

South Dakota Board of Examiner Report

for unit approval

SD State Board of Examiners

Team:

State Consultant

Steve Fiechtner, DOE

Team Chair

Pami Hagen-Erickson

Team Member

Dr. Crystal Pauli, DSU

Team Member

Dr. Mark Halling, DWU

Accreditation Visit to:

MOUNT MARTY COLLEGE

Date: April 25 - 28, 2010

SDEA or South Dakota Board of Education Representative:

No Representative

Type of Visit:

- First
- Continuing
- Combination
- Probation
- Focused

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution: Mount Marty College

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Unit Mission, Conceptual Framework, and Responsibility	M	
2	Preparation of Candidates in Teacher Education	M	
3	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	
4	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	

M = Standard Met

NM = Standard Not Met

Standard 1

Unit Mission, Conceptual Framework, and Responsibility

Higher education programs for the preparation of education personnel shall operate under a written mission statement. The unit’s statements of goals and program objectives, consistent with the mission statement, shall serve as a basis for decision making regarding policies affecting all of the programs for the preparation of education personnel and shall assure that education graduates are prepared to serve in P-12 schools.

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the unit. It should describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel. This section also provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework. The overview should include a brief description of the framework and its development.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes No

UNIT	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
------	--------------	-----------------	--------

Mount Marty College is a Catholic, Benedictine, coeducational institute of higher learning founded in 1936 by the Sisters of Saint Benedict of Yankton, South Dakota. The College is named in memory of Martin Marty, a Benedictine missionary to the Indians who came to Dakota Territory in 1876, became the Territory’s first Catholic Bishop, and who invited the Benedictine Sisters to establish a religious community in Yankton.

The College functioned as Mount Marty Academy from 1922 to 1936 and then as both Mount Marty High School and a junior college for women from 1936 to 1951. This Mount Marty Model School (a “normal school”) allowed teacher education candidates the opportunity to practice their teaching skills. In 1951, the College awarded its first Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees, and in 1969, it became coeducational. Associate of Arts degree programs were introduced in 1975 in areas compatible with already existing programs. In keeping with the Benedictine tradition, the College exists as a community of learners. Primary emphasis is placed on the development of each person as a complete human being with intellectual competence, professional and personal skills, and a composite of moral, spiritual, and social values.

As a private college, Mount Marty College determines its general policies and objectives in the context of its original charter, historical development, educational needs of the region, and the professional goals of the entire college staff. The Benedictine Community of Sacred Heart Monastery is the sponsoring agent of the College; the Board of Trustees is the final governing board of the institution itself.

The mission of the Mount Marty College Teacher Education Department is to prepare high quality teachers. The Department uses a developmental approach within a context of relationships to help candidates grow in their sense of self and in their ability to serve as competent teachers. The professional education unit at Mount Marty College is the Teacher Education Department, which is included within the Division of Education. The Division of Education is one of five subdivisions in the College's Academic Affairs Division (Business and Social Sciences, Education, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Nursing). Each of these academic subdivisions delivers their respective majors and minors. A faculty member chosen by the faculty and the administration serves in the role of division chair to represent each division.

In addition to the majors in teacher education offered at the Yankton campus (Elementary Education, Physical Education, Secondary Education, Special Education and School Paraprofessional, A.A.) and a minor in Special Education, the Division of Education also delivers majors in Exercise Wellness and Recreation Management. Candidates who complete the major in Secondary Education must also complete an academic major from either the Humanities Division (English, History, and Music – Education Emphasis) or the Natural Sciences Division (Biology, Chemistry, Math). Candidates completing the Physical Education major (Education Division) must also complete the major in Secondary Education. Elementary Education is offered as a post-baccalaureate degree-equivalent program at the Watertown campus.

The Teacher Education Department is currently staffed by four full-time staff, a Teacher Education Program Director who administers the program and who is also currently serving as division chair, 11 part-time or adjunct faculty at the Watertown Campus, and 4 part-time or adjunct faculty as needed on the Yankton campus.

The Teacher Education Department has undergone the following substantive changes since the last visit.

- The Teacher Education Department engaged in the College's annual assessment and reporting processes for the Higher Learning Commission/North Central Accreditation quality assurance criteria.
- The Department revised its mission statement and goals, began work on formulating a conceptual framework, and began implementing the candidate performance-based assessment system.
- The state certification test requirement has transitioned to a MMC program exit requirement to take the certification tests at least one time prior to graduation and to achieve the applicable passing scores before recommendation for certification in South Dakota or other states.
- The 4-year degree plan for double majors in Elementary Education and Special Education has been revised to allow completion of these two majors within four years rather than four and a half to five years on the previous four-year plan.
- An Associate of Arts degree for School Paraprofessionals was added in Fall 2006.

Conceptual Framework	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------	---------------

Conceptual Framework – Novice to Expert

The mission of the Mount Marty College Teacher Education Department is to prepare high quality teachers. The Education Department uses a developmental approach within a context of relationships to help candidates grow in their sense of self and in their ability to serve as competent teachers. The Teacher Education Department also believes that the development of a reflective professional is dependent upon a holistic formation program that involves the personal growth of the candidate as well as the acquisition of pedagogical skills. This process involves a commingling of theory and practice, which takes time, practice, and personal reflection on the part of the candidate as well as the guidance of their mentors. This also involves an awareness of God, the experience of community in a hospitable environment of respect, and a commitment to life-long learning.

There are four key concepts in the theoretical underpinnings of the Mount Marty College teacher education program. These concepts are the developmental nature of the art of teaching from novice to expert, the necessity of combining theory with practice for retention of learning, the effect of reflecting on the practice of teaching, and the importance of quality relationships between candidates and faculty.

Over the past three years, the unit has attempted to construct a more comprehensive “conceptual framework” and a “knowledge base” that incorporates the foundational rationales and principles of the MMC teacher education program articulated in the mission, philosophy, values, and goal statements. This process is still evolving and the “Novice to Expert” conceptual framework document remains an unfinished product.

The “Novice to Expert” model was developed by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1984) and later applied to the field of education by David Berliner of the University of Arizona and has been used in facilitating the growth of professionals. This model posits that in the acquisition and development of expertise, one passes through five levels of proficiency (novice – advanced beginner – competent practitioner – proficient practitioner – expert practitioner). These levels also describe the stages a student teacher passes through on his/her way to a higher level of expertise.

Summary of Strengths:

The educational unit at Mount Marty College has developed a vision and mission that is candidate centered and it is evident that this is their central focus. The Conceptual Framework is not fully completed, but the framework will be based on the “novice to expert” model. The faculty and candidates are aware of the purpose of the educational unit at MMC and how this purpose directly relates to the vision and mission of MMC. It is evident that the educational unit has developed a “family-like atmosphere”. The faculty converse with each other on a daily basis, they know all of the candidates individually and are aware of their individual strengths and needs. If there is an issue, the faculty and candidates are in contact promptly and the issue is addressed. The faculty are strong supporters of the candidates and celebrate each individual’s success. The candidates are appreciative and respectful of the faculty at MMC.

Areas for Improvement: None

Rationale: N/A

Recommendation: Standard Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

Standard 2

Preparation of Candidates in Teacher Education

The unit shall print and distribute a policy with specific admission standards and procedures that govern student recruitment and acceptance into the preparation programs. The unit shall provide written verification that candidates are informed about state laws and rules that govern the issuance of certificates for educational personnel.

The unit shall prepare candidates to work in a school as a teacher, administrator or school service specialist, these candidates must know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn. Assessments shall be given to the candidate to ensure the candidate meets professional, state, and unit standards.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes No

Candidate Knowledge and Skills	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
--------------------------------	--------------	-----------------	--------

The admission criteria is similar to other South Dakota teacher education programs:

- Successful completion of specific classes with a C or higher,
- Successfully completing the PPST exam,
- At least a 2.6 GPA, recommendations from at least two faculty members,
- Essay describing the reason for becoming a teacher,
- In addition, completion of application forms, as well as a disclosure form for criminal conduct.

Praxis II content area and Praxis II pedagogy (PLT) pass rates of 100% have been achieved for the 2004-05 through the 2008-09 academic years.

INTASC Standard #1 Content Knowledge

Data from the respective *State Content Knowledge Certification Exams* show that a majority of the 163 candidates who took these content knowledge exams achieved a passing score on their first attempt.

Data from the *Course Grades Assessment* show that candidates in all of the eight programs achieved an average of grades earned above a 3.00.

Data from the *Student Teaching Evaluation* show that nearly all of the 66 candidates in this reporting period (99%) were rated by their cooperating teachers on INTASC #1/SLO #5 Content Knowledge in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels with 77% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level.

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that a majority (96% and 95%) of the 23 - 24 graduates were rated by the school administrator(s) on INTASC #1/SLO #5 Content Knowledge & on the

respective Specialized Professional Association (SPA) content knowledge standards in the Acceptable Performance Level in their first year of teaching.

INTASC Standards #2, 3, and 5 Student Learning/Learning Environment

Data from the *Student Teaching Evaluation* show that nearly all of the 66 candidates in this reporting period were rated by their cooperating teachers on INTASC #2, 3, 5/SLO #2 Student Learning/Learning Environment in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels (99%) with 77% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level.

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that a majority (88%) of the 24 graduates were rated by the school administrator(s) on INTASC #2, 3, 5/SLO #2 Student Learning/Learning Environment in the Acceptable Performance Level in their first year of teaching.

A majority of the 145 candidates who took the *Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)* exam demonstrated scores within or above the ETS Average Performance Range for the respective categories (Category I. 84% and 84% and Category IV. 86% and 95%).

INTASC Standards #4, 7, and 8 Instruction and Assessment

Data from the *Student Teaching Evaluation* show that nearly all of the 66 candidates in this reporting period (99%) were rated by their cooperating teachers on INTASC #4, 7, 8/SLO #1 Instruction and Assessment in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels with 68% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level.

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that a majority (91%) of the 24 graduates were rated by the school administrator(s) on INTASC #4, 7, 8/SLO #1 Instruction and Assessment in the Acceptable Performance Level in their first year of teaching.

A majority of the 145 candidates who took the *Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)* exam demonstrated scores within or above the ETS Average Performance Range for the respective categories (Category II. 78% and 86% and Category IV. 82% and 93%).

INTASC Standard #6. Communication Techniques

Data from the *Student Teaching Evaluation* show that nearly all of the 66 candidates in this reporting period (99%) were rated by their cooperating teachers on INTASC #6/SLO #3 Communication Techniques in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels with 74% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level.

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that (95%) of the 24 graduates were rated by the school administrator(s) on INTASC #6/SLO #3 Communication Techniques in the Acceptable Performance Level in their first year of teaching.

A majority of the 145 candidates who took the *Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)* exam demonstrated scores within or above the ETS Average Performance Range for Category VI. (92% and 89%).

INTASC Standard #9 and #10. Professionalism/School Community

Data from the *Student Teaching Evaluation* show that all of the 66 candidates in this reporting period (100%) were rated by their cooperating teachers on INTASC #9 & 10/SLO #4 Professionalism/School Community in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels with 75% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level.

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that a majority (86%) of the 24 graduates were rated by the school administrator(s) on INTASC #9 & 10/SLO #4 Professionalism/School Community in the Acceptable Performance Level in their first year of teaching.

A majority of the 145 candidates who took the *Principles of Learning and Teaching* exam demonstrated scores within or above the ETS Average Performance Range for the respective categories (Category III. 82% and 82% and Category VII. 90% and 89%).

Candidate Ability to Help All Students Learn

Data from the *1st Year Teacher Employer Survey* show that 96% of the 23 graduates who were rated by the school administrators on their general ability to increase student learning were judged to be in the Acceptable Performance Level.

Data from the *Impact on Student Learning assessment* show that 92% of the candidates were rated by their college supervisors on their ability to help all students learn during the student teaching experience in either the Acceptable or Advanced Performance Levels with 35.4% of those ratings occurring in the Advanced Performance Level. II. 78% and 86% and Category IV. 82% and 93%).

Summary of Strengths:

It is evident that there is a close relationship between the teacher education faculty and candidates. Both graduates of the education program and current candidates report that they appreciate the close relationships they have with the department faculty. Graduates of the program and current candidates report that the faculty is available for advising and assisting them. Candidates are given opportunities to do classroom observations at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. With the small faculty/candidate ratio, the faculty knows the candidates on an individual basis, and the candidates know each of the faculty members. Candidates receive numerous opportunities to do hands-on lessons in their classes, and then go out into the classrooms to teach lessons and mini-lessons. They also receive support from the faculty as they prepare to take the Praxis exams. As a result, they are successful in passing the Praxis exams. When candidates are doing field experiences and clinical practice a faculty member frequently goes out and observes them, and gives them immediate feedback on how well they performed. As data indicates, candidates have strong content and pedagogical knowledge.

Areas for Improvement: None

Rationale: N/A

Recommendation: Standard Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

Standard 3

Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit shall develop an assessment system with its professional community that reflects its conceptual framework and professional and state standards. The units' system shall include a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that shall be used to monitor candidate performance and to manage and improve programs. Decisions about candidate performance shall be based on assessments conducted during admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion. The unit shall take effective steps to eliminate sources of bias in performance assessments and work to establish fair, accurate, and consistent assessments.

The unit shall regularly and systematically compile, summarize, and analyze data, which shall be used to improve applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate proficiency, and program quality.

The unit shall regularly and systematically use data, including candidate and other school personnel performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. The unit shall analyze program evaluation and performance assessment data and initiate changes if necessary. The unit shall regularly share candidate and faculty assessment data with candidates and faculty to help them reflect on and improve their performance.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes No

Assessment System	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
		X	

Since the last state review in the fall of 2001 significant changes in the unit assessment system have occurred. With the revision of South Dakota Administrative Rule to align teacher preparation standards with National Standards, effective July 2008, the unit has made improvements to assessment and evaluation measures to monitor candidate success, program improvement, and manage unit operations.

The mission of the Mount Marty Teacher Education Department is to prepare high quality teachers. The Department uses a developmental approach within a context of relationships to help candidates grow in their sense of self and in their ability to serve as competent teachers. To carry out this mission the department utilizes a three dimensional unit assessment system based on three teacher education program goals and outcomes. These goals are articulated in unit materials and the institutional report.

Unit Operations

Goal #1: To integrate theory and practice by providing multiple and sequential experiences in K-12 classroom settings.

Professional Characteristics

Goal #2: To help each student grow in their sense of self and ability to serve.

Candidate Performance

Goal #3: To provide the continuity of study and experiences necessary for the development and demonstration of the knowledge and skills of the teaching and learning process.

The unit has clearly defined transition points and key assessments within those points to monitor candidate performance on multiple internal and external assessments as they progress through the program. Systems are in place to ensure candidates successfully meet transition criteria. If a candidate does not meet the criteria for satisfactory progress, procedures are in place to provide assistance and remediation.

The unit provides handbooks and conducts meetings for candidates, faculty, including adjunct, field experience supervisors, and cooperating teachers for review of the assessment policies and procedure to ensure reliability. Data are collected, analyzed, and summarized systematically to ensure validity and consistency.

Review of handbooks, meeting minutes, and interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers, and candidates, indicate the unit assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias at both the Yankton and Watertown campuses.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
--	---------------------	-------------------------	---------------

Timelines, policies, and procedures have been implemented to ensure data are collected, analyzed, and summarized systematically to provide comprehensive information on candidates, program quality, and unit operations. Data are shared with candidates on their performance and status at each transition point by an advisor or faculty member.

The responsibility to analyze and evaluate data is the responsibility of the department. Any adjustments or changes identified after review of data is presented at Teacher Education Committee (TEC) meetings. Members of the committee include teacher education faculty and one member from each of the subject areas with a South Dakota approved teacher education program. Recommendations from the TEC for policy changes would be reviewed by the Faculty Senate.

Currently, the assessment data is maintained through the use of excel files, reports are generated in both aggregate and disaggregate formats.

The Teacher Education Department relies on the College’s policies and procedures to document formal candidate complaints and their resolutions. The FERPA Complaint with Family Policy Office, the Grade Change/Appeal Policy, and the Grievance Policy outlined in the catalog are examples that dictate specific record keeping procedures and requirements. In addition to hard copies of these complaints that are retained in the candidates’ permanent file in the registrar’s office, the Director of Teacher Education also utilizes a “memo of record” to document

communication and other informal actions related to any formal complaints that are filed by teacher education candidates.

Use of Data for Program Improvement	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
--	---------------------	-------------------------	---------------

Listed are the Teacher Education Department’s procedures for how data will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of courses, programs, and clinical practice as it relates to the units three dimensional unit assessment system.

Ratings and feedback from candidates, programs, and unit operations evaluations are summarized annually and analyzed at subsequent Department meetings.

- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of EDN 212 – 218 Field Experience and SPE 220 Field Experience in Special Education
- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of EDN 312 – 318 Practicum and SPE 320 Practicum in Special Education
- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience (EDN 454, 455, 456, 457 or SPE 460)
- Student Teacher Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience
- Student Teacher Evaluation of the Cooperating Teacher
- Student Teacher Evaluation of the College Supervisor
- K-12 School Site Field Experience Data Collection Forms for 100 hours of pre-student teaching field experience in multiple and varied placements
- Candidate Exit Feedback
- Graduate Survey

Teacher education faculty also directly observe candidates during the student teaching experience and are able to make appropriate changes to the courses they teach.

Ratings and feedback from the Professional Characteristics assessments are considered at each of the transition points to make decisions about progression in and satisfactory completion of the teacher education program.

Ratings of candidates by different evaluators at multiple transitions will be aggregated to show personal growth of individual candidates, including school administrators in the first year of employment. The data will be aggregated by major and across all programs over time to improve the performance of candidates and the quality of the program.

The ratings and feedback from school administrators of the graduates’ performance in their first year of teaching are included in the present federal Title II reporting and accountability requirements to the SD Department of Education, the College’s HLC/NCA annual reporting requirements, and both SD DOE Program Reports and Institutional Report for Candidate Knowledge and Skills.

Summary of Strengths:

Highly functional and effective assessment systems formally document timelines and policies related to candidate performance and unit operations to ensure its programs and graduates are of the highest quality. Although, the assessment system is in a nascent stage, the unit has timelines as well as policies and procedures in place to ensure data are collected regularly and systematically and shared with all stakeholders for the assessment of candidates, program quality, and unit operations.

Areas for Improvement: None**Rationale: N/A****Recommendation: Standard Met****Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

Standard 4

Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personal develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills, necessary to help all students learn.

In this section, the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes No

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
---	---------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

The unit collaborates with both public and private school districts in the Yankton and Watertown communities, and in other area schools surrounding those two campus sites. School based faculty have not had roles in the design of the unit’s field and clinical experiences, but their feedback during the delivery and evaluation phases is highly valued. For example, feedback from the field drove the decision for candidates to student teach in the fall, allowing them to begin earlier and experience the preparation for the school year and first days of school. The Field Placement Director oversees the early field experience and student teaching placements in collaboration with course instructors.

Field experiences include:

- Orientation to Teaching & Course-embedded field experiences (2 hrs each at primary, intermediate, MS, and HS levels, plus fieldwork for 3 courses)
- Field Experience (Teaching Assistants, 2 hrs/week)
- Practicum (2 full weeks between semesters)
- Student Teaching (12 weeks)

For the Orientation to Teaching and course-embedded field experiences, the course instructor and Field Placement Director collaborate with P-12 administrators to make the placements in area schools. In collaboration with P-12 administrators, the Field Placement Director places candidates in the Practicum and Student Teaching placements. The Director contacts superintendents and principals via email, phone, and letter to arrange placements in conjunction with district policy and procedures.

The unit and school partners share expertise and resources as evidenced by the field experiences candidates partake in during the teacher preparation program. Cooperating teachers mentor candidates, share their classrooms, and provide feedback on individual candidates and the

program. The unit provides supervision to candidates in the field and uses data collected from field experiences to assist in the development of policies and procedures.

The unit appears to have good rapport with its school partners and collaborates in the delivery and evaluation of field experiences. Stakeholders are not involved in the design at this point.

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Unacceptable	Acceptable X	Target
--	---------------------	-------------------------	---------------

The unit has clear entry and exit criteria that candidates meet in order to progress to the next transition points within the program. Review of the handbook and interviews with the Field Placement Director, candidates, and faculty confirmed that field experiences are developmental.

As evidenced in the Institutional Report and the *Guidelines for Students Preparing to Teach*, field experiences are required throughout the program. Initially, candidates enroll in EDN 150 Orientation to Teaching for 8 hours of observation in four levels of P-12 classrooms (primary, intermediate, middle school, and high school). Field experiences are embedded in three courses and a stand-alone field experience of 24 hours. Prior to the student teaching experience, candidates complete a 2-credit practicum of two full weeks. Student teaching is the final field experience of 12 weeks.

A review of field experience requirements and evaluation tools and interviews with candidates and faculty show that experiences are based on the unit’s goals. They align with institutional, state and professional standards. Candidates are assessed at midpoint and completion of field experiences by the candidate, cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor using the aligned evaluation tools.

School-based faculty must meet certain criteria to be selected as cooperating teachers.

- They must hold valid certification with a major of their current teaching assignment(s),
- Have at least two years of teaching experience, one of these in the current position and in the subject area and at the grade level for which the student teacher is assigned,
- Have a thorough knowledge of his or her teaching field(s), a working knowledge of related fields, and experience with a wide variety of teaching methods,
- Have sufficient flexibility to allow the student teacher latitude in trying a variety of methods and materials even though they might differ from those s/he commonly uses
- In addition, have a sincere interest and desire to accept a student teacher, to aid him or her to gain status with the candidates and faculty, and to guide and direct the student teaching.

At this time, the unit does not systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during the program. Interviews with graduates and current candidates indicate they do not feel adequately prepared to effectively use technology in the classroom during field experience and clinical practice. Candidates and graduates indicated they are self-taught in using technology in the lessons they prepare, or that the cooperating teacher with whom they are assigned assist them in learning about technology. However, data in standard 2 from cooperating teachers indicate that 74% of candidates are satisfied with the level of training that candidates have in the area of technology.

MMC recently acquired one Smart Board and three Promethean boards for education classrooms and other college classrooms; with training scheduled for May 2010. Faculty report they will be using the technology in the classes as soon as they receive training, to assist candidates in developing mastery in utilizing technology when they are in the P-12 setting.

The college supervisor meets one-on-one with the cooperating teacher and candidate prior to the candidate's student teaching, as confirmed by interviews with school administrators, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors. At this initial meeting, the college supervisor goes over a packet of information, including evaluation materials that will be used during student teaching.

College supervisors observe and assess student teachers on a bi-weekly basis using a scripted observation form. It guides discussion with the student teacher on supervisor observations and encourages student teacher reflection. Cooperating teachers observe student teachers daily and have debriefings on their observations.

Further, teacher education faculty believe it is valuable to bring candidates back to campus on a bi-weekly basis during their student teaching experience to talk about issues such as theory to practice and the Impact on Student Learning assignment.

Summary of Strengths:

The cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and student teacher meet prior to the onset of the student teaching semester. This ensures everyone has an opportunity to review expectations and requirements, ask questions, and generally get to know each other prior to the official first day of student teaching. The majority of candidates complete student teaching during the fall semester. This arrangement allows candidates to see the all-important first days of school, and gives them the opportunity to attend teacher in-service activities and assist with room set up and preparation of materials.

Areas for Improvement:

The unit does not systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during the program.

Rationale:

The perceived need for increased technology and training available for candidates to learn and use in teaching current methods in technology was evident through interviews and review of course offerings.

Recommendation: Standard Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None