual counseling;
2. Provide small group counseling;
3. Present large group/classroom guidance;
4. Organize and manage peer facilitator programs;
5. Develop a series of counseling and guidance activities for dysfunctioning (i.e., target) students.
6. Provide leadership in organizing guidance experiences for all students within a school;
7. Lead parent education groups;

8. Consult individually and in groups with teachers, parents, and administrators;
9. Consult with child study teams;
10. Demonstrate counselor effectiveness through accountability studies.

Program objectives were revised during the self-study for CACREP accreditation (2000) to be in accordance with the American Counseling Association and its Divisions' competencies and standards; the National Board for Certified Counselors' certification standards; the Missouri Committee for Professional Counselors on licensing standards; and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education on School Certification requirements.

M.Ed. in Counseling Comprehensive Examination

All counseling candidates take the "Counselor Education Comprehensive Examination" developed by the National Board for Certified Counselors. The passing score on the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination is based on locally developed normative data. The examination is given twice per year on campus, and the individual and group scores are reported to the faculty after the examination. Those scores are entered into the local database and descriptive statistics are calculated on the total population that has taken this examination since its inception. The faculty determines the cutoff score based on those statistics.

Figure 7: Counselor Education Comprehensive Examination Scores

UM - St. Louis Total Group (N=304)
Overall exam score mean = 88.928, standard deviation = 14.221
UM - St. Louis School Counseling Program (N=129)
Overall exam score mean = 86.109, standard deviation = 14.443
UM - St. Louis Community Counseling Program (N=175)
Overall exam score mean = 91.154, standard deviation = 13.607

Ninety-nine percent of all our students pass the examination (3 of 305 have not passed). 86.9% pass the examination on their first attempt. Students who do not pass the comprehensive examination on their first attempt will be allowed to retake the comprehensive examination one additional time. Students must be enrolled during the semester they retake the examination. If the individual student does not pass on the retake, they must take one additional course prior to being allowed to sit for the examination another time. The additional course will be determined by the faculty of the Division and will be based on their scores on the subsections of the comprehensive examination.

In order to be certified as a school counselor in Missouri, graduates must take the PRAXIS II test. Counselor Education students began taking the PRAXIS II exam in 2001 as part of their certification requirements. The following table shows the average scores for counselor education candidates seeking state certification.

Figure 8: School Counselor Praxis Scores

Missouri Certificate

Test Code	State AVG. 02-03	UMSL Average Range					State Minimum Score						
		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004							
School Counselor K-8, 7-12		20420	669									695	6
												690	8
												-70	6
												0	6
												N =	2
												10	0
													5
													9
													8
													0
													N
													=
													1
													4

Candidates recommended for certification from the program meet and exceed the state minimum passing score and exceed the state average for all candidates taking the exam statewide.

Graduate follow-up surveys support the quality of counseling candidates’ content knowledge. The candidates rated their preparation quality on a six-point scale, with six being “very satisfied” and one being “very dissatisfied.” Overall, graduates ratings grouped around the generally satisfied score of 5.0, with an average rating of 4.925.

Figure 9: Graduate Survey Data Related to Counselor Education Content Knowledge

Survey Item	Response Mean (six-point scale)
Knowledge about clients who are potentially at risk	4.9
Skill in applying theories and techniques with individuals	4.5
Individual Counseling Skills	5.0
Group Counseling Skills	5.1
Appraisal and Assessment Skills	5.2
Career Counseling Skills	4.9
Marriage/Family Counseling Skills	4.0
Current Professional Issues	5.1
Ethics	5.4
Organization and Development of Counseling Skills	4.9
Human Growth and Development	5.1
Research Skills	5.0

The Counseling Division also surveys the employers of its graduates every second year. In the most recent survey, covering graduates from the Summer 2001, Fall 2001 and Winter 2002 semesters, all employers returning an evaluation (83% of the 12 surveys sent) indicated they were very satisfied or generally

satisfied with all graduates on all factors surveyed. Further 9 out of 10 rated the graduate as highly competent, with the remaining one graduates rated as competent. Six of the work sites were school-based, one was a community agency, one a residential facility, one a substance abuse program, and one a non-profit vocational rehabilitation facility.

Figure 10: Employer Survey Results Related to Content Knowledge

Issue	Very Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Unable To Judge
Initial Individual Counseling Skills	7 (70%)	3 (30%)					
Initial Career Counseling Skills	5 (50%)	2 (20%)					3 (30%)
Initial Group Skills	8 (80%)	1 (10%)					1 (10%)
Initial Skill in Assessment/ Diagnosis	8 (80%)	2 (20%)					
Overall Rating							
Highly Competent: 9 (90%)		Competent: 1 (10%)			Incompetent: 0 (0%)		

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Teacher candidates in all program areas receive pedagogical content knowledge preparation that is both generic and specific to their areas of certification. Early courses and field experiences provide generic, foundational knowledge of pedagogical theories and practices. The spiral progression of learning through the curriculum sequence reengages, expands, and deepens these theories and practices at each successive level. In the culminating final practical year, consisting of special methods courses taken in conjunction with internships and final semester student teaching experiences, students are coached and guided in the intelligent synthesis of theory and practice in real pedagogical situations.

Evidence of pedagogical content knowledge can be seen in candidates’ performance portfolios submitted at the completion of the teacher education program. Data on portfolio pass rates demonstrate high levels of proficiency in those Missouri Beginning Teacher Quality Indicators most directly tied to pedagogical content knowledge: Quality Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Teacher Education Portfolio Results on MoSTEP Beginning Quality Indicators Related to Pedagogical Content Knowledge (Winter 2002-Winter 2004)

Semester Standards	1	2	3	4	8
	Content	Learning and Development	Diversity	Curriculum	Instructional Strategies
Winter 2002					
Pass	225 (93%)	225 (93%)	221 (91%)	230 (95%)	224 (93%)
Fail	17 (07%)	17 (07%)	21 (09%)	12 (05%)	18 (07%)

	242	242	242	242	242
Total					
Fall 2002					
Pass	141 (92%)	142 (93%)	137 (90%)	147 (96%)	148 (97%)
Fail	12 (08%)	11 (07%)	16 (10%)	6 (04%)	5 (03%)
Total	153	153	153	153	153
Winter2003					
Pass	219 (99%)	216 (97%)	201 (91%)	213 (96%)	217 (98%)
Fail	3 (01%)	6 (03%)	21 (09%)	9 (04%)	5 (02%)
Total	222	222	222	222	222
Fall 2003					
Pass	118 (97%)	117 (96%)	117 (96%)	117 (96%)	118 (97%)
Fail	4 (03%)	5 (04%)	5 (04%)	5 (04%)	4 (03%)
Total	122	122	122	122	122
Winter2004					
Pass	141 (94%)	136 (91%)	133 (89%)	140 (93%)	138 (92%)
Fail	9 (06%)	14 (09%)	17 (11%)	10 (7%)	12 (08%)
Total	150	150	150	150	150

Again, these portfolio data indicate students who are able to document their possession of and ability to apply pedagogical content knowledge in professional coursework and in classroom teaching situations.

Surveys of employers of COE graduates indicate a high degree of preparation relevant to issues directly related to pedagogical content knowledge. Candidates were rated by their employers/supervisors as having skills above a 4 rating (“approaching mastery”) on a 5-point scale.

Figure 12: Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Uses a variety of tools of inquiry in teaching	4.09
Creates curriculum and instructional opportunities that support intellectual, social, personal, and motor development	4.02
Accommodates individual learners by using multiple teaching strategies adapted to individual learners’ needs	4.32
Shows knowledge and skills in developing a culturally compatible classroom environment for diverse learners	4.09
Understands how to make information accessible to students	4.28
Understands how developmentally children and youth learn	4.39
Uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students, including special needs students	4.07
Creates instructional opportunities that facilitate and motivate student learning	4.14
Assesses student learning and makes appropriate adjustment to instruction based on results	4.12

Central to the development of pedagogical content knowledge is the purposeful utilization of appropriate instructional technologies. In 2000, supported by a federal PT3 grant, our Technology and Learning Center began providing professional development and on-going support for our full-time and adjunct faculty to facilitate the infusion of instructional technology content across the entire teacher education curriculum. The goal was to improve the quality and quantity of instructional technology content throughout the teacher education program. A comparison data collected from exit portfolios in Spring 2000 and Spring 2002 shows teacher candidates made strong improvement in all five categories of instructional technology use (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: Percentage of portfolios containing different types of technology artifacts

Additional information about improvements in teacher candidates’ utilization of instructional technology is available in the PT3 Executive Summary.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

The preparation of educational professionals at UM-St. Louis focuses on the development of competencies required for certification and the skill sets outlined in the *Missouri Beginning Teacher Quality Indicators*. The Missouri certification competencies are fully addressed within the teacher education curriculum in each certification area. The extensive curriculum matrices provide an in-depth analysis detailing how each certification requirement and subject-specific competency is contained within the teacher education curriculum.

Moreover the program curriculum is designed and implemented as an articulated spiral beginning in Level I Exploration and culminating in Level III Application. Chart Figure 14 shows how the curriculum is structured to give the pre-service candidate the increasingly sophisticated opportunities to learn and apply the professional pedagogical knowledge outlined in the MoSTEP Quality Indicators, with special emphasis on diversity, technology, classroom management, and assessment.

Portfolio scores for the past three academic years reveal cohorts of candidates who score well on this performance-based measure. In each category corresponding to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, on average greater than 90% of candidates passed each quality indicator category.

Figure 15: Teacher Preparation Portfolio Scores on MoSTEP Quality Indicators Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

	Standard						
	2 Learning and Develop- ment	3 Diversity	4 Curriculum	5 Instructional Strategies	6 Classroom Manage- ment	7 Communi- cation	8 Assess-ment
Winter 2002							
Pass	225 (93%)	221 (91%)	230 (95%)	229 (95%)	235 (97%)	229 (95%)	224 (93%)
Fail	17 (07%)	21 (09%)	12 (05%)	13 (05%)	7 (03%)	13 (05%)	18 (07%)
Total	242	242	242	242	242	242	242
Fall 2002							
Pass	142 (93%)	137 (90%)	147 (96%)	144 (94%)	144 (94%)	149 (97%)	148 (97%)
Fail	11 (07%)	16 (10%)	6 (04%)	9 (06%)	9 (06%)	4 (03%)	5 (03%)
Total	153	153	153	153	153	153	153
Winter 2003							
Pass	216 (97%)	201 (91%)	213 (96%)	220 (99%)	214 (96%)	214 (96%)	217 (98%)
Fail	6 (03%)	21 (09%)	9 (04%)	2 (01%)	8 (04%)	8 (04%)	5 (02%)
Total	222	222	222	222	222	222	222
Fall 2003							
Pass	117 (96%)	117 (96%)	117 (96%)	118 (97%)	118 (97%)	114 (93%)	118 (97%)
Fail	5 (04%)	5 (04%)	5 (04%)	4 (03%)	4 (03%)	8 (07%)	4 (03%)
Total	122	122	122	122	122	122	122
Winter 2004							
Pass	136 (91%)	133 (89%)	140 (93%)	142 (95%)	138 (92%)	134 (89%)	138 (92%)
Fail	14 (09%)	17 (11%)	10 (7%)	8 (05%)	12 (08%)	16 (11%)	12 (08%)
Total	150	150	150	150	150	150	150

Principal Evaluations: Principals within the clinical sites gave the following summative evaluation ratings of COE candidates in four areas relevant to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: Planning, Creativity, Class Control and Total Performance. These building principals routinely rated the candidates in the above average or average categories, with the majority being rated consistently as above average. This data indicates that while not all graduates are above average, virtually all candidates leaving the program are prepared to meet and exceed the minimum expectations of building principals. It is interesting to note that the first full cohort completing the new program (Winter 2004) had few candidates scoring in the below average categories in nearly all categories when compared to the previous years.

Employer/supervisor surveys for graduates of the 2002-2003 cohort of teachers, reinforces the findings of the building principals that COE candidates and graduates are prepared to meet the professional challenges of their roles in the schools. Of the categories corresponding to “professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills,” nine (9) categories were ranked above the “nearing mastery” level, with one category (“manages the classroom environment . . .”) ranked at just below that level (3.99). Integrating technology ranked between the “progressing in the last two years” category and the “nearing mastery level (3.69). The lowest ranking (2.93) was in the category “Appropriately documents student learning achievement using Show-Me Standards,” which employers/supervisors rated just below the “progressing” level, i.e., in the “weak” level. Since this category is to some extent district-specific, it may reflect as much on the district’s training of its new hires as it does the teacher’s preparation experience.

Figure 16: Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)

Semester	Survey Issues			
	Planning	Creativity	Class Control	Total Performance
Fall 2002	46 (76.6%)	38 (63.3%)	38 (63.3%)	43 (68.3%)
	12 (20 %)	19 (31.6%)	20 (33.3%)	19 (30.2%)
	2 (3.4%)	3 (5.1%)	4 (3.4%)	1 (1.5%)
Fall 2003	52 (76.5%)	49 (71%)	42 (65.6%)	51 (76.1%)
	16 (24.5%)	19 (27.5%)	20 (30%)	15 (22.4%)
	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	4 (4.6%)	1 (1.5%)
Winter 2004	55 (73.3%)	52 (70.3%)	47 (61.8%)	67 (88.2%)
	19 (25.3%)	20 (27%)	27 (35.5%)	8 (10.5%)
	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.3%)

Figure 17: Survey Data Related to Teacher Education Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

Uses a variety of tools of inquiry in teaching	4.09
Creates curriculum and instructional opportunities that support intellectual, social, personal, and motor development	4.02
Accommodates individual learners by using multiple teaching strategies adapted to individual learners’ needs	4.32
Shows knowledge and skills in developing a culturally compatible classroom environment for diverse learners	4.09
Understands how to make information accessible to students	4.28
Understands how developmentally children and youth learn	4.39
Uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students, including special needs students	4.07
Integrates technology into the instructional environment	3.69
Creates instructional opportunities that facilitate and motivate student learning	4.14
Assesses student learning and makes appropriate adjustment to instruction based on results	4.12
Manages the classroom environment to motivate students and optimize their learning opportunities	3.99
Appropriately documents student learning achievement using Show-Me Standards	2.93

Professional Knowledge and Skills for other Professional School Personnel

K-12 School Leadership: In our courses/program, we are doing the following to assure that

candidates understand that they must know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform practices; use technology in their practices; and support student learning through their professional services.

The Mission of the Division states that the schools are to prepare youth to assume the primary political office of citizen. So that school administrators can help schools fully achieve this purpose of preparing citizens, there are five essential themes that are inherent in all of the Divisions K-12 courses: Access; citizenship; community; equity; and freedom of speech.

Five context courses (knowledge, economic, legal, social and political) form the basis for a Masters Degree in educational administration and provide the basis for understanding and implementing the Interstate School Leaders Leadership Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The Standards are referenced in all courses that are part of the preparation process for administrators, and their being combined with the context courses provides a strong foundation for implementation of theory into practice during the administrative internship in ED ADM 6900. The contextual foundation also adds value to the interns' reflection upon their internship experiences and their impact in the school/district setting.

In most cases, interns complete their internship assignments in the educational community in which they work. Internship experiences add to their understanding of community dynamics. When Interns are not familiar with the setting, they are introduced to the environment by the site supervisor along with the direction of the University supervisor. The sharing of experiences at internship seminars provides the administrative Interns opportunities to compare their own settings with the locations of others. Common and unique experiences, varied contexts of operations, and the research-based dialogue add to the value of the internship experience. All activities of the internship program are centered upon the development of ISSLC-based processes that will benefit educational settings for the improvement of student learning.

Dispositions for All Candidates

The College of Education bases its programs on the MoSTEP Quality Indicators, which are significantly rooted in the INTASC Standards. For School Counselors, we have based our program objectives on the MoSTEP Quality Indicators for Beginning School Counselors and CACREP Standards. For school leader programs, we have designed our programs around the MoSTEP Quality Indicators for Beginning School Leaders, which are identical to the ISLLC Standards. Within each of these sets of standards are nested important dispositions for professional educators, consistent with their roles in educational settings. In addition to these dispositions, the College has adopted an additional set of dispositions as expressed in our Futures II Vision. We are now in process of infusing into our assessment plan and more fully into our programs and initiatives the following commitments and dispositions for educators:

Professional Educators . . .

- Understand, embrace, and celebrate diversity.
- Recognize inequities and act in ways that bring about social justice.
- Use diverse, culturally responsive strategies to provide for the individual needs of all learners.
- Practice and model ethical behavior
- Practice and model active research

- Are reflective and make decisions about best practice informed by existing and emerging research
- Engage in self-reflection, critical inquiry and creative endeavors
- Know that active engagement is vital to learning
- Recognize and seek lifelong learning and professional development as they are critical to success as a professional in a constantly changing world
- Practice collaboration and partnership among educators, other professionals, parents, students and the community at large as an essential part of the learning process.

In addition to these statements, each division of the College engaged in the preparation of education professionals enforces its own Professional Code of Ethical Behavior (Educator, Counselor, School Leader).

At present, programs are only assessing the commitments and dispositions defined by the MoSTEP standards sets upon which we have built our programs. Work is currently underway exploring ways to better assess the additional commitments and dispositions as part of each program’s assessment plan. Still much can be gleaned from past and more recent evaluations and assessments.

Portfolio scores on MoSTEP Quality Indicators which correspond to issues related to dispositions (Diversity, Communication, Reflective Practice and Collaboration) indicate that the majority of candidates pass these quality indicators on the first attempt. The following table shows candidate scores for the last three years.

Figure 18: Teacher Preparation Portfolio Scores on MoSTEP Quality Indicators Related to Dispositions

	Standard			
	3 Diversity	7 Communi- cation	9 Reflective Practice	10 Collabor- ation
Winter 2002				
Pass	221 (91%)	229 (95%)	230 (95%)	228 (94%)
Fail	21 (09%)	13 (05%)	12 (05%)	14 (06%)
Total	242	242	242	242
Fall 2002				
Pass	137 (90%)	149 (97%)	141 (92%)	144 (94%)
Fail	16 (10%)	4 (03%)	12 (08%)	9 (06%)
Total	153	153	153	153
Winter 2003				
Pass	201 (91%)	214 (96%)	215 (97%)	208 (94%)
Fail	21 (09%)	8 (04%)	7 (03%)	14 (06%)
Total	222	222	222	222
Fall 2003				
Pass	117 (96%)	114 (93%)	117 (96%)	119 (98%)
Fail	5 (04%)	8 (07%)	5 (04%)	3 (02%)
Total	122	122	122	122
Winter 2004				
Pass	133 (89%)	134 (89%)	138 (92%)	143 (95%)
Fail	17 (11%)	16 (11%)	12 (08%)	7 (5%)

150	150	150	150
Total			

The Winter 2004 scores show a slight increase in the numbers of candidates failing these standards, which goes against a trend of declining numbers of failing scores. This trend may have a number of causes, including the reduction of outside scorers for the Winter 2004 portfolios, the more rigorous training given to faculty, and/or the fact that the Winter 2004 term saw the first cohort of students leaving the re-designed teacher education program.

Ratings by principals (on issues related to professional dispositions) at culminating clinical experience (student teaching) sites indicate that only a few students each term rank below average on any of these issues, with the majority ranking in the above average or average range. Interestingly, students completing the new program during the Winter 2004 semester received markedly fewer below average ratings. The following table arrays the ratings.

Figure 19: Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)

Semester	Rating	Issues					
		Cooperation	Initiative	Dependability	Professional Attitude	Poise/Vitality	Total Performance
Fall 2002 Above Average 51 (83.6%)			42 (70%)	47 (68.1%)	47 (78.3%)	40 (66.7%)	43 (68.3%)
Average 9 (14.8%)			14 (23.3%)	12(31.9%)	12 (20%)	18 (30.0%)	19 (30.2%)
Below Average 1 (1.6%)			4 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.5%)
Fall 2003 Above Average 58 (82.8%)			52 (77.6%)	54 (81.8%)	56 (83.6%)	55 (77.5)	51 (76.1%)
Average 11 (15.7%)			14 (20.8%)	12 (18.2%)	9 (13.4%)	14 (19.7%)	15 (22.4%)
Below Average 1 (1.5%)			1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.0%)	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.5%)
Winter 2004 Above Average 69 (93.2%)			61 (82.4%)	74 (97.3%)	72 (93.5%)	65 (85.5%)	67 (88.2%)

Average 5 (6.8%)			12 (16.3%)	2 (2.6%)	5 (6.5%)	10 (13.2%)	8 (10.5%)
Below Average 0 (0%)			1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)

Surveys of supervisor/employers of COE graduates from the 2002-2003 cohort, on issues corresponding to professional dispositions, consistently rated COE graduates as “nearing mastery” or “progressing in the last two years.” The lowest scoring issues were “Demonstrates building leadership in developing programs and processes” and “Promotes relationships with families and the community,” issues unlikely to be strong points for beginning teachers during their first year in the classroom. Overall, these ratings are very positive, as are the comments also collected in the survey.

Figure 20: Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)

Accommodates individual learners by using multiple teaching strategies adapted to individual learners' needs	4.32
Shows knowledge and skills in developing a culturally compatible classroom environment for diverse learners	4.09
Understands how developmentally children and youth learn	4.39
Uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students, including special needs students	4.07
Consistently reflects on his/her practice in order to enhance student learning	3.99
Promotes relationships with families and the community	3.75
Demonstrates building leadership in developing programs and processes	3.69
Personally practices a habit of life-long learning and inquiry	4.08

K-12 School Leadership: The Knowledge Base of K-12 Leadership states that school administrators must engage in a constant process of reflecting on both the ethical and moral dimensions of schooling and acting on the technical or functional aspects of school administration in light of the purposes of the schools. Two major implications follow from this orientation of reflection and action: (1) Administrative practice must always be informed by and consistent with the democratic purposes of the schools (Dewey, 1916; Gutmann 1987) and (2) that the reflective practitioner orientation is related to the multiple perspectives that now inform the field of education administration (Donmoyer, Imber & Scheurch, 1995).

The justification for programs in ELAPS is that it is desirable for school administrators to have the knowledge and analytic skills to reflect on both the moral and ethical aspects of their practices in light of the purposes of the schools. Knowledge from both modernity and emerging perspectives such as poststructural, postmodern thought, feminist and critical theory (Cherryholmes, 1988; Foster, 1986; Lyotard, 1984; Freire, 1986) are necessary for students to acquire the understandings and competence to critically reflect on their administrative judgments and practices. To this end, the K-12 faculty believes that an administrator in an educational setting must be thoroughly grounded in the five context areas represented by our core curriculum.

Faculties in all areas discuss the roles of attitudes and belief systems in classes. Students are made aware of the effect their dispositions have on K-12 students, families and the community. Students are asked to develop a personal philosophy of education and a mission statement to help guide them in educational practice. The importance of good communication, consensus building, negotiation skills, and the collection and analysis of data to support decision-making is discussed. ELAPS students are provided multiple opportunities through case studies, article critiques, special projects and exams to address the issues of the appropriate disposition of professionals involved in education. Justice, equity, fairness, and ethics are intertwined with all class material.

The role of attitudes and belief systems in effecting change is emphasized throughout the administrative internship (ED ADM 6900). Interns write a statement of purpose and an educational platform that incorporates each of the Interstate School Leaders Educational Consortium Standards. Reflective practices that challenge or reinforce existing belief systems are incorporated into the internship. Often, Interns must reach a compromise of their own attitudes and beliefs to more effectively serve the communities in which they serve their internship. Dialogue during the internship seminars and during the University supervisor's site visit provides deeper understanding of the role dispositions play in educational systems.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their dispositions to work with others in the text of their personal philosophy and mission statements, in the text of exams, critiques, and class discussions. Connections made with the ISLLC Standards and the ISLLC exam give the faculty of ELAPS feedback to student competencies.

The internship portfolio notebook provides evidence of Interns' professional dispositions. A scoring guide leads the review of essential elements of the Internship, and the site supervisor completes an evaluation instrument. Ultimately, the Intern scores on the licensure examinations (SLLA and SSA) ensure that dispositions expected of professionals are known to, understood, and implemented by the administrative Interns.

Figure 21: Survey of Employers of Graduates of the M.Ed. in Administration (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004)

Survey Item	Mean 6-Point Scale
Getting along with co-workers	5.8
Being ethical in his/her work	5.8
Versatility	5.7
Working with a wide variety of populations	5.6
Reliability	5.7
Professionalism	5.5
Ability to build rapport with the community	5.8
Ability to work with parents to improve organization	5.6

School and Community Counseling: The Division of Counseling "Counseling Program Objectives" focuses on three domains: knowledge, skills, and awareness. Regarding knowledge, students are "(5) prepared to help individuals meet developmental concerns and needs both individually and in a variety of developmental group programs, within a school system or within a mental health setting." Regarding skills, students are "(4) proficient with the understanding and human relations skills necessary to consult as part of a team effort, within a school system or a mental health setting." Regarding awareness, students are "(2) self-aware and sensitive to their clients as people who exist in the context of different cultures and races and as people who are potentially at risk."

A survey of employers of counseling graduates included issues that correlate with professional dispositions. The results of the survey are captured in the following table:

Figure 22: Employer Survey Results Related to Counselor Dispositions

Issue	Very Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Unable To Judge
Getting Along with Co-workers	8 (80%)	2 (30%)					
Being Ethical in His/her Work	8 (80%)	2 (20%)					
Versatility	8 (80%)	2 (20%)					
Working with a Wide Variety of Populations	9 (90%)	1 (10%)					
Reliability	8 (80%)	2 (20%)					
Professionalism	9 (90%)	1 (10%)					
Overall Rating							
Highly Competent: 9 (90%)		Competent: 1 (10%)			Incompetent: 0 (0%)		

In areas related to dispositions, the counseling candidates consistently ranked in the “very satisfied” category with only a small percentage placing in the “generally satisfied” category. No employers indicated any dissatisfaction with the professional dispositions and behaviors of the graduates.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

College of Education has for a number of years regularly surveyed its graduates and their employers. We believe these surveys provide important information on how effective graduates are in the professional positions they assume once they have graduated. Given the emphasis on student achievement, it would be safe to assume that a graduate and/or employer would not give good ratings if the graduates were not having a positive impact on student learning. We are presently exploring other ways, including student work samples, to better assess our graduates potential impact and actual impact on student learning.

Figure 23: Field Experience administrator/supervisor Survey of Teacher Education Candidates on Issues Related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (2002-2003 Cohort)

Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	4.22
Uses a variety of tools of inquiry in teaching	4.09
Creates curriculum and instructional opportunities that support intellectual, social, personal, and motor development	4.02
Accommodates individual learners by using multiple teaching strategies adapted to individual learners’ needs	4.32
Shows knowledge and skills in developing a culturally compatible classroom environment for diverse learners	4.09
Understands how to make information accessible to students	4.28
Understands how developmentally children and youth learn	4.39
Uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students, including special needs students	4.07
Consistently reflects on his/her practice in order to enhance student learning	3.99
Promotes relationships with families and the community	3.75
Integrates technology into the instructional environment	3.69
Creates instructional opportunities that facilitate and motivate student learning	4.14
Assesses student learning and makes appropriate adjustment to instruction based on results	4.12
Manages the classroom environment to motivate students and optimize their learning opportunities	3.99
Demonstrates building leadership in developing programs and processes	3.69
Appropriately documents student learning achievement using Show-Me Standards	2.93
Personally practices a habit of life-long learning and inquiry	4.08

Mean responses on the 17 items ranged from 4.39 to 2.93, indicating that most supervisors and principals generally rated our program completers as at Mastery or Nearing Mastery. Many took the opportunity to volunteer comments about the novice teacher working in their district or building. A comparison of the surveys in previous years yields findings similar to those presented above.

Overall Findings:

The three items rated most favorably by supervisors and principals were:

- Accommodates individual learners by using multiple teaching strategies adapted to individual learners' needs
- Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter
- Manages the classroom environment to motivate students and optimize their learning opportunities

The three items receiving the lowest ratings were:

- Demonstrates building leadership in developing programs and processes
- Appropriately documents student learning achievement using Show-Me Standards
- Promotes relationships with families and the community

Follow-up Surveys of Graduates

The Division of Teaching and Learning has for the last two years used the EBI Survey, a product developed and administered by an outside corporation, to determine graduate satisfaction during the first year after they graduate. The survey questions align to the MoSTEP Quality Indicators, and EBI offers comparisons to six other "like" institutions. The following factors most closely correlate with teacher performance and potentially student learning:

- Factor 2: Learning Theory, Teaching Pedagogy/Techniques
- Factor 5: Classroom Equity and Diversity
- Factor 6: Management of Educational Constituencies
- Factor 7: Assessment of Student Learning

When the 2002 and 2003 results are compared, data reveals no *significant* difference in the overall satisfaction of the programs. The mean score in both years fell between 4.1 and 4.5 on a 0-6 scale. Comparing UMSL College of Education 2003 teacher education programs to the selected six institutions in the EBI survey, one may conclude that our graduates rate our programs significantly the same as the comparison institutions' graduates rate them. One may conclude that while the College of Education Teacher Education Program, while not rated at the top of the scale, is still performing at an above-average level and consistent with other like institutions. Faculty are looking again at the EBI survey data to determine areas for review and possible action.

Graduate Retention Study

The College of Education has just embarked on a study of how long our beginning teachers remain active in the profession once they leave their program. We have data on graduates from the 2002-2003 Academic Year and are presently seeking data for the preceding 4 years from the core data system of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Our hypothesis is that teachers who are having an

impact on student learning are more likely to remain in the profession or be retained by their district/school. We hope to establish some baseline and trend data and, based on these, survey graduates who appear to have left teaching to determine why they left and whether better preparation could have kept them in the profession longer. Initial findings indicate that among graduate of the 2002-2003 AY, only 51% were employed in public (and some private/parochial) school settings. While this number is consistent with national trends, it will be useful to follow these data to determine if this is an area of concern and/or action for the college. Similar data is not yet available for our advanced programs.

Student Learning for other Professional School Personnel

In order to insure that candidates understand how to build a positive learning environment for student learning, ELAPS students are introduced to resource materials from the National School Boards Association, the Missouri School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the Missouri Association of School Administrators, the American Education Research Association and MPEA. The work of Ruby Payne (2001) is an example of materials designed to help candidates understand diversity, families, communities and the policy contexts within which they work. Our diverse faculty insures that students are introduced to the impact of race, class, family and the environment on the educational process. The five correlates of effective schools (Edmonds, 1989) and the process of change are discussed and analyzed in depth. They work of Kotter (1996); Senge (1999); DuFour (1998), Fuller (2001) and Covey (1990) are used in order to support ideas with research. Achievement data based on race, gender and socio-economic deprivation are analyzed and discussed. In addition, candidates learn the expectations of DESE in meeting the academic improvement standards for students at all levels. Candidates learn the IEP process and its legal ramifications when working with students of diverse needs.

The Organizational Change in Education class contains a knowledge base portion that addresses the knowledge, social, political, economic and legal contexts that are important to administrators working in educational settings. It synthesizes the four context classes and unifies the program.

Administrative Interns receive instruction in developmental models for effecting change, and learning is regarded as a change in knowledge, dispositions, and performance. The unique background of each Intern provides a natural opportunity to explore diversity of educational environments, including all learners (student and adults). The previous study of educational contexts in the degree program provides the basis for dialogue in site visits and on-campus seminars.

Employer survey responses on issues tied to student learning are presented in the table below:

Figure 24: Employer Survey Responses Related to Student Learning

Survey Item	Mean 6-Point Scale
Ability to set vision, provide leadership skills to help staff achieve vision	5.0

Working with a wide variety of populations	5.6
Ability to work with parents to improve organization	5.6

Graduates were rated highly on the six-point scale in each area, indicating that graduates of the school leadership programs are well-prepared for leadership positions impacting student learning.

School and Community Counseling: In Missouri, school counselors are no longer required to hold a teaching certificate before gaining school counselor certification. Unfortunately, this removes the beginning school counselor one more step away from the classroom and the role of “teacher” within the school counseling setting. Still, the Division of School and Community Counseling recognizes the impact a counselor can have on student learning and achievement. For this reason, the objectives of our programs are integrally tied to learning, the learner and the milieu within which the student resides. This is the context, then, for the coursework our students take and the kinds of clinical experiences they undertake. The following data, gleaned from our employer follow-up surveys, address issues we believe have potential to impact student learning. Clearly, graduates of the School Counseling program has the skills necessary to have a positive impact on student learning and achievement.

Figure 25: Employer Survey Results Related to Counselor Dispositions

Issue	Very Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Mildly Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Unable To Judge
Initial Individual Counseling Skills	7 (70%)	3 (30%)					
Initial Career Counseling Skills	5 (50%)	2 (20%)					3 (30%)
Initial Group Skills	8 (80%)	1 (10%)					1 (10%)
Initial Skill in Assessment/ Diagnosis	8 (80%)	2 (20%)					
Working with a Wide Variety of Populations	9 (90%)	1 (10%)					
Overall Rating							
Highly Competent: 9 (90%)		Competent: 1 (10%)			Incompetent: 0 (0%)		

Overview

The COE has developed its Ongoing Program Improvement (OPI) System to address not only the need for both formative and summative candidate assessment, but also ongoing program evaluation and decision making. The OPI System is directly tied to dimensions that focus on the quality of the professional preparation received by program graduates and the accomplishments of those graduates. It is grounded in a common mission, set of values, and conceptual framework that have led us to the definition of quality targets in six areas (see Figure 26 below). Taken together these six areas of ongoing review address not only candidate

performance and accomplishment, but also all other critical dimensions of the programs and unit operation. Evidence collected and summarized in reports by a newly organized Assessment and Evaluation Committee permit faculty to examine all aspects of program operation and make decisions designed to result in ongoing program improvement.

Members of the NCATE steering committee designed the assessment system. The system was shared with and refined with faculty over four faculty meetings during 2001 – 2002 and 2002 – 2003. The College began implementing the system in Fall 2003 and is adhering to the following roll-out plan. The system will be fully functioning and populated in by Fall 2005.

Figure 26: On-going Program Improvement System Roll-out Plan

Review of Available Cycle 1 Reports	2003-2004 Academic Year
Development and Review of Cycle 2 Reports	2004-2005 Academic Year
Development and Refinement of OPI System and Data Sources	2002-2005
Full Implementation	2005-2006 Academic Year

Faculty throughout the COE assists in the ongoing implementation of the system. In order to accomplish the assessment plans, a variety of data systems and technical reporting templates needed to be designed with the help of technology faculty and staff. Parts of the technology and system are still in development, but the bulk of the system is functioning, and the remaining portions will be fully implemented by the end of the 2004-2005 academic year.

Ongoing Program Improvement (OPI) System Procedures

The program evaluation process uses a two-year cycle and is embedded within the naturally occurring events of program operation during the academic year. Figure 27 depicts the annual calendar for reviewing information related to each of the Areas of Review. Program and Outcomes Status reports alternate by year, while all other reports occur annually. During each 2-year cycle, individual programs will complete status reports at its appointed time. Each report will be shared with program faculty during regularly scheduled meetings for discussion. The final reports will include:

- A summary of evidence and data related to each quality target
- An interpretation of the data
- Decisions and actions to be taken by program faculty based on the evidence that are likely to bring the program closer to the quality target or ensure that the achieved quality is maintained

Figure 27: OPIS Annual Calendar

Figure 28: Areas of Review and Quality Targets

Area of Review: Governance, Coordination & Resources	
Quality Dimensions Quality Targets	
1. Authority & Unit Governance	<p>1.1 The COE’s authority to operate degree, licensure, research, and outreach programs in relation to public education and human services is clearly stated in a public document, and COE programs are appropriately accredited by appropriate national, state, and regional accrediting organizations.</p> <p>1.2 The office of the dean and each program unit has written governance and operations policies and procedures.</p> <p>1.3 The COE is governed collaboratively through councils and committees.</p>
2. Stakeholders & Accountability	<p>2.1 College stakeholder groups that meet regularly according to a set of bylaws are maintained to support all key program areas and include all key professional stakeholders.</p> <p>2.2 Community and school partners provide input to the design of programs, courses and field experiences, help monitor operations and performance, and review and validate evidence of quality performance</p>
3. Resources	<p>3.4 The university supports the unit with the financial resources necessary to fully prepare its candidates for professional service.</p> <p>3.2 The COE creates relationships with alumni and benefactors to provide the College with endowed scholarships and restricted funds to achieve its goals.</p> <p>3.3 The COE seeks ongoing grant funding to support innovative programs and improve the quality of its existing programs.</p> <p>3.4 The unit possesses and maintains the facilities, instructional resources, and technology necessary to support the preparation of education professionals.</p> <p>3.5 The unit provides time and resources to assist faculty in effectively maintaining their professional knowledge and carry out their professional responsibilities.</p>
4. Operations	<p>4.1 The unit maintains its joint appointees with the College of Arts and Sciences and works with the A&S faculty to ensure the quality of general education and content-specific preparation of candidates.</p>

Area of Review: Admissions	
Quality Dimensions Quality Targets	
1. Recruitment	<p>Program information reaches a diverse range of potential students.</p> <p>The unit has a written plan for recruiting, admitting and retaining diverse candidates.</p>

<p>2. Quality Course of Study</p> <p>2. Admissions Selectivity</p>	<p>2.1 The admission process classifies students into multiple, professional pathways with a high range of artifacts including model (expects, promotes and supports) high quality comprehensive program (multiple courses of data) assessment of academic proficiency (e.g., basic skills proficiency tests and content area tests), faculty recommendations, biographical information, successful completion of any prior college/university course work with at least a 2.5 cumulative grade point average (GPA) on a 4-point scale, background screening, and background checks for felony conviction(s).</p>
	<p>2.2 The unit admits, matriculates, and graduates a diverse study body.</p>
<p>Area of Review: Student Advising & Assessment</p>	
<p>Quality Dimensions Quality Targets</p>	
<p>1. Well-informed & Advised Student</p>	<p>1.1 Students are knowledgeable about program requirements and procedures. 1.2 Each student receives advisement that is fair, accurate, informative and consistent</p>
<p>2. Timely Progress Through the Program</p>	<p>The performance of each candidate is assessed regularly throughout the program using multiple measures of performance and achievement. Deficiencies in student performance are noted and addressed before the student leaves the program. Students revise career goals when appropriate. Programs maintain developmental and articulated structures to support student growth and progress. Performance of each candidate is assessed regularly at the end of the program using multiple measures of performance and achievement to determine the readiness of the candidate for assuming his/her professional roles.</p>
<p>3. Student Support</p>	<p>3.1 The unit establishes, promotes and supports with faculty sponsorship of professional education clubs and associations on campus to facilitate the professional identity of candidates. 3.2 Diverse students receive supports and accommodations throughout their program.</p>

Area of Review: Program

<p>Quality Dimensions Quality Targets</p>	
<p>1. Conceptual Framework</p>	<p>1.1 Every student, faculty member and professional community member is informed about the unit's conceptual framework in a variety of ways. 1.2 The conceptual framework is supported by an informed and supported knowledge base developed by the faculty and professional community, and is reviewed regularly by stakeholders. 1.3 The unit's programs, coursework, teaching, field experiences, and assessment practices are derived from, are consistent with, and/or are evaluated against the conceptual framework and knowledge base, in order to serve all students in the community.</p>

2. Quality Course of Study	<p>2.1 Students complete course assignments, products, and activities with high quality.</p> <p>2.2 The unit <i>faculty model</i> (expects, promotes and supports) high quality instruction in the programs and courses.</p> <p>2.3 Each faculty member's performance reflects standards consistent with the unit's conceptual framework, vision and mission.</p> <p>2.4 Faculty members use evaluation data to improve course designs, instructional practice and field assignments.</p>
3. Field Experiences	<p>3.1 Field experiences are integrated into and supported by the programs and coursework.</p> <p>3.2 The quality, focus and quantity of field experiences are evaluated regularly with professional partners and improved based on data and experience.</p> <p>3.3 Field and supervising faculty provide effective supervision and instruction to support and correct student learning.</p> <p>3.4 Cooperating professionals in field sites/agencies report improvement in their professional practice as a consequence of participation in fieldwork.</p>

Area of Review: Faculty & Personnel	
Quality Dimensions Quality Targets	
1. Quality of Faculty	<p>1.1 The unit has sufficient full- and part-time faculty to effectively prepare its candidates to undertake their roles in the profession.</p> <p>1.2 The unit hires faculty with the professional credentials, preparation, and experience necessary to fulfill their professional roles.</p>
2. Composition of Faculty	<p>2.1 The unit has implemented and regularly evaluates a written plan for recruiting, hiring, and retaining a diverse faculty.</p> <p>2.2 The faculty represents a diverse range of ethnicity, cultural background, and physical ability.</p>
3. Faculty Development	<p>3.1 The unit systematically provides supports for faculty professional development.</p> <p>3.2 Faculty professional development directly and visibly impacts faculty performance.</p> <p>3.3 Faculty actively participate in appropriate professional organizations and contributes to the profession.</p>

Area of Review: Outcomes

Quality Dimensions Quality Targets	
1. Employment Patterns of Graduates	<p>1.1 Licensure and degree graduates are employed in the field within one year.</p> <p>1.2 Licensure and degree graduates remain employed in the field at least four years</p>
2. Graduate Support	<p>Programs offer and support a Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) that fosters the continuing development of its graduates.</p> <p>The BTAP is collaboratively developed based on data gathered from graduates and employers relevant to the candidates' needs as developing professionals.</p> <p>Graduates evaluate their program as effectively preparing them for their professional role.</p> <p>Graduate performance is evaluated after the program via employer and candidates surveys and assistance is offered as needed to candidates seeking it.</p>

Procedures for Communicating Data and Decisions

The OPI System is designed to guide decisions by those members of the faculty and staff closest to

the desired outcomes. At the same time, cross-program sharing of data and decisions improves the overall continuity and coherence of all programs, contributes to a shared mission of excellence, and can make action agendas more efficient. Procedures for communicating data and decisions within and across programs are:

Figure 29: OPI Procedures for Communicating Data and Decisions

1. Status reports are prepared according to the annual calendar schedule and shared with program faculty at regularly scheduled program faculty meetings for discussion. If program faculty do not have regular meetings, a specific meeting will be scheduled to review and discuss data and make decisions within 3 weeks of the status report due date.
2. Status reports from all programs will be shared with the TEC at their regularly scheduled meeting the same month each status report is due. Discussion and decisions might support efforts of all program's action agendas and/or provide suggestions and feedback about how action agendas might be improved to more efficiently and effectively address the quality targets. TEC decisions, for example, might be to develop a common policy or develop a college-wide initiative in a particular area that several programs wish to address.
3. Associate Deans and Division Chairs will report results of TEC review of status reports to the Dean at regularly scheduled Deans' Advisory Council meetings. In this way, the Deans stay informed of program activities related to ongoing program improvement and can provide feedback or direction as needed. Deans' Council discussion may also result in revised college priorities or reallocation of resources in order to support program action agendas.

Strengths and Successes of the OPI System

The OPI System has been functioning in parts since Fall 2003 and has already prompted significant reflection and some change. The following issues and responses have come out of this system and it focus on performance:

- The implementation of an advising satisfaction survey presently being administered in the APEC office;
- Recognition of the issue of grade inflation within the COE resulting in the development of a Grade Inflation Sub-committee within the Division of Teaching and Learning to study the issue and report to the Division with recommendations for action;
- Recognition of the need to scrutinize the various Divisions' portfolio assessment systems to evaluate their effectiveness, fairness, and consistency, as well as their ability to meet the regulatory requirements of DESE;
- Discovery of downward trends in PRAXIS II scores (although still above the state minimum required scores) which the Division of Teaching and Learning are presently studying;
- Distilling from EBI graduate follow-up survey data several issues for focus with the College, for example students' dissatisfaction with their classroom management preparation, and the development of a sub-committee in the Division of Teaching and Learning to study the issue and return with recommendations for action;
- Discovery that only 50% of graduates enter and remain in the profession after their first year of teaching (consistent with national trends);

- Discovery of significant weaknesses in the University System's data stores, which lead to the development of the Teacher Education Application on-line application system and the College's own data store for its own student populations;
- Recognition of the need for a more organized and robust data management system to inform the OPI system, which lead to the purchase of the STEP Alignment Tool for gathering, aligning, arraying and analyzing curriculum and student performance data for use in the OPI reporting system;
- Recognition that the Educational Leadership program needed a greater emphasis in its curriculum and coursework on ethics and the enacting of measures to correct this gap in preparation.

The last two years have been a period of change in the COE, with the phasing in of new programs, a new conceptual framework, and a new strategic planning initiative. It has also been a time of significant reflection based on data heretofore unavailable to or not gathered/reviewed by the College.

Challenges for the OPI System

A number of challenges still face the OPI system and the College, including the following:

- The College is developing technological solutions to address its need for credible data for decision-making; such solutions are not always quick and require time to prepare faculty to use them;
- Sometimes data needs outstrip the data available, so the data is not yet available to fulfill and OPI need, putting the system off schedule.
- University data stores are inaccurate can be arcane and difficult to navigate, so the College must develop ways of either generating its own data, persuading the University to improve its own systems, and/or find ways of more effectively using the existing stores;
- Sometimes too much data can raise too many issues seemingly to need immediate attention. Priorities must be set, in those cases, to deal with immediate and long term issues in a large institution.

Candidate Assessment System

The Candidate Assessment Systems (CAS) for each area are designed to be comprehensive, addressing all DESE standards for teachers (Figure 30) school counselors (Figure 31) and school leaders (Figure 32). Each tool serves both a formative and summative function. In addition, a variety of criteria (e.g., test completion, GPA) augment the assessment tools to ensure that candidates meet not only COE quality standards, but also those of DESE and the profession.

Teacher Education: During the Spring 2004 semester, with the implementation of the electronic portfolio system and the final phase of implementing the revised teacher education program, the Division of Teaching held a portfolio summit to explore ways to improve the portfolio system for teacher education programs. Within that summit, faculty identified two primary purposes for the portfolio system, brainstormed characteristics of a more effective system, and charged a faculty committee with the task of developing a more detailed proposal for the new system within the context of a more clearly defined and structures "assessment plan" for beginning teachers in the program. Two meetings in the Spring and Summer, yielded a plan that identified both existing assessments and new assessments to evaluate student performance on all the domains identified by the NCATE Standards and tied to the standards and dispositions identified in the conceptual framework, including the dispositions identified in the MoSTEP Quality Indicators and the COE Vision and Beliefs. Specific assessment tools and benchmarks are further described in Figure 30.

End of Level II Checkpoint	GPA Content/Basic Knowledge	2.5 Portfolio II Exp Score	Prof. Knowledge/Skills		Exp. Score	Add Quality Indicators 5, 8, and 11 plus other Dispositions artifacts	Minimum Expectations: Score progressing in all three TBA Quality Indicators	1. Revised Education Philosophy 2. K-12 Student Learning Issues 3. Paper 4. Case Study 5. Class Discussions Cooperating Teacher Evaluations	TBA Exp. Score
Entry to program End of Level I: Admission to TEP	Academic Profile (2005) C-BASE GPA ACT	TBA 235 2.5 20	Portfolio I	Quality Indicators 1, 2, 3, and 7 plus other potential artifacts	Minimum Expectations: Progressing on all 4 Quality Indicators	1. Gregorian Inventory 2. Education Philosophy 3. Diversity Essay 4. Field Notes from "Cultural Plunge" 5. Criminal Background Check			

Preparation activities on campus registration and gas expenses

End of Level III: Mid-point of Internship or Mid-point of Student teaching	Academic Profile (2005) PRAXIS GPA	TBA Per state for each area 2.5	Portfolio III	All 11 MoSTEP Quality Indicators	Minimum Expectations: Proficient in 9 of 11 Quality Indicators	1. Summative Assessment via Internship/ Student Teaching Evaluations 2. Final Education Philosophy 3. Final Case Study	TBA	4. Pre- and Post Assessment Data Collection 5. Student Work Samples 6. Analysis and Reflection Paper	Grade of "C" or above on each
---	---	--	---------------	----------------------------------	--	--	-----	--	-------------------------------

Candidate assessment occurs throughout the teacher education program with progress being measured at each of 3 Levels. For each level the teacher candidate assessment system addresses 3 dimensions of assessment: (1) program/certification requirements, (2) dispositions assessment, and (3) performance assessments, and (4) impact on student learning.

Throughout a candidate's program, evidence of their ongoing acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions is gathered in an electronic portfolio which is assessed at each level. The electronic portfolio system (presently LiveText) offers candidates opportunities to develop artifacts of various types and in various media, align these to various state and national standards, and pull from their collection a representative sample to showcase in their assessment portfolio. Candidates then submit the portfolios for review on line. The following timeline reflects the next steps in the development and implementation of the new assessment plan:

Figure 31: Timeline for Completing and Implementing the New Teacher Education Candidate Assessment Plan

Fall 2004:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Specification of Student Work Samples Share Assessment Plan and Instruments with entire division faculty, faculty in the Education Research Division, adjunct faculty, and representatives of the COE partners and advisory committees Complete refinement of the system and present again to division faculty for approval and adoption Work with Community College partners to create seamless transition of students into new assessment system Develop System Evaluation Protocol and Instruments
Spring/Summer 2005:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot and refine rubrics and scorer training protocols/materials using faculty, student and partner input Develop necessary guidelines, instructional activities, instructional materials, and student support systems Finalize implementation timeline
Fall 2006:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin Implementation with Level I students in COE and with Community College partners
On-going:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gather, analyze and report evaluation data to Division Faculty (via Assessment and Evaluation Committee) Refine system components as necessary based on evaluation data

Assessment of portfolios presently relies on rubrics based on the MoSTEP Quality Indicators for Beginning Teachers (aligned to MoSTEP, INTASC, and College of Education Dispositions). Beginning Fall 2004, the COE will pilot the *Assessment of the Ongoing Acquisition of Educator Dispositions* tool which is further elaborated by rubrics that detail expectations for each standard. When candidate's acquisition of

knowledge and skills fall short at any gate, various remediation efforts kick in. These range from additional advising, referral to counseling, and other student support services.

To ensure fairness and consistency among within our assessment of students in the teacher education program, several actions have been undertaken:

- Internship/Student teaching guidelines and evaluation materials for the candidate, cooperating teacher, and clinical supervisor have been revised and made more consistent. Moreover, meetings are held with supervisors to make sure they understand the expectations for each constituent in the process and can work with cooperating professionals to ensure understanding on their parts.
- Each level of the program has a level leader who meets with level faculty to discuss syllabi, field experiences, and expectations. Each class in the levels and each content area has a leader who meets with faculty teaching those classes to ensure the same understanding and consistency.
- Portfolios are scored by faculty, clinical faculty, supervisors and professionals from the field. Training sessions are held to jointly “unpack” the standards and rubrics used in the scoring process. If a portfolio fails its review, a second faculty member scores the portfolio to corroborate the score. If the two disagree, the portfolio is scored by a third reader who makes the final determination of its overall score. Students whose portfolios fail are counseled by a faculty member and assisted in addressing the issues that precipitated the failing score. By and large, failures are a matter of too little evidence or weak/absent reflections, and candidates are able to revise the portfolio to complete the requirements of their certification.

The ongoing assessment of the acquisition of dispositions necessary for effective teaching uses a different system that also occurs repeatedly throughout the candidate’s program. The disposition assessment process occurs in two stages. First, the candidate, faculty, and district cooperating professionals record examples of evidence of a candidate’s dispositions throughout each semester, coding the evidence towards the end of the semester using the tool “Assessment of the Ongoing Acquisition of Educator Dispositions.” As candidates move from Level to Level and again at completion of their program, faculty on the Level teams will use the dispositions assessment document entitled “Making the Teaching-Learning Connection.” As with the formative steps for standards assessment, dispositions assessment document also includes a procedure for remediation.

School Counselor Candidate Assessment Plan

The faculty of the School Counselor program have a focused and on-going system for ensuring the quality of its candidates. To start, faculty interview all applicants to the Ed.D./Ph.D. degree program. All candidates’ files are screened to ensure that they meet the entrance standards. Candidate’s files are rated and those that meet the division’s standards are interviewed. The faculty rate the applicants at the time of the interview. Candidates are then notified with regard to their acceptance into the doctoral program.

Dr. Susan Kashubeck-West, is designated the Coordinator of Admissions for the M.Ed. programs. All faculty are involved in rating applicants for the program. The Coordinator for the Community Counseling Program and the Coordinator for the School Counseling Program review the faculty ratings for all applications. Admissions decisions are then made for the M.Ed. in School and Community Counseling. Special consideration is given to students of color who meet the admissions criteria.

All individuals who are accepted into the M.Ed. program are "provisionally accepted" until they have

satisfactorily completed CNS 6000, Personal and Professional Development in Counseling. This process is described in depth in the Bulletin.

Figure 32: School Counselor Candidate Assessment Plan

Checkpoints	Content Assessment	Dispositions Assessment
Provisional Admission	3.0 GPA Writing Sample	3 Professional References
Full Admission	Successful Completion Of CE 6000 Counseling Faculty Review Board Reviews Dispositions	
On-going Formative Assessments	Grade Less Than A "B" In Any Core Counseling Course	Portfolios
Exit Requirements	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination	600 Hour Field Experience Portfolios
School Counselor Certification	Praxis II	

During and especially at the end of CNS ED 6000, faculty teaching sections of the course will identify students who are having difficulty and academic or personal recommendations are made. Faculty will complete a referral form to the Counseling Review Board (CRB) which is composed of faculty who do not teach CNS ED 6000. The CRB will review the recommendation and written materials from the faculty member, will interview the student, and will decide on a recommended course of action. Any special recommendations for personal counseling or other personal development prior to admission to candidacy would be made at this time.

Further, as part of our retention policy, students with low effectiveness potential are identified as early as possible and to initiate the necessary procedures for dealing with such students. This policy is outlined in the Bulletin. We have a division policy which states that students who have a grade less than a "B" in any of the "core" counseling courses will automatically trigger a referral to the Counseling Review Board for possible remediation or termination.

Students may appeal any of these processes or grades and must follow the Graduate School policies which are outlined in the Bulletin. Any decisions are provided in writing at each step of the appeal process.

K-12 Leadership Candidate Assessment Plan

The faculty of the K-12 Leadership program have an on-going system for ensuring the quality of its candidates. Students entering the program must meet the admission requirements of the graduate school. They must also submit letters of reference and complete an interview with program faculty members.

Course objectives are aligned to knowledge base and state standards. Measures used to assess that candidates are meeting expectations are case studies, simulations, research projects, term papers and exams. When exams are given, the candidates have an opportunity to demonstrate, in depth, their knowledge and understanding of professional, state and institution standards. Candidates are required to critique case studies

and articles that allow them an opportunity to speak to the ISLLC standards within the context of practical applications. Candidate performance is monitored throughout the program, and they must meet minimum grade and GPA expectations to make adequate progress through the program.

On-going evaluation is continued via the professional internship. Throughout the semester-long clinical experience, interns reflect upon their unique experiences through discussion with supervisors and completion of reflective written activities that result in a portfolio notebook. The ISLLC Standards are included in each activity. Seminar sessions are held throughout the semester to provide opportunities for group reflection allowing Interns to learn from the experiences of other Interns. The site supervisor provides an evaluation of the Intern activities, and the portfolio notebook is submitted at the end of the course for the review of the University supervisor.

Figure 33: School Leader Candidate Assessment Plan

Gates	Content	Professional Skills	Dispositions
Admission to Graduate Program	Admission to Graduate School GPA3.0		Interviews and Letters of Reference
Formative Assessments of Candidate Progress	GPA3.0	Successful completion of relevant course assignments GPA 3.0	Successful completion of relevant course assignments GPA 3.0
Exit	GPA 3.0 Completion of School Leader Internship School Leadership Inter Portfolio	Completion of School Leader Internship School Leadership Intern Portfolio	Completion of School Leader Internship School Leadership Intern Portfolio
Certification	SLLA (School Leadership Licensure Assessment) SSA (School Superintendent's Assessment)		

Throughout the semester-long internship, interns reflect upon their unique experiences through discussion with supervisors and completion of reflective written activities that result in a portfolio notebook. The ISLLC Standards are included in each activity. Seminar sessions are held throughout the semester to provide opportunities for group reflection allowing Interns to learn from the experiences of other Interns. The site supervisor provides an evaluation of the Intern activities, and the portfolio notebook is submitted at the end of the course for the review of the University supervisor.

Course objectives are aligned to knowledge base and state standards. Measures used to assess that candidates are meeting expectations are case studies, simulations, research projects, term papers and exams. When exams are given, the candidates have an opportunity to demonstrate, in depth, their knowledge and understanding of professional, state and institution standards. Candidates are required to critique case studies and articles that allow them an opportunity to speak to the ISLLC standards within the context of practical applications.

University supervisors make a minimum of two visits to each Intern site and meet with the Intern and the site supervisor to address successes and concerns. A scoring guide leads the review of essential elements of the Internship, and the site supervisor completes an evaluation instrument. Ultimately, the Intern scores on the licensure examinations (SLLA and SSA) ensure that the principles and concepts are known to and understood by the known to and understood by Administrative Interns. The State ISLLC exam reflects knowledge of fields.

Technology and the COE Assessment System

The College of Education is using technology in a number of ways to support and extend the OPI and CAS systems. In this regard the College is well-served by an in-house group of technology professionals, the Technology Integration Group (TIG), who are ready to assist the unit, its programs, its

faculty, students and members of its professional community. The TIG has been particularly helpful during the conception and development of the OPI system and various data-gathering and reporting functions, all in the service of the educational ends of the College.

The University System data warehouses and systems are notoriously inaccurate, inconsistent and arcane. Faced with flawed data, the College and TIG decided to develop its own systems for gathering, arraying and reporting data about the unit, its programs, and its students. To these ends, the COE has developed or purchased a range of versatile tools to serve the College's assessment and evaluation needs:

- **Teacher Education Application:** This powerful tool is the gateway into the teacher education program. All teacher education students apply on-line using the tool; the system then retrieves relevant data from the university's data warehouses and presents it to the APEC office for evaluation and either admission into the program or denial of admission. The program tracks student progress and helps maintain the integrity of the developmental programs by preventing students not yet admitted to the program from taking classes without the appropriate pre-requisite courses.
- **STEP Alignment Tool:** The *STEP Electronic Alignment Tool* helps institutions manage and use curriculum and student data to improve programs and gauge student readiness to enter the profession. *STEP* facilitates data-driven continuous improvement in educator preparation and the campus-wide conversations needed to implement that improvement. *STEP* provides two fully integrated components: 1) *Curriculum Alignment Module*, which allows the College to align courses and programs to state & national standards, test specifications, instructional strategies, technologies, and clinical experiences; and 2) *Performance Module*, which helps the College track and report candidate performance and use candidate, course, program, and unit performance data to refine alignment and improve performance.
- **Faculty Portal:** This on-line tool allows faculty to up-load current syllabi and CVs for review by the appropriate review agent.
- **Electronic Portfolios:** Throughout a candidate's program, evidence of their ongoing acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions is gathered in an electronic portfolio which is assessed at each level. The electronic portfolio system (presently LiveText in Teacher Preparation and Foliotek in Counseling; Educational Leadership Portfolios are presently optionally electronic) offers candidates opportunities to develop artifacts of various types and in various media, align these to various state and national standards, and pull from their collection a representative sample to showcase in their assessment portfolio. Candidates then submit the portfolios for review on line.

Overview

The College of Education, based on its 1997 "Futures I" work, redesigned its teacher education programs to enhance them with more intensive field-experiences and a more intense culminating clinical experience as an induction into the professional life of the classroom. Soon afterward the Educational Leadership and Counselor programs refined their own clinical experiences to better prepare their candidates for professional service. Our desire and commitment is to ensure that every professional leaving our programs will be ready to assume the professional roles for which they have prepared, having more experience and increased self-efficacy.

Moreover, our commitment to field and clinical experiences are consistent with and reflective of our

conceptual framework:

Engagement in Multiple Contexts and Individuals and Communities—The College of Education is committed to intense field experience as a means to exploring, practicing and reflecting on the professional roles and responsibilities of educators. These experiences focus students' attentions on different populations with differing needs and experiences. Frequently, these field experiences are coupled with inquiry into learners and learning, exploration of cultural influences on learning, and engagement with students, faculty and resource persons within the educational setting and broader community. For example, candidates will go into level 1 field experiences with assignments relevant to

- Cross-cultural research
- How cultural values shape child-rearing practices
- Teaching strategies and management strategies for diverse and special needs students
- Ideas for culturally relevant teaching.

Social Justice—Field experiences in both the initial and advanced levels specifically direct candidate focus on issues related to social justice, democracy, privilege and class. These focuses are supported by the College's commitment to engage in the urban educational settings of the Saint Louis Public Schools and the urban-ring districts (where nearly 90 % of all our field experiences occur) that share many of the same social, cultural and economic challenges. They also provide the concrete contexts for discussing issues such as

- Racism, cultural bias, segregation, equity, economic parity
- Economic equity, cultural pluralism/segregation relevant to St. Louis City, County, Ring and Suburban schools
- Economic issues affecting access to technology in high poverty areas.
- Gender issues related to technology.

Educational Practice—As our knowledge-base statement says, educators must be “engaged in inquiry--the complex process of constructing understanding through building models, explaining phenomena, and validating experiences through socially defined community. . . . New teachers especially must be prepared to talk about the responsibly teaching a diverse population, solving perplexing educational problems, and reflecting on their actions.” The College of Education field experiences, and the reflection and inquiry that support them, are opportunities for our candidates to engage the complex thinking and problems posing/ solving that makes an excellent educator. The field forces the issue by challenging candidates daily with real experiences in real educational contexts, for example

- Implications of differences for assessment and practice
- Sources of bias
- Inclusive education for children from diverse backgrounds and with any type of disability.

Partnerships— The College endeavors to create “reflective apprenticeship learning with partner schools, youth service agencies, cultural institutions.” That is why we are implementing intense and on-going field and clinical experiences. This reflective apprenticeship, with increasing complexity of involvement and inquiry, allows the student to develop the self-efficacy necessary to meet the challenges of their chosen professional roles. Moreover, these intense field and clinical placements, by their very nature, challenge the candidates' commitment to a profession that requires much of them, helping them explore and evaluate the

depth of their commitment and either affirm their desire to be a professional educator or choose to pursue other career goals. If the candidate chooses to become an educator, the field/clinical experiences can create bonds between candidates and the professionals, students, and parents with which they engage. These bonds help the candidate develop and extend their skills and dispositions.

Collaboration between the Unit and School Partners

Teacher Preparation: Each field and clinical experience in the teacher education program is designed with both the needs of the candidates in mind and the needs of the classroom teacher and his or her students. Whether it is a virtual classroom visit, a tutoring session, or an internship, the school partners help determine what the candidates see, experience, and do. For example, this is done with the initial design of the experience; in other situations, this is accomplished during meetings where partnerships are developed and defined. Often, they are arranged between the cooperating teacher and the candidate within the context of a set of “needs” which the candidate’s experience must address. At base, partner schools and cooperating professionals communicate their preferences for both the number of interns and the schedule of assignments to clinical and field experience faculty in order to facilitate placements. Students are not permitted to adjust schedules unilaterally. Schedule changes are negotiated among school personnel, candidates, and university faculty.

Collaboration between the Teacher preparation and School Partners—

Elementary Education—

The Division of Teaching and Learning initially planned the addition of field-based internships across all programs during the 2001-02 academic year, and more intensive planning began in the Elementary Education program in Fall 2002. For the past two years, the majority of Elementary Education faculty meetings (3 per semester) have been devoted to the development of Level III internship and student teaching experiences. The elementary education internship has been designed around the “communities of practice” framework (Murrell, 2001) and the development of geographic partnership networks which allow core faculty to spend more time on site at schools.

In March 2003, the Internship Committee held a series of individual meetings at more than a dozen schools across four partner districts (St. Louis Public Schools, Normandy, Ferguson-Florissant, Parkway) as well as a series of “cluster” meetings in April and May of 2003. In May 2003, the Internship Committee began to solidify Fall 2003 internship cohorts, determine literacy liaison roles and responsibilities, and to plan for collaboration with building principals in identifying excellent mentor teachers. Discussions with district partners about readiness for implementation of the new model led to a decision to begin implementation in the North City, South City, Mid-Town, and North County/UMSL clusters for Fall 2003.

In the summer of 2003, the Elementary Education faculty hosted a series of six drop-in information sessions in order to provide students with information about the new internship and help with registration decisions. Kick-off meetings and information socials were held at a number of partner schools upon teachers’ return for the fall. The Elementary Education faculty continued to meet monthly (Oct, Nov, Dec) to monitor the implementation of the program.

Secondary Programs—

Secondary Education programs, given the size and varying nature of their program and the existing relationships with schools and cooperating teachers, take a more individualized approach to collaboration. Below are some examples of these collaborations.

- One strength of the secondary education program is the personal contact between the faculty and professionals in area high schools. Joint appointees (or their predecessors) in each subject area have built these relationships over many years. Because UM-St. Louis is the largest supplier of new secondary teachers in Missouri, many of our own graduates work in the high schools where we now place new interns and student teachers. All faculty rely on these relationships for practical help with placements, for tips on job openings, and also for a “reality check” in our own curriculum planning. These partnership contacts are considered so valuable that several programs maintain their own databases of excellent teachers, department chairs, and others in the schools
- In both chemistry and physics, UMSL enjoys a very strong and collegial relationship with secondary school teachers in our partner schools. This is a result of working closely with mentors in a large and diverse group of mentor teachers who participate actively in the development and evaluation of pre-service teachers, and through participation in chemistry and physics teacher organizations in the region. Mentors and administrators provide assessment of university supervision and programs as well, and their critical comments help us correct deficiencies and build strengths.
- Joint appointees Jane Zeni and Nancy Robb Singer often consult the people we regard as master teachers in the schools to help in our own teaching decisions. One example has been our effort to help our students transition from the lesson plan models taught in their earlier Education classes (models based on the short mini-lesson) to the task of planning for the 50 to 90 minute blocks typical of today’s high schools. We discussed this dilemma with our team of supervisors and also with teachers currently in the schools until we were able to reconceptualize the “lesson” as a “lesson sequence,” with several instructional models linked together in a 90-minute class period. Similarly, we struggled to find a format to cite the Show-Me Standards and Curriculum Frameworks on the lesson plans. As we talked with teachers in St. Louis City and certain other districts that require teachers to submit written plans, we could see the format preferred in the professional world. This is what we now teach.
- Secondary Social Studies joint appointees keep a database of school contacts, use summative evaluations to shed light on our program, and meet in person to discuss the field experiences and candidates' preparation.

Placements for candidates within Level III internships and student teaching are negotiated by the supervising faculty member with school partners. Placements are made at the grade level of the candidates’ certification, and for middle and secondary education candidates, within their certification subject area. When possible, special education students are placed in settings where they can have access to students with disabilities in both general education and special education since most receive dual certification. For example, whenever possible, interns are assigned in cross-program teams in order to facilitate peer supervision, reflection and feedback and to consolidate the task of instruction, supervision and support. To further support the interns/student teachers, school sites may elect to appoint a “site coordinator” or “site leader” who will coordinate and troubleshoot the activities of interns.

Student teachers are supervised by either full-time faculty members or by former certified teachers who are prepared for their supervisory role by clinical faculty members. These supervisors meet together with the Clinical Faculty members and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, as well as with appropriate full-time faculty to plan the assessment of our student teachers. Student teaching supervisors, who are not faculty members, are required to hold an undergraduate education degree, teacher certification in the area of supervision, and at least three years of teaching experience in K-12 schools.

The College of Education adheres to Department of Elementary and Secondary Education written criteria for the school faculty who serve as cooperating teachers in the student teaching program. These criteria include:

- At least three years experience in certification area
- Undergraduate college degree

Additionally, cooperating teachers are recommended by faculty members and evaluated by student teachers. The APEC office reviews the evaluations and those for student teachers supervisors each semester. Decisions for continuance and/or alteration of procedures are then made in consideration of these documents.

School Counselor Preparation: The process of developing program clinical experiences has included input from the American Counseling Association and its Divisions on competencies and standards; from the National Board for Certified Counselors on certification standards; from the Missouri Committee for Professional Counselors on licensing standards; and from site supervisors, professional counselors who are graduates of our program, professional counselors who are not graduates of our program, parents, and lay people invited to participate in focus groups in each of the program areas to develop specific program objectives. These focus groups were representative of the St. Louis metropolitan area which is a particularly diverse and rich urban environment.

To supervise and coordinate the practica, the Division of Counseling hires a doctoral candidate with professional experience as an adjunct faculty member to regularly work with site supervisors and interns in our school counseling field experience. This faculty member reviews interns' weekly journals and logs and makes regular phone and personal contacts regarding the entries in those logs. She also assists in group supervision for peer review of training tapes. She is available to assist the intern and supervisor through crises or general concerns. At the beginning of each semester, she meets with each site supervisor and intern to help them understand and organize the field experience in an attempt to strengthen the training program and limit crises. At each midterm, this adjunct faculty member follows up on evaluations with phone consultations with each site supervisor. At the end of each semester, she interviews each site supervisor regarding their intern's progress; ways the university could enhance the training program and clinical experiences; and each intern's area of "further needed growth".

The Division of Counseling program faculty and students have excellent relationships with a variety of internship sites throughout the St. Louis metropolitan area. Our students have placements in many community, college, and school settings. We maintain a database of these schools, colleges, and agencies and make information from this database available to our students as they begin to seek field experience

placements. Many of these placements have had a relationship with the Division of Counseling program for years.

Prior to approving a site and supervisor as an appropriate field experience for our students, potential supervisors are mailed an informational packet which includes: a cover letter explaining the purpose of the packet, an "Internship/Field Practicum Questionnaire" which collects data on the supervisor and site, an "Information and Application" form which details the requirements for the field experience especially the program's expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures for the students. Further, in that packet, it is specified what the requirements of the on-site supervisor are:

- a. have at least a master's degree in counseling or other approved mental health profession;
- b. be a licensed professional counselor, psychologist, psychiatrist, or possess other approved licensure or certification;
- c. have a minimum of three years counseling experience.

K-12 School Leadership: The Administrative Internship experience is a semester-long clinical experience based upon the ISLLC Standards with the development of knowledge, skills and dispositions begun in earlier coursework reaching the application level. Site supervisors have input into the evaluation process for intern performances, and interns and their supervisors have opportunities to join ELAPS faculty in suggesting course improvements. Throughout the internship, students complete reflective activities that contribute to self-evaluation.

The field experience for administrator preparation is ED ADM 6900. Depending on the certification being sought (principal or superintendent), interns are placed with certified site supervisors in school or district level positions.

An evaluation of the internship is included by the site supervisor. Course evaluations are provided for each intern and results are provided to the department chair and instructors. Subsequent discussions contribute to improved internship experiences. The site supervisor's perspective is incorporated into the scoring guide.

Administrative interns are responsible for finding a location and a site supervisor for their internship with the assistance and approval of the University supervisors. Within schools/ districts, site supervisors and interns negotiate roles and responsibilities in Memoranda of Agreement that are reviewed and approved by the University supervisors. Priority is given to ensuring a balanced incorporation of the ISSLC Standards in all internships.

The administrators who supervise our interns in elementary, middle school, and secondary administration are required to be certified administrators in the state of Missouri at the level sought by the intern (elementary or secondary). There is no restriction on years of experience--our site visits help to monitor the quality of the internship experience.

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Undergraduate Teacher Education – In order to meet the demand to prepare educators for the 21st

Century the University of Missouri – St. Louis has adopted a new curriculum that aligns with state and national standards for new teacher preparation. Part of this new curriculum involves an increased reliance on guided field experiences throughout a teacher candidate’s program.

Field experiences are developmental. They begin with the opportunity to investigate the profession of teaching across a variety of situations and environments in order to help the potential candidate assess the appropriateness of teaching as a career. Field experiences continue with the opportunity to “try out” aspects of the teaching role in schools, classrooms, and the communities in which they are embedded. Field experiences end with 2 semesters of intensive work in classrooms learning and practicing techniques and strategies and engaging with professional colleagues in order to have an impact on the learning and achievement of K-12 students.

The following principles have guided the development of field experiences in the new program:

- **Principle 1:** Fieldwork Informs Coursework
- **Principle 2:** Quality Programs Require a Diverse Faculty Working Across All Aspects of Candidates Programs the necessary close connections between university coursework and candidates’ fieldwork.
- **Principle 3:** Quality Teacher Education Programs Use a Supported, Reflective, and Holistic Approach to Candidate Learning and Assessment

Field Experience Descriptions - There are 3 types of field experiences for all teacher candidates corresponding to the three levels of the curriculum. At each level the field experiences will be guided and instructed differently; however, field placement personnel and clinical faculty will coordinate placement for all levels of field experience with recommendations from teaching faculty.

Level 1: Professional Practice Investigations These first experiences assist candidates to investigate the field of teaching as a profession. All are course-related field experiences totaling a maximum of 40 clock hours divided across the three Level 1 core courses (with a maximum of 10 clock hours per course). Field experience personnel and clinical faculty coordinate placement assignments with recommendations from instructional faculty. Students receive specific task assignments that are monitored and assessed by course instructors.

Level 2: Professional Practice Experiences Level 2 experiences allow the candidate to engage more actively with practicing educators and learners and include more intense observation and study of classrooms, as well as brief opportunities to teach and be part of working classrooms. Level 2 experiences are also course-related field experiences totaling a maximum of 40 clock hours divided across the four Level 2 professional courses (with a maximum of 10 clock hours per course).

Field experience personnel and clinical faculty coordinate placement assignments with recommendations and assistance from instructional faculty. Students may pool their assignments and complete the tasks from more than one course in the same classroom setting if the opportunities are available and the cooperating teachers are willing to support additional assignments. For some candidates it will be important that placements offer the opportunity to work across a range of students since they might be pursuing multiple licenses or endorsements (e.g. science and math, general and special education).

Level 3: Professional Internship and Professional Practicum (a.k.a. “student teaching”) Level 3 experiences are the most in-depth, offering candidates time to apply their learning from courses, teach students in real schools and classrooms, and develop an understanding of their own capacities to facilitate student learning. These two, semester-long experiences (14 weeks each) require enrollment in internship or practicum credits. Interns must enroll in internship credits concurrently with other required coursework.

The Professional Internship requires candidates teach individual and small groups of students, explore collegial relationships through the model of their cooperating teacher, and begin to understand the role of a professional educator within the culture of a specific school organization. Since these experiences are new to interns, they require a richer allocation of instruction, supervision and support than they needed for Level 1 & 2 experiences or might require for the Level 3 Professional Practicum. Effective and successful internship candidates enter the final Professional Practicum ready to assume the role of a co-teacher who is new to the profession, but brings both a base of experience and accomplishment with regard to effective practice and impact on student learning.

The Professional Internship requires enrollment in 3 continuing education credits. Each credit equals 3 clock hours on site per week for a total of 126 hours of internship to be completed the semester before the Professional Practicum. Student schedules for internship span the full week with a minimum of 2 hours on any single day.

The Professional Practicum requires candidates to enroll in 12 credits, which translates to full-time placement on site. Full-time means that candidates are present and have primary and co-teaching responsibilities for the same hours per day expected of the cooperating professional. Candidates are also expected to attend before and after school meetings, sample school duties and other committees or events required of their cooperating professional. Whenever possible, practicum students are assigned in cross-program teams in order to facilitate peer “supervision,” reflection and feedback. Student achievement in the practicum is assessed by the COE supervisor and by the cooperating professional, as well as by the school administrator/supervisor in the school using an evaluation form tied to the MoSTEP Quality Indicators and aligned to the COE dispositions. Candidates are also evaluated via the certification portfolio, which is presently scored using a rubric developed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education based on the MoSTEP Quality Indicators.

School Counselor The purpose of the school counseling practica and field experience are to provide students with an on-site tutorial experience in school counseling; to introduce or advance training in interviewing and other counseling techniques within a school setting; and to help students analyze and apply appropriate counseling techniques relative to sound theory and school counseling practices within a comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling program. Through assigned readings, class participation, case processing, case study, observation and (peer) tape critiquing, student will be able to:

- Identify and practice within the boundaries of their competence, based on their education, training, supervised experience, state and national professional credentials, and appropriate professional experience.
- Demonstrate a commitment to gain personal and professional knowledge, awareness, sensitivity, and skills pertinent to working with a diverse client population.

- Identify strengths and weaknesses of counseling interviews and other guidance activities.

Practicum Experience Description: Each candidate completes a minimum of 100 clock hours of supervised practicum. The practicum provides for the development of individual counseling and group work skills under supervision. The student's practicum includes the following:

- A minimum of 240 hours of direct service (at least 1/4 of these hours should be in group work)
- Minimum of one hour per week of individual supervision over a minimum of one academic term
- A minimum of 1 and ½ hours per week in group supervision with other students
- Formal and informal evaluation of the student's performance throughout the field experience
- Identify appropriate approaches and techniques to be used with various clients.
- Practice evaluating counseling approach against ethical and legal standards.
- Develop criteria for writing case studies.
- Learn innovative techniques for supervision

Students who are registered for CNS ED 485, Community Counseling Practicum and CNS ED 493/482, School Counseling Practicum are required to complete 100 hours of supervised practice in counseling as described in the syllabus for these two courses:

1. A minimum of 40 hours of direct service with clients, so that experience can be gained in individual and group interactions (at least one-fourth of these hours should be in group work.);
2. A minimum of one (1) hour per week of individual supervision (using audiotape, videotape, and/or direct observation) over a minimum of one academic term by a program faculty member or a supervisor working under the supervision of a program faculty member;
3. A minimum of one and one-half (1 1/2) hours per week of group supervision with other students in similar practica over a minimum of one academic term by a program faculty member or a supervisor under the supervision of a program faculty member; and
4. Evaluation of the student's performance throughout the practicum including a formal evaluation at the completion of the practicum.

The Division of Counseling at the University of Missouri - St. Louis requires that its students in the Community or School specialty complete a 600 contact hour internship in two 300 contact-hour courses. The 300 hours per semester are divided into the following categories:

1. 262.5 hours per semester (17.5 hours per week per semester and 33 hours per week in the summer term) of counseling and counseling-related experiences
2. 15 hours per semester of individual face-to-face supervision, one hour per week
3. 22.5 hours per semester of weekly on-campus group supervision meetings, 1.5 hours per week

The faculty has worked together to incorporate coursework and practica, both at the master's and doctoral levels, that are relevant to a diverse, multicultural, and pluralistic society. The faculty encourages and assists students in their field experiences to seek out clinical sites that are reflective of a pluralistic society in order to broaden their experience within the cultural realm.

Evaluation criteria are included are based on the CACREP standards and specific program objectives. All master's and doctoral level students complete the regular course evaluations of their faculty supervisors

each semester. Further, on-site supervisors are evaluated each semester by the students they are supervising. The same form is used to evaluate both.

K-12 School Leadership – The Administrative Internship is designed to assist graduate students who are pursuing careers as educational leaders. They will take the lead in initiating, planning, and carrying out all internship activities. The internship course (and its performance-based portfolio assessment, known as the ‘ISLLC Standards Project’) is the academic vehicle for supporting, guiding, reflecting upon and assessing the candidates’ experiences as interns.

Internship Course Overview - This course is designed to integrate theory from the classrooms with the contextual challenges of the actual educational organization. For this reason, the internship is one of the last courses taken in the certification/degree sequence. The Intern participates, to the maximum extent possible, in a variety of administrative activities. The individual who is primarily responsible for the quality of the internship is the Intern. Beginning with the planning process and the development of the "Memorandum of Agreement," the Intern must take the lead in securing the approval of the On-site Supervisor (who must be a fully-certificated administrator) and University supervisors. Likewise, in all other phases of the internship, the Intern will assume the leadership role.

Intern responsibilities include: scheduling and conducting the on-site meetings; attending all seminars and administrator meetings; developing a statement of purpose and an educational platform, maintaining a log of activities; writing and submitting six (6) Significant Incident Reports and one (1) Case Study; carrying out all assigned activities; completing the ISLLC Standards Project, carrying out two major elective projects under the direction of the on-site supervisor; and participating in an evaluation of strengths and concerns related to the internship experience. The above mentioned documents are collected in an Intern portfolio submitted in either paper or electronic format.

Administrative interns are required to use technology in the assembly of their portfolio notebooks and are required to submit assignments as e-mail attachments. Interns have the option of submitting notebooks electronically, and a great deal of communication among interns and University supervisors is accomplished on-line

Candidate’s Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skill and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Undergraduate Teacher Education

In order to appropriately support interns and practicum students through this critical developmental period, UMSL faculty provide instruction, support, and evaluation through 6 onsite visits per semester. These visits may include individual observations, group seminars with all students assigned to the site, or a combination. UMSL supervising faculty also maintain communication with interns through email and discussion board exchanges on My Gateway. Each program maintains a handbook for cooperating professionals that describes their tasks and responsibilities to interns and university faculty. These may include, but are not limited to: (1) observing interns and providing feedback, (2) reporting weekly by email to supervising faculty regarding intern status, (3) participating in three-way meetings with university faculty and intern, (4) providing feedback on portfolio artifacts, (4) participation in intern assessment. Interns must pass

the internship experience in order to enter student teaching. In the same way, student teachers must pass student teaching (as evaluated against the student teaching rubric) in order to be recommended for certification.

Intern and student teaching performance are evaluated using evaluation rubrics based directly in the MoSTEP Quality Indicators (based almost entirely in the INTASC Principles). These are applied at every visit and at the end to the practicum by the student teaching supervisors and the cooperating teacher. The certification portfolio is collected and read at the end of the culminating clinical experience and must be passed in order for the candidate to be recommended for certification. Candidates not passing the portfolio initially are interviewed by faculty and/or supervisors to determine their level of readiness and are counseled in how to revise the portfolio or better document their preparation. Virtually all failing portfolios may be adequately refined to meet rubric expectations. There are some candidates who do not or can not revise the portfolio in order to gain the recommendation for certification.

School Counselor

Three types of supervision/evaluation are employed in the counseling practice and clinical experiences, including individual supervision, group supervision, and site supervision. Individual supervision will consist of meeting face-to-face with your field experience instructor or advanced graduate students for a minimum of one hour per week. Group supervision consists of meeting in a group of practicum students and your practicum instructor(s) for a minimum of 1 ½ hours per week. Site supervision includes meeting with a Missouri guidance certified professional at the field experience site for a minimum of one hour per week. Evaluation of the student's performance occurs throughout the practicum, including assigned readings, class participation, case processing, case study, observation, (peer) tape critiquing, and a formal evaluation at the completion of the practicum. Evaluation criteria are included are based on the CACREP standards and specific program objectives.

Portfolio reviews and evaluation procedures for school counseling students are conducted for every student. This portfolio is turned in at the completion of the field experience semester. The completion and implementation of this process began during the Winter 2000 semester. Additionally the state has implemented the Praxis Exam requirement for all Professional School Counseling Candidates graduating from a graduate degree program in the state of Missouri. It is the student's responsibility to apply for and take the Praxis Exam and have the results sent to the division. M.Ed. candidates must take the "Counselor Education Comprehensive Examination" developed by the National Board for Certified Counselors.

K-12 School Leadership

Interns are required to attend three seminars during the course of their internship:

- **Orientation Seminar** – The introductory seminar familiarizes the student with the course requirements, the assignments, and the due dates for completion of the various activities. A secondary goal is to initiate a network of Interns who will communicate with one another during the course of the semester. This initial networking often results in sustained communication throughout the educational leader's professional career.
- **Mid-Semester Seminar** - The midway seminar provides an opportunity to check on progress of interns and to relate their experiences to the Leadership (ISLLC) Standards that will impact their assessment for licensure (SLLA).
- **Exit Seminar** - This seminar is conducted to wrap up any loose ends. Brief presentations are made

by each intern, describing activities and projects.

On-Site Conferences The Intern is also responsible for arranging and planning the agenda for all on-site meetings. The meeting(s) take place at the site where the Intern and the On-site Supervisor are working. The University Supervisor comes to the site at a mutually agreeable time. The meeting lasts approximately 30 minutes, and the Intern conducts the meeting.

Evaluation of The Internship Evaluation of the internship is referenced to the following:

- The breadth and depth of the activities and experiences logged.
- The organization and technical quality of the written materials and assignments.
- The detail of the Significant Incidents Reports and the evidence of insights gained in the process.
- Feedback from the On-Site Supervisor
- Evidence of professional growth in the area of critical analysis of leadership in addressing educational concerns.

A scoring guide for internship evaluation, based on the ISLLC standards and goals of the internship guides the assessment of the internship. The university supervisor also applies the SLLA criteria to give the intern feedback on areas of strength and weakness among the skills required to pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment.

A scoring guide based on the ISLLC Standards is provided to interns at the first of three on-campus seminars and is shared with site supervisors. The site supervisor completes an internship evaluation instrument for each intern and incorporates results into scoring. When Memoranda of Understanding are written, attention is given to designing internships that make meaningful contributions to the schools/districts involved with resulting development of optimal student learning opportunities.

A benefit of the administrative certification program at UM-St. Louis is the diversity of the students and their working locations. Three seminars provide opportunities to share unique experiences in widely varied internship venues in urban, suburban, and rural school districts. Through group reflection processes, interns compare the differences among schools and identify common challenges and solutions in providing optimal learning opportunities for all members of learning communities.

Overview

The University of Missouri-St. Louis College of Education is one of two public teacher preparation institutions in the St. Louis Metropolitan Region (St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and surrounding Missouri counties). The other institution is Harris-Stowe State College, an historically black college whose traditional mission has been to prepare teachers for St. Louis Public Schools. UMSL was founded in the 1970's, on a suburban campus (originally and country club and golf course), far from the city. As a result, the university and its programs drew a primarily white/suburban clientele. Even as the demographics of the suburban "ring" districts have become more diverse, the tradition of UMSL training primarily a less diverse clientele has persisted. As with any large, public institution, change comes slowly, but change must come. The COE has made great strides in the past five years toward becoming a more diverse college with a strong plan and

commitment towards diversity in all its forms.

The College of Education is fully committed to the University of Missouri Saint Louis Mission and its developing strategic plan. Integral to that plan is a commitment to diversity among both students and faculty. The COE is not a perfectly diverse college, nor has it reached a place where it can announce a successfully working plan to increase the diversity of its faculty and students. However, the College has specific plans, program and initiatives, in place and in development, to confront this issue.

The COE has made a commitment to address diversity issues in the program over the past 5 years. This includes the recruitment of faculty, the retention of students, a revised teacher education curriculum that addresses diversity, and staff development activities for the faculty. The effort has been college wide, has had the support of the dean, has included our stakeholders and members of our professional community, and has involved significant numbers faculty members.

Over the past five years, the COE has focused increasing attention on the issue of diversity. The Knowledge Base and Conceptual Framework document addresses issues relating to Social Justice. "... Schooling does not seem to provide access to economic benefits and legal standing for person from lower social-economic status groups." Recognition of the issues provides initial guidance for addressing diversity and social justice in the College of Education. The new conceptual framework has three themes dealing specifically with the issues of diversity and social justice: Individuals and Communities, Social Justice, and Educational Practice.

These themes and the COE commitment to diversity and social justice are also particularly evident in the conclusions of the work of the Futures II committee and in the decision by the Dean to promote and fund the "Working Group on Social Justice in Education." These are but two examples of the many on-going initiatives being undertaken by the COE as it begins to infuse its Conceptual Framework into the fabric of its programs, its structures, and its work.

Additionally, the Futures II working groups on "Social Justice" and "Diversity" joined their work into a single powerful priority. They developed a set of action plans in place, (see Institutional Character and Mission section) resulting from the Futures II process and incorporating input from many constituencies. These actions-plans will propel us even further in the coming years.

Action Steps

1. Develop and use a new Dean's Advisory Group on Cultural Responsiveness and Social Justice to keep the dean informed about the progress of the COE diversity efforts and to advise the dean about policies, decisions, and needed actions relevant to the issue of cultural responsiveness within all areas of the COE.
2. Convene a faculty committee to draft a plan for faculty professional development relevant to diversity and social justice, explicitly to meet the objectives identified in the Diversity and Social Justice Big Idea, including (but not necessarily limited to) the following issues:
 - a. Development of common definitions of diversity and social justice
 - b. Self awareness and multicultural awareness

- c. The effects of privilege and position
 - d. Barriers to accessing resources
 - e. Characteristics of different groups and their dynamics
 - f. Factors that affect faculty and student awareness and success
 - g. Knowledge, skills and dispositions needed by faculty and students to address social justice and diversity in their teaching.
3. Implement a research agenda to define and describe the existing culture of the College of Education from a variety of perspective to help inform the work of the professional development committee (cited above):
 4. Develop and implement an ethnographic survey of students, alums, faculty and staff to gather “stories” of experience within the COE and “characteristics” of the culture within the COE (i.e., what are positive characteristics of the COE culture? What things (characteristics) of the COE need to change to make the college more responsive to the needs of various cultural groups?)
 5. Conduct a faculty self-evaluation regarding what the college has done relevant to multiculturalism in the past and faculty reaction to these initiatives:
 - a. What has been done in the past to broaden and enhance their definition of diversity and social justice? (E.g., the diversity bus tour of the city; the CHOCD Open House for faculty; and the movie “The Color of Fear.”)
 - b. What did you or did you not attend? If you attended, how effective was it? Why did you attend? Why did you not attend?”
 6. Develop diversity, multicultural awareness, and social justice resources database for faculty and student reference and use.
 7. Complete the curriculum audit of all COE programs and courses to determine how we are presently addressing diversity and social justice in our curriculum.
 8. Based on the audit results, each COE program will design and implement a developmentally appropriate and spiraled diversity/social justice curriculum.
 9. Develop and implement a plan for recruiting and retaining a more diverse student body, staff, and faculty with accountability to achieve the goals set forth in the plan.
 10. Actively support and exceed the UM System and Campus policy on diversity and equal opportunity.

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The COE has a set of standards and competencies for each of its major program areas: teacher preparation (MoSTEP), counselor preparation (MoSTEP and CACREP), and school leader preparation (ISLLC). Each of these presents its own set of proficiencies for addressing diversity. The Counseling faculty has also adopted the multicultural competencies proposed by the American Counseling Association (ACA). Part of our mission is to incorporate, where appropriate, these competencies into ALL of our courses, the Knowledge Base/Conceptual Framework, and division policies

The College is developing its own indicators, drawn from the new conceptual framework and the refined belief statements resulting from last year’s Futures II strategic planning process. This work is presently in the discussion stages. The proficiencies being considered are drawn directly from our belief statements and informed by Missouri’s MoSTEP Quality Indicators for Beginning Teacher (based on INTASC Principles). We expect this idea of proficiencies to be presented and discussed (along with the revised teacher preparation student assessment plan) at the beginning of the Fall 2004 term in our first Division of Teaching and Learning

meeting. The proposals are coming from an Ad Hoc Committee of the Assessment and Evaluation Committee (Division of Teaching and Learning).

Teacher Preparation

In 2000, the College of Education undertook a wholesale redesign of its teacher preparation curriculum to make it more developmental, coherent, and field-based (see [Student Guidebook](#)). The resulting work yielded a three-level program with heavy emphasis on five specific strands (drawn from portfolio performance data, student evaluation data, and input from our graduates): diversity, technology, classroom management, assessment and field-experience. Diversity, then, has been a major theme in the new curriculum the COE has been phasing in over the past three years. While we are not in a position yet to have final performance data on the students going through this new program, some research and evaluation efforts are helping us begin to see the effects of our work.

A curriculum audit done on the program core over the last two years has revealed the following specific activities (tied to course objectives) geared toward engaging candidates in thinking about diversity and what it means for teaching and learning.

Level 1: Exploring Education as a Profession

1. Tch Ed 2210: Introduction to Classroom Teaching:

- Field placements in urban schools and schools with diverse populations
- Reflection and analysis of [The Dreamkeepers](#)
- Developing ideas for culturally relevant teaching
- View Through the [Eyes of a Child](#) video examining the racial history of St. Louis
- View [How Difficult Can This Be](#) video about learning disabilities
- Discussion of teaching strategies and management strategies for diverse and special needs students
- Discussion of socio-cultural theories
- Discussion of Black English

2. Tch Ed 2211: Introduction to Schools:

- Issues of racism, cultural bias, segregation, equity, economic parity
- Economic equity; St. Louis City, County, Ring and Suburban schools discussed from cultural pluralism/segregation perspective
- Economic issues affecting access to technology in high poverty areas.
- Gender issues related to technology.

3. Tch Ed 2212 and Ed Psych 2212

- Focus on cross-cultural research
- Emphasis on how cultural values shape child-rearing practices
- Read contemporary books such as [Real Boys](#) and [Raising Cain](#) on the cultural pressures of the boy code
- Read texts about middle school girls' literacy practices in Just Girls/"social queens" and "tough cookie" groups
- View film on issues around tracking students by academic ability
- Emphasize the links between SES and school success

- Economic issues affecting access to technology in high poverty areas.

Level 2: Analyzing the Nature and Processes of Education

1. Ed Psych 3312/Tch Ed 3312: Psychology of Teaching and Learning:

- Respecting individual differences, valuing each learner's individuality
- Understanding gender, cultural, ethnic and socio-economic differences
- Implications of differences for assessment and practice
- Research and reflections on sources of bias
- Confronting bias
- Critical Response Journal on Bias

2. TchEd 3315; Literacy, Learning and Instruction

- Field placement in diverse schools
- Adaptations used in lesson plans
- Material that includes expository, environmental and narrative text to relate to individual needs assessed by surveys

3. Tch Ed 3310 Introduction to Instructional methods

- Field experiences focus on inclusive/integrated classrooms
- Definitions of inclusive education for children from diverse backgrounds and with any type of disability
- Sharing life experiences with individuals from diverse backgrounds and with any type of disabilities.

The beginning teacher programs have also increased the number of field-/clinical-experience hours and to ensure that all candidates have experiences in urban classrooms with primarily minority populations. Many of these experiences are specifically located in the St. Louis Public Schools, where the College of Education has made a significant commitment to field and clinical placements. In 2000, the COE had only 2 student teaching placements in the St. Louis Public Schools. Presently, the bulk of our early-level field experiences and more than half of all internship/student teaching placements are in St. Louis Public and adjacent ring districts. This represents a strong commitment to urban teacher preparation.

In the Fall of 2003, the Division of Teaching and Learning instituted a new two-semester Internship and Student Teaching experience for elementary, special education, and middle school education preservice teachers. The arrangement created a full-year induction into the profession designed to immerse the emerging professional into the school culture and the surrounding community. In essence, this final year of teacher training is being moved to the center of the school community, rather than being university-based.

In conjunction with pre-service teacher training, cooperating teachers and university faculty engage in ongoing professional development driven by the needs of participating schools. Reading faculty and mathematics, science, and social studies methods instructors serve as the primary university liaisons to school partners and work with schools in identifying areas for professional development. To the greatest extent possible, professional development opportunities draw on the local expertise within the community of practice, involving master teachers who have the content knowledge, pedagogy, and cultural understandings that promote success for urban school children.

A number of studies are being done on the impact of the new teacher preparation program, its emphasis on diversity and its increased number of field-experience hours and opportunities. One such study explores the changes in attitudes of COE candidates resulting from these two changes in the program: ***Acculturation, Not Indoctrination: Change within Diversity***, by Prof. Virginia Navarro and Prof. Gayle Wilkinson, University of Missouri, St. Louis, a paper presented at the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, February 2004, Chicago, Illinois.

School Counselor

The Division of Counseling curriculum and program is nationally recognized by CACREP (2000). The division is probably the most advanced among the COE programs relative to the infusion of diversity into its faculty, program design, and its program implementation. The Division of Counseling has implemented efforts to recruit and retain diverse program (e.g., women, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, persons of diverse sexual orientation). Our Division of Counseling faculty is relatively diverse. Three professors are all African-American, one is Native American, two are differently-abled, and 3 are Gay/Lesbian.

The Division's clinical experiences (practicum and internship) provide opportunities for students to counsel clients representative of the ethnic, lifestyle, and demographic diversity of their community. The University of Missouri - St. Louis is situated in one of the largest metropolitan areas in the USA. The population of the St. Louis metropolitan area is a particularly diverse one; the faculty, therefore, has worked together to incorporate coursework and practica, both at the master's and doctoral levels, that are relevant to a diverse, multicultural, and pluralistic society. The faculty encourages and assists students in their field experiences to seek out clinical sites that are reflective of a pluralistic society in order to broaden their experience.

As part of the field experience application process, onsite supervisors must complete our form titled "Internship/Field Practicum Questionnaire" which contains a section titled "Client Populations Served" which identifies the population by chronological age as well as a section titled "Diversity Experiences Provided" which addresses issues of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and differently-abled status.

K-12 School Leadership

The School Leader (ELAPS) programs have the most diverse student population in the COE, with more than 50% minority representation among its students. In response to this extensive diversity, the ELAPS programs have spent the last year developing a new conceptual framework tied to the COE Conceptual Framework with its emphasis on Social Justice and Diversity. During this process, the ELAPS faculty have examined how the ISLLC standards and the dispositions they present are present and reinforced in the curriculum.

The division has also developed a number of programs directed specifically at minority candidates to prepare them for leadership positions. One in particular, **The Preparing Urban Leaders for Urban Schools Program**, is a principal preparation program specifically designed to meet the need of the St. Louis Public Schools to have a qualified cadre of prospective principals to fill vacancies due to the anticipated retirement of a significant number of practicing principals in the next few years. The program was designed and implemented in the fall of 2001 by co-directors, Dr. Lynn Beckwith, Jr. and Dr. John Ingram, Jr. The

program provides a unique mix of college coursework taught by University of Missouri-St Louis faculty balanced with seminars presented by practicing principals and central office administrators.

The program leads to a Master's Degree and certification as a principal. The enrichment and enhancement activities via seminars focus on four major areas:

1. The belief system
2. Teaching and learning
3. Leadership
4. The role of the principal

To date, twenty-seven of the thirty- four participants have graduated from the program. Three are expected to graduate in August 2004 and one in December 2004. Of the twenty-seven who have graduated, thirteen currently serve in the St. Louis Public Schools as principals, assistant principals and literacy coaches. During the 2003-2004 school year, Dr. Beckwith and Dr. Ingram served as executive coaches and mentors for the thirteen practicing administrators by visiting them at their school site to provide guidance, discuss the challenges and problems they faced, and to collaboratively generate possible solutions.

Such programs illustrate the growing commitment on the part of the College and its divisions to bring in and better serve the diverse population of the St. Louis region.

Experiences Working With Diverse Faculty

Some success relevant to the College's commitment to diversity is demonstrated in the increased numbers of diverse faculty and students in the COE.

The College's strong commitment to diversify our faculty (Figure 34) and to promote women and minorities to leadership positions has more than doubled (from 6 to 15) our full-time minority faculty (including 10 new, full-time African-American faculty), included the hiring of nearly 30 female faculty, the appointment of two female associate deans, two female chairs, one female advancement officer, a female African-American pre-collegiate program director (new position), an African-American Director of the Center for Human Origin and Cultural Diversity, and an African-American Superintendent in Residence (presently also the Endowed Profession for Urban Education). Approximately 18% of faculty represent ethnic minority populations, including South African, German, Canadian, African-American, Asian, and Hispanic. The College has a number of differently-abled professors and diverse group of gay/lesbian/bisexual faculty.

Figure 34—Composition of Faculty

Ethnic Origin	Full-time in Unit	Part-time in Unit	Part-time Unit & Institution
TOTAL	54	21	61
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	1	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander 2		0	0
African American, Not Hispanic 7		3	7
Hispanic 0		0	0
White, Not Hispanic 44		18	54
Other			
Non-Resident Aliens 0		0	0
Data Unavailable 0		0	0
Female	30	10	43
Male 24		11	18

Staff Development Activities

In order to develop and implement proficiencies for the candidates, it is necessary to provide staff development for the faculty. The College of Education has held staff development on diversity issues in the curriculum for the entire faculty and for individuals. A list of these activities (Figure 35) is given below.

Figure 35—COE Staff Development Activities on Diversity Issues

Activity	Topic	Date	Who was involved
Teaching and Learning Retreat (agenda and minutes)	How do we adequately integrate Cultural Pluralism, Classroom Management, Evaluation and Assessment, and Technology into Levels 1, 2 and 3 of the revised curriculum?	May 2001	Teaching and Learning Division (Approximately 40)
COE Speaker Series	Speaker on Diversity Issues, William Dr. Julius Wilson, Harvard University	Oct 2001	Self selected faculty (approximately 70)
Tour of Urban St Louis, Video and discussion by faculty	How do we implement a curriculum in which students develop acceptance and tolerance for self and others	Nov 2001	Self selected faculty (Approximately 10)
Colloquium with Dr. Bob Bliss	Exploring Faculty Belief Systems relevant to Diversity	Decemb er 2003	Self-selected faculty (approximately 40)
Video and Discussion of Video” Color or Fear	Diversity Workshop	Spring 2003	COE Faculty meeting (approximately 50)

Working Group on Social Justice in Education	This group was set up to work with educational equity consultant Dr. Peter T. Wilson (see approved proposal submitted at the request of The Working Group on Social Justice in Education). Wilson is accountable to the Working Group and works with them to develop the plan of work in strengthening diversity and social justice. Development activities have included working with the NCATE Standard 4 writing team and facilitating a faculty study group on diversity and social justice.	Fall 2003-continuing	Sheridan Wigginton Kathleen S. Brown Peter Wilson Susan Kashubeck-West Amana Hanks Kent Butler Helene Sherman Virginia Navarro Lynn Beckwith Carl Hoagland
NCATE Standard 4 Writing Team	The NCATE process has been used as a tool for deepening understanding of Standard 4, and to suggest ways to gather rich data about the culture of COE in relationship to diversity and social justice. This will manifest itself in Focus groups to be held at the end of April – early May with students, staff and faculty of color and with white faculty. It is also manifested in survey questions which will be sent to faculty in April.	April 2004	Carl Hoagland Peter Wilson Kristen Wilke
Faculty Study Group on Diversity and Social Justice	. The Study Group’s emphasis has been two-fold: (1) To assist members in exploring their own issues with racism as a form of oppression. This includes both white and people of color. (2) To explore how these issues show up in instruction and relationships particularly with those who are different from oneself racially.	Winter/Spring 2004	Self-selecting faculty (approximately 25)
Futures II	The Futures II work groups on Diversity and Social Justice has met three times to develop a strategy for implementation	Winter/spring 2004	Approximately 12 faculty
Greater City University (GCU) Alliance	Since 1999, the College has participated in the alliance of urban universities. Two conferences are held each year. At these meetings, issues of diversity and social justice are addressed	1999 to present	Approximately 20 faculty

Experience Working With Diverse Candidates

The COE has maintained an 18% minority population over the past 5 years (Figure 36). This percentage matches the percent of minorities in the St. Louis Metropolitan region. That said, while the African-American population in the region is approximately 16%, the COE’s African-American student population runs about 13% over the five years, with the remaining 5 % made up of American Indians, Asian-Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and Non-resident International students. There is also a sizeable group not reporting (approximately 4 %). When further disaggregating by gender (Figures 37 and 38), one finds the percentages similar for both female and male populations. Among graduate programs, the numbers of African-American and other minorities is significantly higher that for undergraduate programs.

Figure 36—Annual Unduplicated COE Majors by Fiscal Year, Gender, and Ethnic Origin

Gender	Ethnic Origin	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004
FEMALE AMERICAN INDIAN/ ALASKAN NATIVE		10	11	13	10	10 ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
		25	28	21	23	21
BLACK, NON- HISPANIC	355	370	362	373	329	
HISPANIC	26	24	22	27	19	
NON-RESIDENT INTERNATIONAL	12	16	23	17	15	
NOT AVAILABLE	79	103	103	118	109	
OTHER					1	
WHITE, NON- HISPANIC	2,120	2,090	2,042	2,059	2,056	
Total	2,627	2,642	2,586	2,627	2,560	
MALE AMERICAN INDIAN/ ALASKAN NATIVE		2	1	2	4	4 ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
		8	6	7	15	10
BLACK, NON- HISPANIC	95	91	76	89	85	
HISPANIC	6	6	8	7	11	
NON-RESIDENT INTERNATIONAL	6	7	6	5	7	
NOT AVAILABLE	23	40	44	56	48	
OTHER					1	
REFUSE TO INDICATE		1	1			
WHITE, NON- HISPANIC	638	639	632	648	566	
Total	776	790	774	820	728	
Grand Total	3,403	3,432	3,360	3,447	3,288	

Student Recruitment Plans and Initiatives

Teacher Education Program

The COE also has a range of additional initiatives designed to enhance the diversity of its undergraduate student population. These activities include:

Increased Community Partnerships and Service: K-12 Partnerships and community collaboration involve over 200 schools and school districts, particularly the St. Louis Public Schools, the 12 community college districts in Missouri, and St. Louis community institutions such as the Science Center, Art Museum, Symphony, Opera Theatre, Youth Organizations and Variety Club. For more detailed information on other partnerships and projects, see the College of Education webpage listing “Partnerships and Projects.”

Specifically, the St. Louis Gear-Up (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs), a 6-year project bringing together four institutions of higher education, Missouri's Coordinating Board for Higher Education, and three community based agencies to improve teaching and learning, parental involvement and student achievement with a cohort of over 1000 students from five high need middle schools.

The most recent collaborations include:

- Undergraduate program internships in St. Louis City schools
- Working with **GEAR UP** on bringing students to campus as part of their summer school experience in St. Louis Public Schools.
- **The Bridge Math and Science Pre-collegiate Programs** serve high school students, their parents and teachers from economically depressed areas with after-school math and science clubs, Saturday and Parent Academies, and summer programs. Bridge provides secondary school students from economically disadvantaged neighborhoods with stimulating educational opportunities that help them realize their academic potential and, ultimately, improve their chances for lifelong success.

In addition to the many on-going efforts of the College of Education to attract and retain a diverse candidate population, the following proposal was developed in the Division of Teaching and Learning as an outgrowth of the Urban Achievement Alliance:

Teach Today, Teachers For Tomorrow - is a proposal for the creating and implementing an urban tutoring project designed to recruit individuals into the teaching profession and, if possible, the College of Education. The goals of the institute are:

1. To increase the number of prospective teachers for all levels of education by creating a “pipeline” of high school students to the university experience; and
2. To recruit and retain a diverse student body in the College of Education, particularly in the COE Teacher Education program.

Advanced Programs

The **College of Education: Increasing the Diversity of the Graduate Student Body** (*An Action Plan*) was adopted by the Graduate Education Council on March 12, 2003:

In its strategic plan, the faculty of the College of Education resolved to “actively recruit . . . diverse faculties and

students . . .” Consistent with this resolution, the faculty and staff associated with the graduate program undertake activities to bring a diverse group of students to our graduate programs. Below are examples of these plans and initiatives:

- **Visits to school districts** at least once a year, their schedule permitting, to bring information about the UM-St. Louis graduate programs to the teachers of the district. A particular emphasis is placed on visiting with first- and second-year teachers, both in districts with a diverse faculty and in districts with a diverse student body. The school districts of the City of St. Louis, Riverview Gardens, Ritenour, and Normandy are visited regularly.
- **Considering skills and talents** beyond traditional admission criteria, such as minimum standardized test scores and minimum grade point averages, to find additional evidence of potential for success in graduate studies.
- **Participation in the City of St. Louis School District’s Emerging Leaders Program** that identifies candidates for initial and advanced Principals’ Certificates.
- **Participation in the UM-St. Louis Multicultural Relations Graduate School Information Session** as a panelist.
- **Awarding of scholarships** for Master’s study to the staff in the ten United Way agencies in the Regional Institute for Tutorial Education.
- **Participation in an annual day of professional development seminars for school counselors** in the St. Louis Public Schools, coordinated through the Division of Counseling and Family Therapy and the Multicultural Relations Office at UM-St. Louis
- **Promotion of faculty and student participation in professional associations** that focus on diversity, such as the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, and support for faculty and students holding leadership positions.

Experience Working With Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The APEC office tracks the diversity of field placements for all field and clinical experiences. Data indicates that approximately 90% of all students in Level I and II complete field experiences in St. Louis City School District and the surrounding ring districts. These districts are urban settings representing a remarkably diverse mix of students and faculty from many different socio-economic levels, languages, ethnic origins, and other cultural considerations. The remaining 10% of students have field experiences in districts such as Parkway and Lindbergh, which are suburban districts with less diversity (90 to 96% White) among their student populations and faculties.

In a recent study, conducted by a Division of Teaching and Learning faculty member, of the new internship/student teaching experiences, student teachers were asked to indicate in which districts they had completed field work prior to student teaching, and in which districts they planned to (or had already) applied for teaching positions. On the whole, teacher candidates reported having had a wide variety of field experiences in the St. Louis metropolitan region. Eighty-nine percent of respondents indicated they had completed field work in two or more school districts, while 59% indicated they had field experience in three or more districts and 30% reported experience in more than three. Of those surveyed, 39% completed a range of experiences in county schools, 9% completed a range of experiences in city schools, and 52% completed experiences in both city and county school settings. It appears that early field experience placements are correlated to internship and/or student teaching placements. Ninety five percent of teacher candidates who opted for the year-long

internship/ST route had prior field experiences in SLPS, while 30% of students following the traditional route had previous experience in SLPS. Upon completion of their programs, 32% of teacher candidates completing the year-long internship/ST route indicated an interest in applying to SLPS or another high need district, versus 5% of students who chose the traditional route. To some degree these findings may be related to student home geography, but we do believe that internship and student teaching placements make a difference in beginning teacher employment decisions, as is indicated by the student interview data reported below.

Candidate interviews indicated strong consensus among all teacher candidates that the year-long experience was beneficial. Teacher candidates found it valuable to learn from children who were, in many cases, very different from themselves, and they reported expanding their views of children (and people) in general. Consistent with survey results, intern/student teachers reported that they learned more about planning and adapting instruction for individual students and that they felt more confident about their ability to meet individual student needs.

Portfolio Data – All beginning teacher candidates prepare portfolios for submission at the end of their student teaching semester. While this system is likely to change in the coming year, we may glean some information from this performance-based assessment relative to the candidates’ readiness relevant to diversity issues. If we regard the MoSTEP (INTASC) Quality Indicators 2 (Knowledge of Learning and Development) and 3 (Diversity), with Quality Indicator 3 as the most specifically relevant, then we may begin to get a picture of the COE candidates performance as measured by the COE beginning teacher portfolio rubrics. In 2002, the College began phasing in its new program design, with its greater emphasis on diversity. While not all courses immediately began to infuse more study and experiences with diversity, many faculty were aware of the need to begin preparing our candidates for a more diverse classroom. We have steadily increased our capacity as the program has unfolded. 2004 is the first year all candidates have experienced the new program.

A review of the data indicates a steadily improvement in portfolio scores over the past three years in performance on Quality Indicators 2. Quality Indicator 3, however, is still weaker by comparison. This indicates the College has not made as much progress as we would like, and faculty are in process of reviewing the portfolio data, by program area, to determine how we might continue to improve our programs and our students’ learning in this area (see portfolio data in Standard 1).

Employer Surveys – In 2003, 346 programs completers were surveyed. Results were received from 205 program completers. Of this number 68.8% were teaching. From the 205 who completed, 141 principals/supervisors were contacted in January 2004. As of March 4, 2004, 70.2% had responded. The table below (Figure 39) show ratings of the novice teacher compare to other novice teachers for questions relating to diversity.

Figure 39—Survey of Employers of Novice Teachers

Question	Much Better than Average	Better than Average	At the Average	Below Average	Much Below Average	No Opportunity to Observe
----------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------------------

Creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners	35 36.1%	40 41.2%	16 16.5%	6 6.2%	0 0	1
Creates effective learning experiences for his or her students	44 44.9%	36 36.7%	17 17.3%	1 1.0%	0	1
Uses formal and informal evaluation and assessment strategies	32 34.0%	31 33.0%	27 28.7%	4 4.3%	0	4

Administrators said that 93.8% of COE graduates created instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners. Based on the 5-point scale used, the mean response of 4.26 was the second highest rating of the 24 categories that supervisors rated. The supervisors said that 99% of the novice students created effective learning for his or her students and that 95.7% of the novice teachers were average or above in their use of formal and informal evaluation and assessment strategies. This data from the administrators in schools is a powerful indication that UMSL students work effective with diverse learners.

Qualified Faculty

A strength of the College of Education at UM-St. Louis is its faculty. Faculty members are recruited nationally and have come to the University from some of the best doctoral programs in the country. All “Regular” full-time with the College faculty members, that is, those with the academic rank of Assistant Professor or higher and who are tenured or on a tenure track, must have an earned doctorate. Twenty-eight or 58.3% of our regular Teacher Education faculty hold, or have held, a teacher certification. Eight, or 67%, of the fulltime faculty in administrator preparation, excluding the adult or higher education faculty, have or have held a teacher or administrator certification or both. Details are found in the chart in Appendix B. Approximately 88% of our 87 faculty who are Full time with the College as well as those who are full time with the campus and part time with the COE spend time in the schools for various purposes, including research, supervision of internships, supervision of student teaching, and collaborative school reform efforts. The College faculty is further strengthened by 14 endowed professors, 11 of whom are housed in the College of Education and 3 of whom are housed in both the College of Education or the Colleges of Arts and Sciences or Fine Arts and Communication (jointly appointed). Ten of these endowed professors hold the rank of full professor and came to UM-St. Louis with well-established scholarly programs.

The Division of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education also includes two Clinical Faculty/ Affiliate Assistant Faculty full time positions. These faculty members are required to have a significant number of years of experience in the schools and a minimum of a Master’s degree in a field of education. There are 20 “Non-regular” full-time with the College faculty members who complete the full time instructional staff. These faculty members must hold a Master’s degree if they teach undergraduate courses and a doctoral

degree if they teach graduate courses. They supplement the full time faculty because they also have significant experience as teachers or administrators in the schools.

Sixty four adjuncts teach in the educator preparation programs in the Fall 2004. These faculty members are required to have extraordinary experience in the schools at the level and in the area of the courses taught. Adjuncts work in partnership with a full-time faculty member to bring the benefit of their experience in the schools to the teacher preparation program while meeting the goals of the teacher preparation program.

Student teachers are supervised by either full-time faculty members or by former certified teachers who have had contemporary professional experience in school settings. These supervisors meet together regularly with the full time university Clinical Faculty members, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and appropriate full-time faculty to plan the curriculum and assessment of our student teachers. Student teaching supervisors, who are not faculty members, are required to hold an undergraduate education degree, teacher certification in the area of supervision, and at least three years of teaching experience in K-12 schools. As well, cooperating teachers are recommended by faculty members and evaluated by student teachers. The Advising, Professional Experiences and Certification (APEC) office reviews the evaluations and those for student teachers supervisors each semester. Decisions for continuance and/or alteration of procedures are then made in consideration of these documents.

Teacher Education –The College of Education adheres to Department of Elementary and Secondary Education written criteria for the school faculty who serve as cooperating teachers in the student teaching program. These criteria include:

- At least three years experience in certification area
- Undergraduate college degree

K-12 School Leadership – Administrators who supervise our interns in elementary, middle school, and secondary administration are required to be certified administrators in the state of Missouri at the level sought by the intern (elementary or secondary). There is no restriction on years of experience. On-site visits allow the faculty to monitor the quality of the internship experience.

School Counselor – The counselors who supervise our school counseling interns must have a M.Ed. in counseling and certification as a school counselor for supervising field experiences and be a full-time school counselor and have a minimum of 3 years of recent school counseling experience. For the Community Field experience, the on-site supervisor is to have a master's degree in counseling or other approved mental health profession, be a licensed professional counselor, psychologist, psychiatrist, or possess other approved licensure or certification, have a minimum of three years of counseling experience. Doctoral students in the program who are either Teaching/Research Assistants or are enrolled in the doctoral course in Supervision serve as Clinical Supervisors for our M.Ed. students.

Modeling Best Professional Practice in Teaching

The size of the UM-St. Louis College of Education faculty body, especially when supplemented by adjunct instructors from the St. Louis metropolitan region, allows divisions to staff their courses with individuals who are experts in the content they are teaching. The Curriculum shows the various areas of

specialization for each of the faculty members. Through the promotion and tenure and annual evaluation of faculty, the College assures that faculty members attend regional, national, and international conferences that maintain currency in their respective fields.

Integrating the Conceptual Framework/Knowledge Base in Coursework

The COE Knowledge Base/Conceptual Framework is being infused into the educator preparation program by providing a wide variety of active instructional opportunities for students to develop the knowledge, skills and disposition required for excellence in education. These lessons and activities are heavily infused with technology and emphasis on diversity so that students can reflect and understand different learning styles.

Counseling Division

→ *Social Justice and Individuals and Communities* are demonstrated in the artifacts gathered for *Multicultural Counseling* coursework, which focuses on awareness of the individualist bias of the counseling profession and the attempts of the profession to recognize and respect both individualist and collectivist mindsets;

→ *Partnerships and Engagement in Multiple Contexts*: The school counselor candidate understands, develops, and uses professional relationships in the school, family, and community, through consultation and collaboration to promote development of all learners. Artifacts from coursework in several courses, including Field Experience it, demonstrate the school counselor candidate's exposure to professional relationships in the school, family, and community.

Division of Teaching and Learning

→ The English and Speech/ Theatre program developed a powerful assignment that we believe helps students to understand “culture” in a more personal way, as something that involves themselves, not just certain kids in their classrooms. During the methods course, the instructor guides students to search their own memories and life experiences for data to create their own cultural profiles in several dimensions: Gender, Race, Generation, Ethnic Heritage, Region/ Neighborhood, Education, Class, Religion, and Family.

→ “U.S. History and World History for the Secondary Classroom” offer students opportunities to develop lessons that reflect cultural diversity. During the internship and student teaching experiences, candidates observe students with a wide range of abilities and meet with special education personnel to discuss teaching strategies.

→ Foreign language faculty have arranged for incoming Level 3 students to meet with language-specific city teachers and to become acquainted with the school’s language program and available resources.

K-12 School Leadership

→ Faculty created electronic Bookmarks, which summarized the vision statement, objectives, and knowledge base, for their candidates.

Modeling Best Professional Practice in Scholarship

The faculty in the College of Education are reviewed through the promotion and tenure process and through an annual evaluation. A strong scholarly record is required for promotion through the professorial ranks and is rewarded in annual evaluations resulting in merit pay increases. The College has its own promotion and tenure document outlining the standards for scholarship and suggesting means for evaluating an individual's record. The standards are consistent with those of the University but clearly reflect the unique nature of the College mission. The College values various types of scholarly work, including collaborative efforts and works concerning practice in education. The value of collaborative work also was recently stressed in discussion at a faculty meeting that included the dean and the chancellor. The curriculum vitae of the faculty, also included in the exhibits, provide a list of the various works published by the faculty, as do selected examples of that scholarly work. Selected examples include:

Benninga, J.S., Berkowitz, M.W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2003). The relationship of character education implementation and academic achievement in elementary schools. *Journal of Research in Character Education*.

Brown, K.S. (2003). A forty-year perspective on teacher education policy and the current teacher policy debates. University of Missouri St. Louis College of Education. *Perspectives on Education Series*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

Danforth, S. & Taff, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Crucial topics in special education: A book of readings*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall

Ding, C.S. (2003). Exploratory longitudinal profile analysis via multidimensional scaling. . *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation* [On-line serial], 8(12). Available at: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=12>

Polman, J. L. (2004). The perils and promise of after school programs on school territory. *Afterschool Matters*, 3, 3-12.

Sherman, H.J., Richardson, L.I., & Yard, G.. Teaching children who struggle with Mathematics: A systematic approach to diagnosis and instruction, Prentice Hall, Pearson Education (Published, (2005)2004).

Simmons, P., Ruffin, M., Polman, J., Kirkendall, C., & Baumann, T. (2003). If stones could talk. *The Science Teacher*, 70 (5), pp. 52-54.

Talbot, E. & Fleming, J.E. (2003). The role of social contexts and special education in the mental health problems of urban adolescents. *Journal of Special Education*, 37, 111-123.

Woodhouse, S. (2003). Affirmative action and academic employment: Differentiations of campus perceptions in the University of Missouri System. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 27(2), 98-107

Modeling Best Professional Practice in Service/Collaboration

The College promotion and tenure document includes standards for professional service. The document indicates that collaborative efforts at all levels, in teaching, scholarship, and service, are valued. Service to Education, the broader university, schools and the education community, as well as to professional associations, is vital to the mission of the College. Faculty members are permitted to consult the equivalent of one day per week on education-related tasks and are encouraged to include these activities in annual evaluations. Additionally, the leadership of the College rewards collaborative efforts in annual evaluations. Involvement of the faculty in school settings is facilitated, and actually is necessary in the internship program now included in the teacher preparation curriculum.

A key theme in the COE Knowledge Base/ Conceptual Framework is the goal of preparing culturally sensitive/ culturally competent teachers who believe that all children can learn. Such teachers need to interact with students and teachers in diverse field experiences – St. Louis City, inner suburban, affluent suburban, and the quasi- rural outer suburbs. It is evident from our annual reports and selected examples below that the faculty is heavily engaged in the professional world of practice in P-12 schools, and education related services. The array of professional associations to which faculty belong and in which they are active are included in faculty vita information.

Service is integrally tied to collaboration and the mission and implementation of the curriculum. A selection of examples of such faculty involvement in K-12 school settings includes the following, organized by Division:

K-12 School Leadership

Preparing Urban Leaders for Urban Schools Program: Faculty serve as executive coaches and assist districts in efforts to improve the culture and climate for schooling of African American students.

Vashon Education Compact Principals Initiative: Program is a collaborative venture between the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, the St. Louis Public Schools (SLPS) and the Vashon Education Compact (VEC), a privately funded entity to assist VEC principals in improving their instructional leadership skills in an effort to improve academic achievement in their schools.

The Principal's Academy in which faculty work with the St. Louis Public Schools to train new principals.

Teacher Education

Faculty members work intensively with the Ferguson-Florissant School District to develop an in-service professional development model designed to improve the teaching of writing and thereby improve student performance outcomes in the district

Faculty worked with elementary and middle school classes in the Wellston schools, to improve the mathematics performance of students in that district. MAP Scores did improve in the following testing period.

Science Education faculty designed "Missouri Science Teacher Education Program" (MO-STEP), sponsored by the National Science Foundation, to develop teaching/learning teams in schools.

The faculty in the Art Education program led the creation of a mural in spring, 2004, at University City's Flynn Park Elementary School.

Secondary Social Studies/History Education 's Dr. Kevin Fernlund Dr. Laura Westhoff directed a 10-week per semester program involving Secondary Social Studies Methods students in facilitating high school students after- school historical inquiry at Vashon High School (SLPS).

Dr. Tom Loughrey, sponsored a visit by eight undergraduate students to the PE4Life Institute in Grundy Center, IA.

Ms Bonnie Shiller, Early Childhood Education, worked over a two year period visiting dozens of child care programs in the St. Louis area collecting data on the quality of these child care programs.

Dr. Virginia Navarro organized and presented Character Adventure Days in the past three years for student teachers and their cooperating teachers with Marvin Berkowitz and the YMCA experiential education staff as part of the TWR PDS Mentoring Project.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

In part because all salary adjustments at the University of Missouri are by merit only, the College of Education conducts annual reviews of all faculty members. Faculty members submit a report that covers their teaching (including extension) activities, their professional service, and their scholarly work. This report is reviewed first by the division chair, and then by the Dean in consultation with the division chair.

Faculty members are required to conduct a course evaluation in all courses at the close of the term. The chair and faculty member discusses these evaluation results. The unit also generates unit averages for items on the course evaluation instrument. These are used for comparison when the faculty member is considered for tenure and/or promotion.

Adjunct faculty and doctoral teaching assistants also are required to conduct course evaluations and these are used in decisions about rehiring the person for subsequent course offerings.

Other teaching activity evaluated includes, but is not limited to: work on curriculum committees to revise courses or programs of study; work on committees to implement the use of technology in teaching; implementation of new teaching strategies or materials; supervision and mentoring of students in internships or other pre-student teaching field work; dissemination of information on teaching strategies and techniques through publications and presentations.

The annual evaluation of service includes an assessment of active involvement in professional organizations, campus governance; and local education agencies. The annual evaluation of scholarship includes an assessment of the number and significance of publications and presentations to learned societies, and of the number grant and contract proposals written, with funding as a significant indicator of quality and impact.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

The College of Education over the past few years has placed a high priority on supporting faculty travel to meetings of national and international professional organizations. Faculty members with leadership roles at meetings and conferences, including service as an officer and being on the program, are supported at a higher level (see Appendix C Faculty Travel Policy).

The College also has sponsored a speaker series (see Appendix D list of guest speakers) for faculty, joined by other members of the education community. Selections of specific topics and speakers is a direct result faculty discussions, informal brown bag lunches and the action steps identified in the Futures II process. Many of collaborative programs also have sponsored speakers and included the faculty members of the College of Education.

Unit Leadership and Authority

The Unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating all programs at the institution designed to prepare education professionals for teaching, counseling and leadership in P-12 schools. The Unit is identified as the college of Education; the head of the Unit is the Dean. The structure that is used to manage the Unit includes specific positions with specific responsibilities including but not limited to: associate deans, directors, division chairpersons, coordinators of programs and academic staff with specific responsibilities. The organizational chart depicts that structure for the Unit. is in Appendix A. Job descriptions (documents) ensure that each position is defined.

Three associate deans provide leadership for the planning, implementation and ongoing evaluation of programs in undergraduate teacher education, continuing education, and graduate education, respectively. Major service areas of the College such as the Technology and Learning Center, the Regional Center for Education and Work, the Child Development Center, the Center for Human Origin and Cultural Diversity, and Institute for Science, Math and Technology Education are coordinated by Directors. Academic programs designed to prepare candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards are organized in four division of the College: *Teaching and Learning, Counseling and Family Therapy, Educational Psychology, Research & Evaluation and Educational Leadership & Policy Studies*. Program development, candidate advisement and evaluation of faculty are coordinated at the division level under the leadership of the four Division Chairs. The work of the College's Division and Centers is characterized, enhanced and magnified by partnerships with governmental agencies, non-profit institutions, school districts and community organizations. The College's admission practices, calendars, course offerings and degree and certification requirements are clearly and accurately described in up-to-date print and on-line publications. All undergraduate students are served by three advisors and faculty, where appropriate. Graduate students can request or are assigned a faculty advisor and have access to counseling, technology, and library services.

Faculty, P-12 practitioners and other members of the community are involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the unit on an ongoing basis. Mechanisms such as the committee structure of the College of Education Faculty, including the Graduate Affairs Council and Faculty Affairs Council, the College's Alumni Council and various program advisory committees, such as the Teacher Education Committee in the Division of Teaching and Learning, in addition to client surveys provide ongoing feedback

and identification of needs. A series of joint faculty appointments facilitate collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the University involved in the preparation of educators. The work of the unit's 14 endowed professorships further connects the College's work to the needs of the professional community.

Unit Budget

Over the period from FY1999 to FY2003, the funds provided from the campus to the professional education unit have shown a steady increase although the most recent increase was very slight reflecting the state's fiscal problems. Although there have been swings in the amounts spent on faculty professional development, the overall trend has been to provide more funds to support faculty travel and research. Grants and contracts funding exploded over the last few years but recently has dropped to a more sustainable level. Alumni and community constituents continue to show their support through increase in gifts to the college.

Figure 40: College Of Education Expenditures

	FY2003	FY2002	FY2001	FY2000	FY1999
Faculty Professional Development	41,924	14,929	18,164	18,422	13,135
Professional Education Unit	8,234,750	8,210,828	7,481,002	7,302,961	6,676,568
EXTERNAL FUNDS					
Grants and Contracts	4,685,383	5,372,624	3,954,889	1,620,408	1,255,289
Other Institutional Sources	1,390,730	1,360,979	1,284,163	1,326,055	1,087,041

Figure 41: Ward Barnes Education Library Report

Institutional Acquisitions Expenditures		<u>2003/2004</u>
a.	Print	
	Books	\$ 219,628.49
	Serials	\$1,286,042.65
b.	Electronic	\$ 83,230.14
	TOTAL	\$1,588,901.28
Education Acquisition Expenditures		<u>2003/2004</u>
a.	Print	
	Books	
	All educ.categories	\$ 15,652.04
	Sports, PE materials	\$ 1,092.13
	Non L, GV	\$ 4,077.87
	Juvenile	\$ 737.07
	Tests	\$ 0
	Textbooks	\$ 0
	Subtotal	\$ 21,559.11
	Serials	
	Barnes Educ	\$ 40,125.47
	GVs at TJL	\$ 2,413.14

	Subtotal	\$ 42,538.61
b.	Electronic	\$ 1,628.25
	EDUC TOTAL	\$ 65,725.97

Personnel

Workload policies and practices encourage faculty to be engaged in a wide range of activities including teaching, research, advisement, collaborative work in schools and service at the national, state and local level. These priorities are reflected in the annual evaluation process for faculty and documented in the annual reports required of each member of the faculty.

Teaching assignments for full-time tenure-track faculty are 9 credit hours per semester at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The class load for non-tenure track faculty is 12 credit hours. This includes courses offered on campus, through continuing education satellite centers and courses offered on-line and through other forms of distance learning. Supervision of clinical practice, (e.g., student teaching, administrative internships,) is usually 5 candidates for every full-time equivalent faculty member. Faculty who are awarded grants or who participate in externally funded partnerships have reduced teaching loads.

The use of part-time faculty is limited. To the greatest extent possible, full-time faculty are used to maintain quality, consistency and alignment with state and national standards. Full-time with the College non-tenure track faculty, resident positions, e.g., Superintendent in Residence and graduate assistants (doctoral candidates) drawn from the educational field, play an important role in the unit.

Despite state budget reductions and growth in enrollment, the unit has been able to maintain sufficient full-time faculty and support staff to operate programs, effectively maintain quality, and increase student outcomes relative to state and national measures.

The unit is a leader in support for faculty development. Faculty receives periodic anonymous feedback from students assessing teaching effectiveness through the faculty evaluation process. These ratings provide a basis for faculty development and are an important factor in the recommendation of merit increases by Division Chairs. The Center for Teaching and provide an annual 'brown bag' lunchtime program series to assist faculty in the development of engaging pedagogy, use of technology in instruction and understanding of student diversity. Extensive training in the use of the 'My Gateway' system and technology equipped classrooms is provided by the University's IT Department and the College of Education's Technology and Learning Center. Faculty who are presenters at state, regional and international conferences receive financial support from the unit to attend these meetings. Mini-research grants are offered by the university to assist faculty in the development of their research agendas.

Unit Facilities

The unit's facilities are well equipped to support candidates in meeting standards. Located on the UMSL South Campus, the Unit occupies a complex comprised of Marillac Hall and the South Campus Classroom Building (SCC). Facilities include a state-of-the-art Technology and Learning Center (TLC) and the Ward Barnes Library for Education and Health Sciences. Many classrooms are technology equipped for power point presentations and use other computer technology hardware and software to enhance teaching and

learning. The extensive resources of the TLC, (described below), further support faculty and candidates use of information technology in instruction.

The unit has acquired excellent classroom facilities for courses offered through its Continuing Education & Outreach program by arrangements with regional institutions such as St. Charles Community College, Jefferson College, Mineral Area Community College and the South County Education Center.

Unit Resources Including Technology

The unit has aggressively pursued resources to develop and implement high-quality projects that respond to needs of the professional community and assist candidates in meeting standards. Four sources support these efforts: allocations to the unit from the University budget; a portion of tuition revenue generated by the unit itself; a significant and increasing number of grants; and other sources of external funding.

The University's SIS database is connected to the unit's data collection system. Assessment data specific to the unit is maintained, analyzed, and published electronically for review and discussion by faculty influencing program modification. The unit has developed an Ongoing Program Improvement System (OPI) accessible from the unit's website. Portfolio assessment has been well established by the unit as a tool in the assessment of standards at the undergraduate and graduate levels. An electronic portfolio system is currently under development.

The unit has made significant investments in information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. All faculty have desktop computers and access to laptop computers, projectors and other hardware to produce PowerPoint and other technology applications for course work. The 'My Gateway' system connects faculty and students of each course and facilitates assignments, grading and on-line discussions. Candidates and faculty may also access library catalogs and conduct research on-line.

The Barnes Education Library is open to serve candidates, faculty and the professional community seventy-two hours per week. The Library is open 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday, and 1:00 p.m. to 9:00p.m. on Sunday. Library catalogues, journal titles and electronic databases can be accessed by candidates and faculty from any desktop computer. Additionally, faculty and candidates can obtain books, copies of journal articles and documents from libraries throughout the United States. Faculty may request the acquisition of books, media and journals for their course curricula. The Library offers research classes and provides individual research assistance through the Research Consultation Program. The Barnes Library has 85,484 bound volumes and 648,441 microform holdings in areas including educational administration, elementary, middle and secondary education, early childhood education, special education, physical education and counseling.

The Technology and Learning Center (TLC) was created as a full-service, continually staffed facility to support, mirror and model technology integration in teaching practice by faculty and student as the UM-St. Louis College of Education. TLC staffing includes 2 full-time faculty, 6 full-time staff and 8-12 part-time staff. The TLC offers help on demand to faculty and student, runs a drop-in computer lab for members of the community, supports integration of technology into course work, and provides consulting and services to area schools and educational organizations. The TLC's technical infrastructure available to candidates and faculty

includes 53 Pentium class workstations (III and IV) and 10 Apple Macintosh G4 and G5 workstations. All workstations have 100MB access to the University gigabit backbone. Twelve workstations have digital video editing software installed. Additionally, the TLC has a technology checkout program available for workshops and student projects that include 18 digital video cameras, 12 digital still cameras, assorted PASCO scientific equipment, and portable, external hard drives for video/audio data storage.

Appendix A

Appendix B

**College of Education
Faculty Licensures and Certifications Relevant to Educator Preparation
July, 2004**

Faculty Member	Category	Licensure or Certification
Teacher Preparation Faculty		
Scot Danforth	Regular	English, 9-12, Inactive Special Education (Emotional Disorders), K-12, Inactive
Philip Ferguson	Regular	None
Carl Hoagland		Chemistry 9-12, Life Mathematics 9-12, Life
William Kyle	Regular	
Louis Lankford	Regular	Visual Art, K-12, Inactive
Wendy Saul	Regular	
James Shymansky	Regular	
Patricia Simmons	Regular	Biology, 7-12, Active General Science, 7-12, Active Chemistry, 7-12 Active German, K-8, Active
Douglas Turpin		
Richard Friedlander	Regular	
Charles Granger	Regular	Biology, 7-12, Life General Science, 7-12, Life Chemistry, 7-12, Life
Kathleen Haywood	Regular	Physical Education & Health, K-12, Life
Fred Willman	Regular	
Jane Zeni	Regular	English, 7-12, Active
Dianne Ferguson		
Harold Harris	Regular	None
Allison Hoewisch	Regular	Elementary, K-6 Reading, K-12
Thomas Loughrey	Regular	Physical Education, K-12, Life
Helene Sherman	Regular	Elementary, 1-6, Active Mathematics, 7-9, Active
Gwendolyn Turner	Regular	
Cathy Vatterott	Regular	Secondary School Administration 7-12, Life Family/Consumer Science 7-12, Life

Mayly Alvarez Salamon	Regular	Reading, K-12, Active
Corey Drake	Regular	Journalism, 7-12, Active
Kevin Fernlund	Regular	Mathematics, 7-9, Active
Jane Fleming	Regular	Elementary Education
		Secondary Education Special Education (Learning Disabilities)
Karen Hagrup		
Virginia Navarro	Regular	English, Life
Joseph Polman	Regular	None
Kim Song	Regular	
Laura Westhoff	Regular	Social Studies, 7-12, Active
Sheridan Wigginton	Regular	None
Linda Cason		
Jacquelyn Lewis-Harris		
Lynn Navin		
Matthew Keefer	Regular	
Marvin Berkowitz	Regular	None
Victor Battistich	Regular	None
Margaret Cohen	Regular	Elementary, K-8, Active
Elisha Chambers	Regular	
Cody Ding	Regular	
Donald Gouwens	Regular	School Psychologist, K-12, Active
Clark Hickman	F-T, N-R	Social Studies, 9-12, Life
Stephen Sherblom	Regular	None
Tracy Reynolds	F-T, N-R	Elementary, K-8, Active
Margaret Niederberger	F-T, N-R	None
Bill Foster		English, 9-12, Active Speech/Theatre, 7-12, Active
Hank Zak	Adjunct	Physical Education, K-12, Active Health, K-12, Active Biology, 9-12, Active
Laurie Milburn	Adjunct	Learning Disabilities, K-12, Active Secondary Administration, Active
Diana Katz	Adjunct	Elementary, K-8, Active Early Childhood, P-3, Active
Anthony Ambrose	Adjunct	Social Studies, K-12, Life Elementary, K-8, Life Soc. Stud. & Lang. Arts, 5-8, Life

Mayly Richards Salamon	Regular	Reading, K-12, Active Mathematics, 7-12, Active Mathematics, Life 7-9, Active Mathematics, Active, 1965-69
K Brown		Special Education, K-12, Active Elementary, 1-6, Active Reading, K-12, Active
M T Dixon		Elementary, K-8, Active Language Arts, 7-12, Active
S J Bennett		Administration II Special Education, Active
PasdcO		Mathematics, 7-12, Life
M T Dixon x		Elementary, K-8, Active Core Areas, 7-9, Active Language Arts 7-12, Life Social Studies 7-9, Life BD, LD, EMH, K-12 Active Administration, K-8, Active
D Kane		Drama, 6-12, Active Speech/Communications, 6-12 Active English, 6-12, Active Journalism, 6-12, Active
Canf2f		Learning Disabilities, K-9, Active
S Coppersmith		Core Areas 7-8 Earth Science
R H Dixon		Behavior Disorders, K-12, Active Learning Disabilities, K-12, Active Mental Retardation, K-12, Active Speech/Language, K-12, Active
Stephen Viola	F-T, N-R	School Psychologist
Gladys Smith	F-T, N-R	Elementary, K-8, Life
Carol Weber	F-T, N-R	Physical Education, K-12, Inactive
Administrator Preparation Faculty		
Carole Murphy	Regular	
Judith Cochran	Regular	English, Secondary, Inactive Administrator, Secondary, Inactive Reading, K-12, Inactive Educational Diagnostician, K-12, Inactive

Lloyd Richardson	Regular	Elementary, K-8, Life Mathematics, 9-12, Life Principal, Life Mathematics, 9-12, 1965-69 General Science, 9-12, 1965-69 Mathematics, 7-12, Life
Charles Schmitz	Regular	School Studies, K-12, Active Sociology & Psychology, 7-12, Active Public School Counselor, K-12, Active School Psychological Examiner, K-12, Active
Charles Fazzaro	Regular	
Ken Owen	F-T, N-R	
Steven Adamowski	Regular	
Kathleen Sullivan-Brown	Regular	
Margaret Dolan	F-T, N-R	Elementary, K-8, Active Principal, K-8, Life Superintendent, K-12, 1993-2003
Thomas Hensley	F-T, N-R	History, 7-12, Active Social Studies, 7-12, Active Secondary Administration, Active Advanced Administrative, 7-12, Active
John Ingram	F-T, N-R	Elementary, K-8 Principal, K-8 Superintendent, K-12
Lynn Beckwith	F-T, N-R	Elementary, K-8, Active Elementary Core Areas, 7-9, Active Principal, K-8, Active Superintendent, K-12, Active
Adult and Higher Education Faculty		
John Henschke	F-T, N-R	
Patricia Somers	Regular	None
Patricia Boyer	Regular	
Mary Cooper	Regular	
Paulette Isaac	Regular	
Shawn Woodhouse	Regular	
Thomas Schnell	Regular	English, 8-12, Life Communications, 8-12, Life
Counselor Education Faculty		
Therese Cristiani	Regular	

Rocco Cottone	Regular	None
Susan Kashubeck-West	Regular	Licensed Psychologist
Mark Pope	Regular	<p>National Certified Career Counselor #16849. (1985-current).</p> <p>National Certified Counselor #16849. (1985-current).</p> <p>Master Addictions Counselor #16849. (1995-current).</p> <p>Registered Psychological Assistant #PSB12233 and #PSB13564 (California, USA).</p> <p>Registered Professional Career Counselor #1038 (California, USA). (1993-current).</p> <p>Approved Clinical Supervisor #16849. (1998-current).</p> <p>Licensed Professional Counselor #CS2438 (Missouri, USA). (1998-current).</p> <p>Licensed Clinical Psychologist #071-005900 (Illinois, USA). (1999-current).</p> <p>Master Career Counselor. (2001-current).</p> <p>Licensed Psychologist #2003019243 (Missouri, USA). (2003-current).</p>
Lela Bunch	Regular	
Kent Butler	Regular	
Dawn Szymanski	Regular	

Appendix C

NEW COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

FACULTY TRAVEL POLICY

(Full Time Faculty)

2003-2004

1. **MAXIMUM** reimbursement for actual expenses for a trip over 250 miles one-way, *if* an individual is *presenting a professional paper and/or has a leadership role in the organization*, is \$1000.00.
2. **MAXIMUM** reimbursement for actual expenses for trips under 250 miles one-way, *if* an individual is *presenting a professional paper and/or has a leadership role in the organization*, is \$500.00.
3. **MAXIMUM** reimbursement for actual expenses for trips over 250 miles one-way, *if* an individual is *not* presenting a professional paper and/or does *not* have a leadership role in the organization, is \$400.00.
4. **MAXIMUM** reimbursement for actual expenses for trips under 250 miles one-way, *if* an individual is *not* presenting a professional paper and/or does *not* have a leadership role in the organization, is \$200.00.

This policy *generally* applies to *only one trip per year*. In addition, however, we will support, where appropriate and *if resources are available*, selected **second** trips that are designed to leverage the acquisition of a grant or a contract for services, present a professional paper, or that which involves international professional travel.

Joint appointees will be supported based on the % of their salary that is paid by the College of Education and based on the **MAXIMUM** statements above.

Endowed professors are expected to travel from their endowment fund.

If the trip is one to represent the College of Education as an institutional representative to those organizations in which we have an institutional membership (i.e., AACTE, MACTE, Holmes, etc.), expenses will be reimbursed *in full*. Institutional representatives are designated by the Dean.

If a faculty member has travel support from other sources, such as a grant, endowment funds, etc., they *should use those funds before applying for College of Education resources to support their professional travel*.

All travel is subject to the regulations of the University of Missouri System. To review those regulations go to <http://www.umsl.edu/services/finance/trv-info.htm>

Reimbursement for meals will be made in accordance with approved University of Missouri System policy. Note: there is no "per diem" for meals. You will be reimbursed only for the actual cost of meals you eat up to the limit allowable by University policy.

Faculty are encouraged to secure the *best rates* for hotel rooms and *advance purchase* airfares whenever possible. Cab fares, shuttle buses, and other forms of public transit will be reimbursed with proper documentation. Charges for rental cars *must receive prior approval* for reimbursement.

The cost of conference registration will be reimbursed; however, *on-site and late registrations will be reimbursed only at the level of early registration costs* (submit written evidence of early registration cost with the request for reimbursement).

Audio-visual services used in scholarly presentations will be reimbursed up to a *maximum of \$75.00*.

When traveling by air, faculty should park on campus and take MetroLink to the airport. Faculty are encouraged to *use long-term parking if they must use airport parking*.

All travel for which you seek reimbursement must be approved in advance by your divisional chair and the dean prior to taking the professional trip for which you are requesting reimbursement.

Appendix D

Dean's Issues in Education Series College of Education

Speaker History

September 18, 2000	Dr. Sally Lubeck	67 attendees
Topic: New Directions in Early Childhood Practice		
October 5, 2000	Dr. Thomas Lickona	72 attendees
Topic: Educating for Character: What Schools, Parents, and Communities Can Do to Teach Respect, Responsibility, and Other Virtues		
November 13, 2000	Dr. John Bransford	51 attendees
Topic: How Educators Can (and Should) Integrate Technology into the Curriculum		
April 5, 2001	Dr. David Berliner	53 attendees
Topic: Business and Education: A Problematic Relationship		
October 10, 2001	Dr. William Julius Wilson	106 attendees
Topic: The Impact of Welfare Reform in the New Economy		
March 21, 2002	Dr. Sylvia B. Rimm	62 attendees
Topic: The Creative Underachiever		

Major Conferences at which faculty were specifically invited to hear major speakers:

February 23-24, 2001	Drs. William Ayers and Lou Smith	110 attendees
Topics: The Relationship Between Research Question and Research Method (Ayers) and Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow: Reflections on Qualitative Inquiry (Smith)		
February 23, 2002	Dr. Joseph Maxwell	90 attendees
Topic: Realism, Meaning, and Qualitative Research		
February 21, 2003	Dr. Kathleen deMarrais	95 attendees
Topic: The Relationship Between Research Question and Method		
March 12, 2004	Dr. Margaret Finders	90 attendees
Topic: Those are the Good Girls: Crossing Borders in Middle School Contexts		
March 3, 2004	Dr. Sally Reis	167 attendees

Topic: Educating the Gifted: Everyone's Responsibility