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I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Kean University was established in 1855 as a Normal School for the public school system of the city of Newark, New Jersey. Today, the institution serves approximately 15,000 undergraduate and graduate students in the liberal arts, the sciences, and the professions. Kean is a comprehensive institution offering 48 undergraduate and 28 graduate degree programs across five colleges. Kean is a teaching university and Kean faculty dedicate themselves to student learning and academic rigor.

Kean University is one of the largest producers of teachers in the state. Currently, in the professional education unit there are approximately 3,200 students enrolled in 14 undergraduate programs and over 1,350 students enrolled in nine Masters and post-Masters level graduate programs and one doctoral program. Included in the professional education unit are 21 Professional Development Schools (PDSs) across 11 central New Jersey school districts. In addition to programs housed primarily in the COE, the professional education unit collaborates with other colleges (College of Visual and Performing arts, College of Natural Applied and Health Sciences, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Center for Science, Technology, and Mathematics) to prepare educators. The Teacher Education Council includes faculty from each college and issues regarding program development and assessment, data collection, and joint governance of teacher education programs are the responsibility of this committee.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was an NCATE-only visit. There were no deviations from the state protocol. The visit began with an off-site review during summer 2010 prior to the on-site, three-day visit in...
I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

Some graduate programs are offered at PDS sites for practicing teachers. Faculty offer instruction at these sites for the convenience of the participants. Members of the BOE team visited two such sites and interviewed faculty and candidates at these sites.

The Kean Ocean campus in Toms River, New Jersey offers identical courses to those offered on the main campus. There are 327 currently enrolled in courses at the Kean Ocean campus. Qualified faculty teach these courses in a hybrid of on-site and distance learning. Faculty teaching at the Kean Ocean campus were interviewed by members of the BOE team.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

No unusual circumstances. The unit was well prepared for the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The SPECTRUM serves as the basic curriculum model for the unit. This model is represented by a Venn diagram showing the overlap of knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to informed, dynamic professionals. In the model, this Venn diagram is circled by "classroom, school, community, state, nation, and the world." The outer circle is bordered by general education, professional studies, field experiences and specialty studies. According to the IR "This model is based on the premise that a teacher is first and foremost a committed professional whose primary responsibility is the academic, social, and emotional growth of students." Displays of the SPECTRUM graphic are visible in the halls of the COE, in all classrooms, and in syllabi reviewed by the BOE. Appropriate disposition goals for candidates are evident in course syllabi. Teacher candidates are well versed in the concepts entwined in this model. The SPECTRUM is presented at every candidate orientation. All courses, program Teacher Work Samples (TWS), field experiences and other assessments are aligned with the SPECTRUM. Candidates in field experiences demonstrate through TWS their understanding of the concepts inherent in the SPECTRUM.

The SPECTRUM has been under continuous review by unit faculty and administrators. Records of committee meetings, coordinators' meetings, faculty and staff meetings and faculty retreats provide
documentation of revisions to the CF that are purposefully related to the mission of the unit. The belief that all children can learn is emphasized in the CF. Reliability of data used in the assessment system has also become a focus in the CF. A Progressive Science Initiative (PSI) was implemented in 2008-2009 to further solidify the unit's commitment to incorporate technology in instructional practice and to provide opportunities in science in high needs districts.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

According to the institutional report (IR) and through conversations with the NCATE Coordinator, the 17 initial and nine Masters and post-baccalaureate education programs at Kean University are aligned with their respective state and national standards. Additionally, program course outlines reiterate the SPECTRUM conceptual framework as demonstrated in the objectives for EDUC 4000: "Students will achieve growth toward becoming informed, dynamic professionals and demonstrate comprehensive knowledge, application of instructional skills, values and dispositions related to teaching." The Fall 2010 issue of the Kean Magazine states, "Kean does more than produce the most new teachers in New Jersey—we produce the finest" (p. 89). The skills candidates learn at Kean put them ahead of the competition and make them world-class educators who are highly sought after by the state's most competitive school districts.

Praxis II data indicate an initial program completer pass rate of 95% as reported in the 2009 Title II report and a 100% completer pass rate for fall 2010. An example of faculty effort to improve pass rates on the social studies Praxis exam for candidates was a collaboration between the history department and the middle/school faculty to make two curricular changes. A required course for the K-12 History candidates, HIST 3000, was added as a required course for the Middle School Social Studies candidates. HIST 3000 is a comprehensive course that covers the topics addressed in the History Content Knowledge Praxis II exams. And, beginning fall 2010, middle school social studies candidates are required to pass both Praxis II exams prior to student teaching.

Program reviews by the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) are a primary source of assessment data. Comments on the SPA reports indicate assessment criteria are detailed and comprehensive and that evidence from a variety of assessments within programs indicates that teacher candidates are able to have an effect on student learning and can create developmentally appropriate environments. In September 2009, 26 programs were submitted for national review. Of those 26, 22 received National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions and four received Further Development Required. Responses to programs receiving national recognition with conditions are currently being revised and will be submitted again in spring 2011. The four programs requiring further development have received detailed study by unit faculty and administrators. A decision was made to temporarily suspend the TESOL program due to the loss of key faculty for the program. Faculty for teacher education in physical education will resubmit the program for review under Option B for program review. Under Option B the physical education faculty can select the key assessment with certain constraints. The programs in English and Spanish are under revision and will be resubmitted...
spring 2011. During interviews with faculty representing the departments of English, Spanish and Physical Education it was clear that the revision of assessment rubrics in each program to match SPA standards was viewed as an important step toward national recognition. Because of the progress faculty are making toward revising program reports, the area for improvement has been removed for Standard 1.

Entry requirements for post baccalaureate or advanced programs not included in a national or state review process may include:
• certification in another teaching area,
• knowledge of another language,
• New Jersey teacher's certification,
• undergraduate GPA of 3.00,
• passing rate on the GRE or MAT,
• B.A. in Spanish,
• department interview, or
• writing sample.

A summary of the data from key assessments for these five programs indicates, on average, 90% of the candidates meet or exceed standards at the accomplished level of either a four- or five-point scale ranging from below standards, satisfactory, developing or accomplished. Examples of key assessment points in the program and an aggregation of data were viewed in Exhibit 3. Professional dispositions and knowledge were demonstrated by these candidates in interviews. Follow up surveys also indicated that standards are met by advanced program completers.

Candidate Learning Outcomes at both the initial and advanced levels are articulated in the SPECTRUM, Kean University's conceptual framework. The SPECTRUM has served as a basis for all professional education programs at Kean since 1993 and is consistent with the mission of the institution and the college of education. In 2004 NCATE confirmed that the SPECTRUM model was successfully integrated into the teacher education curriculum. During the fall semester 2007, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) performance assessment was also aligned with the SPECTRUM model.

In September 2009, the School of Global Education and Innovation began accepting students. This school offers a number of programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels that focus on three areas; global education, learning technologies, and world languages. Among the programs is a proposed five-year BA/MA program. Candidates earn a BA in Global Studies at the end of the fourth year and during the fifth year candidates complete a Master's degree and become eligible for teacher certification in social studies, English, or world languages.

Dispositions are assessed through reflective essays required for admission into the program; reflective journals and Teacher Work Samples, and observations by supervisors and faculty during field experiences; and program specific experiences described in the SPECTRUM-aligned course outlines. Current assessments indicate that candidates meet institutional standards pertaining to dispositions reflected in the Conceptual Framework. High scores on professional internship Performance Competency Assessment across programs provide evidence that candidates meet target level for Professional Dispositions for All Candidates.
1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Kean University candidates' content knowledge is assessed at various points in programs. Prior to admission to education programs and to introductory field experience candidates must have a grade point average of 2.75 indicating successful completion of English composition, communications, mathematics, science and history courses, and must have passed the PRAXIS I exam. Before student teaching candidates must meet the required GPA, have completed the professional program courses, and pass the PRAXIS II exam. During student teaching candidates must receive satisfactory evaluations from both supervisors and cooperating teachers. All candidates must complete a Teacher Work Sample Portfolio. At graduation candidates must have the required GPA of 2.75 and have passed the PRAXIS II to be recommended for licensure.

Information received from candidates who also complete the "Report Cards," a process for evaluating course content and course instructors, support the evidence from the PRAXIS data. Approximately 70 percent of students surveyed indicated that they have strong content knowledge background sufficient to help all students learn. Data from the professional field experiences indicate that supervisors rate students as having strong content knowledge in subject matter.

Advanced Teaching
The Program Completer Surveys for advanced candidates have been modified to include questions about candidate effectiveness in leadership and mentoring roles. Program Completer Surveys for candidates in advanced programs include data that document teachers are experts in the content they teach. Self-reporting by advanced candidates on the Program Completer Survey also indicates candidates believe they are well prepared to use assessment data to make instructional decisions. Samples of candidate work indicate that candidates collect and analyze data, reflect on practice, and use research and technology to support and improve student learning. The Advanced Programs National Recognition Reports also provide evidence that Kean University has met Target Level for pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates.

At the advanced level, dispositions are assessed through reflective essays for admission into programs, reflective journals during field experiences, observations during field experiences and projects, and through reflection required in the comprehensive exams. Advanced programs currently use a pre- and post-survey to look more closely at dispositions across programs.

Other School Professionals
Candidates are assessed for admission to the program (GPA and GRE scores); at mid-point prior to the internship, comprehensive exam and/or thesis; and for completion of the program and graduation and/or recommendation for licensing. Two of the advanced programs, Educational Administration and Speech-Language Pathology have state exam requirements for licensure. The passing rate on both of these assessments has consistently been in the 90th percentile. Each program has field experiences and data are collected and used for program improvement. The College of Education aggregates data on candidates' professional and pedagogical skills as demonstrated in the field. Candidates demonstrate that they can plan and implement instruction that motivates and engages learners, and accommodates individual learners. Documents submitted for national accreditation demonstrate that other School
Professional candidates at Kean University pass the academic content examinations of respective programs and have an in-depth understanding of knowledge in their fields.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Educational programs at Kean University have been directed and modified in accordance with the conceptual framework, the SPECTRUM. Revisions to improve programs are related directly to the manner in which they exemplify elements in the SPECTRUM. Faculty deliberations of the conceptual framework and the purposes of the programs lead to minor and major changes that are becoming integral elements in teacher education at Kean. This continuous effort to improve and to streamline teacher education for the benefit of teacher education candidates and PreK-12 students demonstrates the unit's progress toward meeting the target level on Standard I.

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is required for all initial teacher candidates. Through completion of the TWS, candidates demonstrate their ability to 1) be reflective in their understanding of the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy, 2) use their in-depth understanding of the content to provide multiple instructional strategies, and, 3) present the content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways. Evidence from the TWS data indicates initial certification candidates meet the standards for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates at the target level. The unit is in the process of improving the TWS assessment to better align with specific program standards.

During the student teaching experience, candidates analyze assessment data to determine students’ progress related to learning goals and then reflect upon this analysis in the TWS. Evidence in TWS data across programs demonstrates that candidates meet the standard for student learning at the target level. All candidates entering student teaching must pass the PRAXIS II exam before being allowed to complete their final field experience.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs in English and physical education have not been nationally recognized by their respective specialized professional associations ITP, ADV</td>
<td>The program in English and physical education have received detailed study by unit faculty and administrators. During interviews with faculty representing the departments of English and Physical Education it was clear that the revision of assessment rubrics in each program to match SPA standards was viewed as an important step toward national recognition. Because of the progress faculty are making toward revising program reports, the area for improvement has been removed for Standard 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Desired candidate outcomes are outlined in the unit's conceptual framework. These are clearly aligned and reflected in the assessment system for both initial and advanced programs. There is a clear plan and a perceivable determination to continue reviewing and as necessary improving the existing assessment plan to identify program need areas and to enable informed determination of best routes of action.

Evidence from IR, attached exhibits and interviews with faculty, staff and candidates suggest a high level of consultation with program faculty and school personnel in the development of assessments, revision of instruments and rubrics, data analysis, and in making use of collected data to inform program revision. It is clear from review of the IR that close attention is given to taking the necessary steps to meet target expectations; there is evidence of a variety of initiatives being implemented. Reviewed evidence does suggest that candidates engage in multiple assessments as they progress through the different programs the unit offers. Again, efforts have been initiated to ensure that collected data is used to inform candidates of areas/ issues needing their attention. There seems to be a systematic use of comprehensive and integrated set of evaluations measures, as supported by a review of SPA reports. These show that the majority of programs offered are nationally recognized or nationally recognized with conditions (only four were found to be in need of further development). Instances where problems with the alignment of assessments and/or rubrics with SPA standards were noted are reportedly being addressed, instruments are being revised and new data is being collected as indicated by attached action plans. There are plans to submit to three SPA areas as early as spring 2011. Gathered information is distributed and discussed with various constituents at least once a year through the dean's office and at various levels throughout the year. There are systematic, planned opportunities to complete data analysis, make it accessible and use it to inform program review/ improvement. Reportedly, outcomes from assessment measures are to be made available online for all stakeholders. Interviews with faculty and unit administrators confirm that the program/ unit leadership adhere to a culture where assessment is valued. It is reported that the College of Education is seen as a valued resource in regards to assessment and student outcomes for the larger University.
The system for evaluating candidate performance is accurately described in the IR and supported by provided documentation and interviews with candidates and unit personnel. The assessment system consists of multiple, varied, comprehensive measures intended to assess candidate performance according to established standards and unit operations. For instance, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is consistently used to evaluate candidate performance. Recently acquired software, Qualtrics, allows evaluators to provide specific comments on the candidate competencies. These in turn will be available for feedback to candidates— a clear added benefit for advisement purposes. Review of SPA reports indicate that most programs have successfully developed assessment systems that are aligned with pertinent standards and that programs are actively engaged in examining collected data and that these are used for program improvement. Though some revisions in this regard are indicated, evidence from interviews with faculty and administrators show that steps have already been taken towards developing/revising rubrics, aligning these with pertinent SPA standards and that data will be collected, aggregated and analyzed in time for program reports to be submitted in spring 2011. Data show that most program completers are meeting standards. Interviews with candidates, program completers, school personnel show high level of satisfaction with the unit's program. The high level of satisfaction from employers of graduates seems suggestive of the extent to which the graduates are meeting or exceeding programmatic outcomes.

The various assessments and rubrics in use are subject to revision as needed in order to ensure that they conform to relevant standards and that they provide clear performance indicators that are aligned with current standards. Interviews with personnel and examination of exhibits show that assessment is an integral part of the work the unit does and that there is a progression of efforts to improve the assessment system (e.g., developing or adapting existing mechanism or instruments, or by acquiring software and other technological resources to improve data collection, aggregation and accessibility). Analysis of supporting documentation suggests a close collaboration of the faculty with both stakeholders and candidates in regard to assessment and program improvement. The IR indicates that the unit and programs have systematically made a wide range of changes as the various assessment data are analyzed and that this is an ongoing, cyclical process that is concurrently taking place at different levels. The unit uses disaggregated information available from PRAXIS exams for candidate evaluation, follow-up studies, and state and national program reviews. For instance, records show that based on testing results, a number of program revisions are being undertaken, e.g., discontinuation of comprehensive exam for graduate Early Childhood in favor of a portfolio. Review of IR and other evidence provided show that in evaluating the unit operations and program, the unit collects, analyzes, and uses a broad array of information and data from varied sources, e.g., evaluations of clinical practice, admissions process, school partners, etc. Evidence is provided, and confirmed through sources/items at the site, for changes made to both graduate and undergraduate programs resulting from examination of data.

The IR indicates the existence of measures taken by the unit to eliminate bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its internal assessments, e.g., portfolios and internships. Fairness, accuracy and consistency are ensured through consultation/collaboration with faculty, multiple raters, and peer review of rubrics. Administrative, academic, and support staff all play specific roles in addressing concerns and in identifying fair outcomes. Data show that the key assessments at each transition point are clearly identified for candidates and that documentation outlining or explaining tasks is readily accessible. Candidates are informed of outcomes and advised as needed in terms of moving ahead in their program of choice or addressing areas of concern. Technology is increasingly being used to improve feedback and guidance to candidates and candidates report they find these sources useful and productive. Evidence shows key transition points identified for both undergraduate and graduate programs with specific assessments link to these. Candidate performance for both initial and advanced programs is determined through use of multiple assessments.
The assessment system clearly and consistently enables the unit to access data on all assessments in a multitude of permutations through the use of available technology. The IR notes that SPSS is used to analyze and report data and that there are ongoing efforts to implement use of additional resources, e.g., use of assessment resources that can be scanned or Internet surveys. This reportedly allows administrators and program faculty to access information specific to candidates, programs, and the unit. Indeed, faculty and administrative personnel report feeling increasingly comfortable and adept at using technology based tools (e.g., SIR II) to access data and apply these to advising candidates as well as in making informed programmatic decisions. Interviews indicate that faculty are comfortable as data users.

Examination of supporting documentation reveals the ongoing and systematic aggregation and disaggregation of data to analyze performance of individual candidates, groups or cohorts of candidates, and program efficacy. As a candidate reaches a transition point, the data are accessed to determine whether the candidate can continue to the next transition point, feedback is provided to candidates on their performance, reported to pertinent programs, and used in program improvement efforts in regards to enrollment, retention and transfer of candidates. Opportunities are increasingly made available for candidates to have access to collected data that describe their performance and provides specific feedback for improvement.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The collection, analysis and evaluation of data are systematic and regular. Comprehensive information is provided on candidates, program, and unit. Assessments are scored by instructors at the end of each submission period and evaluated by the program faculty at different transition points, e.g., PRAXIS scores, TWS. In addition, there is an exit survey, as well as an employer survey. All data are compiled, analyzed and summarized by programs annually. This process relies heavily on consultation with stakeholders (faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and other constituencies) and is cyclical to ensure availability of usable information. Personnel made it clear during interviews that they felt quite at ease in sharing/discussing programmatic concerns with the unit administrators. A consultative climate is reported as prevalent in unit operations and evaluation. For instance, interviews demonstrate that there are ongoing, regular contact opportunities and consultations with field personnel to solicit input on candidate performance and on the assessments being used and their performance/suitability. Input from the field is solicited and welcomed providing evidence of true partnerships.

The IR indicates that in order to implement change, the unit/programs review findings and collectively decide how to address recommendations and make appropriate changes to assessments, courses and programs. Interviews confirm close collaboration between the unit members and other stakeholders at various levels in developing assessments, scoring rubrics, data entering, aggregation and analysis. The unit has a formal due process for handling candidate complaints. It has been publicized in the catalogue, handbooks, and at the university's website. There is a clearly outlined appeals process to handle grievances. Records of grievances and their resolution are maintained within confidential files at the dean's office as needed.

There is clear support emerging from review of documentation and interviews with high ranking administrative personnel to conclude that the unit largely relies on the efficient and effective use of assessment data to make informed decisions and that they are making satisfactory progress toward meeting Target Level expectations.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if
appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

From the IR, examination of exhibits and interviews on site it is clear that the unit has an effective assessment system that systematically allows for the collection, aggregation and analysis of data that are consistently relied upon and used to improve candidate performance and programs. Scoring guides are in use for determining levels of candidate performance and are reviewed as part of SPA reviews. It is clear that the unit is committed to identifying areas of improvement, and developing and implementing the necessary mechanisms to meet Target Level expectations.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFI s have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.2 What AFI s remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.3 What new AFI s does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFI s may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 3: 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 professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence from the IR demonstrates that Kean University views field experiences and clinical practice as
an essential component of every program offered by the professional unit at the initial and the advanced
levels. The director of the Teaching Performance Center (TPC) works closely with 150 field and clinical
supervisors to ensure candidates have quality experiences that are connected to course content and are
aligned with unit and professional program area standards. Collaborative partnerships with the
community and K-12 schools have been developed and fostered over time to ensure that candidates and
other school professionals have an environment where they can develop and demonstrate the knowledge,
skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Twenty one professional
Development Schools (PDS) offer urban, suburban, and rural fieldwork placements for KU candidates in
New Jersey.

Candidates are placed in field experiences and clinical practices at the initial level in a three course
sequence at various intervals throughout their programs of study. This sequence begins with an
introductory level placement, continues with the pre-professional level placement, and is finally
completed in a professional level student teaching experience. Candidates are regularly assessed in each
field experience and are expected to document their impact on student learning using formative and
summative measures. Faculty consistently collect and analyze data from these assessments to ensure
candidates use acquired content and pedagogical knowledge.

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is one requirement that has been integrated into the field experience
sequence to document candidates' impact on student learning. Data from the TWS verify that candidates
have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, implement, and assess students. The TPC works
with field experience supervisors to monitor candidate progress with the TWS. Handbooks for each of
these three field components are available and updated annually to reflect expectations for placements.
Criteria for candidate performance are outlined at each level of field experience or clinical practice to
ensure that rigorous expectations are followed. Assessments for these experiences include observations,
two competency assessments, video analysis, TWS projects, and special case reports. When candidates
experience difficulties with any of these assignments, the unit responds with appropriate interventions
such as an action plan or by a referral to the TPC. As candidates matriculate through the established
sequence of field experiences and clinical practices, the emphasis on impacting student learning
increases. Evidence from TWS data indicates candidates are knowledgeable of differentiated teaching
strategies necessary to accommodate the needs of a diverse student population. Survey data substantiate
that candidates feel that they are well prepared to teach as a result of the sequence of field experiences
that are closely correlated to coursework and the conceptual framework.

Interviews with public school partners confirm that KU candidates exit the professional level experience
ready to teach. Clinical faculty note that knowledge of content, pedagogy, 21st century skills,
technology, and reflection combine to provide candidates with "what it takes to be very good teachers."
The capstone course that is paired with the fifteen week professional experience includes seminars and
instruction related to each of these aspects of professional practice and assists candidates with
connecting theory and practice.

At the advanced level, candidates complete field-based assignments that are closely linked to course
content. Examples of these assignments include action-research projects, case studies, and project based
learning. Faculty construct clear expectations in course outlines. Objectives and assessment measures
substantiate the learning experiences of advanced candidates.

Interviews with faculty from advanced programs reveal that the SPECTRUM conceptual framework is
well integrated into field-based assignments. Advisory boards meet regularly to assess program quality,
to ensure an ongoing commitment to professional program standards, and to ensure an alignment of field
and course concepts.
3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

According to the final NCATE/BOE Report from 2004, all indicators within Standard 3 were met with no noted Areas for Improvement at the Initial and the Advanced Levels. Unit faculty, however, have continued to use data and feedback from all stakeholders to make changes to ensure continuous improvement across all fourteen initial and nine Masters and Post Masters program areas. Examples of changes that have been initiated since 2005 include the addition of a technology course, classroom management seminars, workshops related to working with parents and the community, inclusion, differentiated instruction, and assessment. Staff development for university supervisors has been conducted to keep them abreast of program requirements and changes.

Other noted improvements at the initial level include: 1) the addition of regularly scheduled seminars for clinical instructors related to assessment, portfolio requirements, journal writing, inclusion, and state mandated curriculum, 2) the implementation of "Focused Conversations" and a "Supervisor's Forum" with field experience supervisors and university faculty, 3) the development of institutes for cooperating teachers which have been scheduled in PDS sites, 4) the collection, aggregation, analysis and dissemination of data, 5) the addition of seminars and conferences for candidates that address special topics, 6) the introduction and piloting of the TWS, 7) the use of online assessment tools and programs, and the development of a recruitment brochure for attracting teachers to serve as cooperating teachers to meet the enormous needs of KU programs.

At the advanced level, continuous improvement steps include: 1) the development of more intense internship requirements, 2) the alignment of internship assessments with the conceptual framework, 3) the collection, aggregation, disaggregation, and the dissemination of data, and 4) the development and piloting of common rubrics for assessing graduate research and comprehensive exams.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The Field Experience Advisory Committee (FEAC), school and university committees, and all collaborative partners work together to structure a series of field experiences for candidates. All areas of concern are discussed in an open communication style forum as evidence the university values input from all stakeholders. The unit openly communicates its goal of integrating educational theory with practice, its expectations of all stakeholders, and its progress in meeting all established expectations. Handbooks are designed and updated to document all expectations for candidates and involved partners.

The unit has initiated plans for three new PDS sites to ensure that candidates have continued opportunities to experience urban education in their field experience sequence. An emphasis on candidates having field experiences in diverse settings is found throughout the IR and evidenced in interviews and observations. Stakeholders play an important role in the development, implementation, and evaluation of field experience and practicum assignments.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

A series of field experiences in diverse settings is required at the initial and the advanced levels. Field experiences are closely monitored with assessments, and data are collected, aggregated, analyzed, and interpreted to ensure continuous improvement. The TWS documents initial candidates' impact on student learning. A data driven system is in place to assist faculty with making programmatic changes that ensure continuous improvement.
3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No AFIs were cited in the 2005 BOE Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No AFIs remain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No new AFIs need to be addressed at the current time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation        |     |

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

In 2008, Kean University was named one of five of the most diverse campuses in the United States by Diversity Inc Magazine. This is due in part to the geographic location of Kean University but also is due to a systemic and intentional effort on the part of the institution to both recruit and retain students of diverse backgrounds. These efforts include Project Adelante – a pre-college program for Hispanic students and the new Network for Student Success. This program was initiated by the College of Education's Middle School Consortium and is focused on finding ways to close the achievement gap between majority and minority students. Making use of grant awards the unit is also engaged in research directed at examining issues centered on instruction in urban areas through the Garden State Partnership Urban Teacher Residency Program. The unit's commitment to diversity is evidenced in its Conceptual Framework which emphasizes the preparation of informed, dynamic professionals who will be sensitive
to the unique and diverse learning styles of their students by designing instruction that is appropriately responsive to cultural differences that are inherent in their classrooms. This is further supported by the university’s commitment to diversity, e.g., graduation rates for both majority and minority students are the same.

The overarching goal of the unit is to produce candidates who "recognize and respect the complexity of the world in which they live, to welcome the challenges associated with differentiating instruction to accommodate varying styles of learning, and function as advocates for educational quality and social justice for all learners. (IR, page 23)" The commitment to diversity is further evidenced by the unit's diversity institutional standards and outcomes:

Knowledge: Diversity of Learners
Teacher candidates within the unit rely upon contextual factors to design instruction that accommodates for various learning styles.

Skills: Instructional Strategies
Multimodal instructional strategies are utilized to spawn the exercise of higher order thinking and problem solving skills.

Dispositions: Diversity/Individual Differences
Teacher candidates are respectful of the unique, diverse talents of all learners and promote the development of self-confidence and competence.

Dispositions: High Expectations
It is expected that all students will learn and exhibit mastery of content and that academic success is achieved through persistence.

Dispositions: Community/Culture
Teacher candidates are aware of community and cultural norms and demonstrate sensitivity to these in a consistent and nurturing manner.

Candidates in both initial and advanced programs receive instruction in and are assessed on their cross cultural competencies that further their abilities to use a variety of instructional strategies that afford students the opportunity to experience success in multiple settings. Courses at the initial and advanced levels emphasize the unit’s commitment to diversity. From initial through advanced programs, the courses that candidates are required to complete are sequenced in such a way that the Target Level is reached. Interviews with candidates reveal they are at ease when teaching diverse student populations and that they have the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to successfully make informed instructional decisions to differentiate instruction. Examination of assessments, e.g., TWS, Professional Internship Competency Assessment, demonstrate that candidates are meeting desired performance expectations. Moreover, it is noted that work created by candidates as part of their courses, e.g., video reflections, is indicative of the ability to make use of instructional opportunities to engage in advocacy for minority groups. Faculty are actively engaged in researching the possible pedagogical ramifications of such instructional tools in addressing issues relevant to diverse students.

Candidates in all programs are exposed to diverse perspectives on curriculum design, implementation, and evaluation. This is confirmed by exhibits examined at the site and by interviews with students, faculty, and candidates. Examples from courses include: EMSE 2800, Sophomore Field introduces candidates to teaching in multicultural, urban and suburban schools; SPED 2200, Multicultural Learners in Diverse Settings emphasizes the characteristics of diverse learners in multicultural settings, along with examining strategies to meet the needs of bilingual and minority populations; and EC 4260, Supporting
Emergent Literacy Development in Young Children examines culturally responsive support and assessment strategies for language/literacy acquisition in young children. Interviews with candidates and program completers show that they typically feel capable of successfully handling instruction of diverse student populations. Reports from employers support this evidence.

At the Advanced Level coursework includes: EMSE 5401 Bilingual/Multicultural Education in American Schools; CEd 5915 Multicultural Counseling; and EC 5270, Teaching in a Pluralistic Society: Pre-K through Third Grade. Assessment of candidate proficiencies related to diversity occurs across programs. Samples of assessments include reflective journals, Teacher Work Samples, portfolios, case studies, sample unit plans, and clinical experience evaluations. Examination of actual examples of these and other assessment shows that candidates exhibit both the ability to develop suitable instructional opportunities and the desired dispositions towards diverse populations.

Candidates engage with faculty of diverse backgrounds. Specifically, over 18% of the faculty at Kean University are persons of color. Additionally, Kean University has a nearly balanced faculty as relates to gender with 49.2% representing males and 50.7% representing females. Within the unit, nearly 16% of faculty who teach in both initial and/or advanced programs are persons of color. Demographic data of the student body reflect significant diversity as well including 46% White, nearly 20% Black/African American, 19.9% Latino or Hispanic, and at least 6.1% reporting Asian/Pacific Islander. In fall 2009, African American, Hispanic, and Asian candidates represented nearly 44% of all candidates at the initial level in the unit. At the advanced level, African American, Hispanic, and Asian candidates constitute 31% percent of candidates in the unit. Candidates have numerous opportunities to interact with diverse PK-12 students through clinical placements, internships, and university programs including Project Adelante, the Adelante Scholars Program, and Project Excel. Moreover, examined evidence shows that the neighboring school districts receiving candidates for field experiences, by virtue of their demographics, offer opportunities for interacting with diverse groups of teachers, students and administrators.

A systemic and intentional commitment to diversity permeates the unit. The commitment to culturally relevant/responsive practices is further evidenced by the College of Education's Diversity Council. A partnership of member districts and the Kean University College of Education, the Diversity Council is dedicated to the "active pursuit of human dignity, harmony, understanding and mutual support of issues dealing with diversity." The Diversity Council offers in-service courses, diversity leadership training for school students, and facilitator training workshops for teachers and administrators. Interviews show the existing climate of inclusiveness where "diversity is accepted, not just tolerated." Currently, over 70 districts are members of the Diversity Council. The Council, which includes members from the entire university, the unit and P-12 administrators and teachers, exemplifies two distinguishing characteristics of the unit: commitment to diversity and partnerships with P-12 schools.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
Unit curriculum and field experiences promote candidate knowledge of diversity. Interaction with diverse populations found in classmates, faculty, teachers and their own students supports the candidates' knowledge and skills in interacting with diverse groups. Additionally, candidates are regularly assessed on skills related to teaching in multicultural settings and records are kept of specific outcomes and diverse field opportunities. Cross-cultural competencies are fostered through candidate experiences with diverse peers, institutional faculty, and P-12 students and personnel. Review of exhibits and interviews both indicate that the unit is making significant progress toward meeting the target level on this standard.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The COE consists of 78 full-time faculty members and 13 full-time staff, who can teach one class a
semester. Evidence collected through interviews with faculty, candidates, and exhibits, confirms that the unit is committed to hiring highly-qualified faculty and providing instructional tools, professional development opportunities and resources necessary to maintain and support continued growth of unit faculty. One hundred percent of the tenure track faculty have doctorates and have extensive experience in public and private schools. School-based clinical faculty are licensed in their fields and internship supervisors hold appropriate licenses for the candidates they are supervising. Programs offered through the dean's office and during faculty retreats focus on current education topics and trends, thereby maintaining a high level of professional development.

Faculty take an active leadership role at the university including chairing several important committees. COE faculty are also actively involved in area schools in ways other than supervising candidates, such as operating as teacher trainers, consultants, and in grant coordinator positions. COE faculty are recognized as experts in their fields as evidenced by numerous professional collaborations and partnerships, engagement in professional organizations, educational research and publications, and presentations. Unit faculty have published numerous texts and articles in the areas of: Communication Disorders and Deafness; Counselor Education; Early Childhood and Family Studies; Elementary Education; History Education; Literacy; English Education; Middle/Secondary Education; Physical Education, Health and Recreation; Special Education; and Teacher Education.

The university president reported that a major institutional goal is to create an environment where faculty can do research and that funding for research is now seven times greater than it was in 2002. The COE engages in qualitative research to assess faculty "intellectual vitality" in content. Interviews with faculty confirm that scholarly research is continuing to grow. The president reported that Kean uses the "Teacher-Scholar" model. In this vein, there are five internal funding programs available for faculty research: Release Time for Research (RTR) Awards Program; Untenured Faculty Research Initiative (UFRI); The Foundation Faculty Research Award; The Students Partnering with Faculty (SpF) Summer Research Program; and The Presidential Scholars Challenge.

### 5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Following discussions with faculty, two networking organizations now foster growth and research within the faculty; the Tenured Track Faculty Network which was in place to mentor new faculty, and the Faculty Development Network for tenured faculty, which was created to continue collegial faculty support. Adjuncts are also provided with professional development, training and curriculum support through the COE, the Teaching Performance Center and the Center for Innovative Education.

Continued growth and integration of technology and its use throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices, better connects faculty and candidates. Technology is stressed as a tool for instruction and was in evidence in classrooms, Teacher Work Samples, videotapes of teaching by candidates, and presentations. Appropriate resources and tools are used such as the Blackboard program, a suite of Google tools, SMART technology, and programs designed for instructional use.

Full-time faculty are evaluated using the Career Assessment Review which has three criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure: teaching effectiveness, scholarship and professional growth, and service. Adjunct faculty are evaluated for their teaching effectiveness and are observed annually by chairpersons or program coordinators. Candidates have regular and systematic opportunities to evaluate faculty members at the conclusion of courses through the "Student Evaluation of Teaching” and Student Instructional Report (SIR II). The evaluation process reflects the Conceptual Framework in that it assesses each faculty member's mastery of knowledge, skills and dispositions. Forms are easily accessed.
Faculty are also using data from program assessments and professional development through the COE to create more effective syllabi and rubrics. Evidence of this was provided through changes in course credits to provide students with the opportunity to complete additional coursework in areas of interest (such as classes concerning brain injuries) or the addition of courses where graduates felt they needed more expertise (such as classroom management).

Numerous examples of scholarly work by faculty were observed even though the IR states that full-time faculty "carry a 12-credit teaching load (per semester) and devote a minimum of 8 hours per week to advising. In general, faculty have responded to the increase in student population and shrinkage in full-time faculty by working harder, rather than by curtailing their scholarly and creative activities." Five internal funding programs and four major grants are listed in the evidence citing efforts to support research, service and recruitment of candidates. The COE also publishes a refereed journal, Journal of School Connections, devoted to enhancing teaching and learning. One thousand dollars per faculty member and other stipends are provided to support professional development and the OSRP support site is available to support grant writing.

The COE actively partners with urban school districts, 21 PDSs, and provides institutes and workshops for P-12 schools. Faculty are in leadership positions at numerous levels, including local and international professional organizations. The Speech and Language clinic is operated by the Department of Communications Disorders and Deafness serves the public in a new 7 million dollar state-of-the-art clinic.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The COE has a highly-qualified faculty who provides educational leadership within and beyond Kean University in the areas of scholarship, leadership, and service. The unit also models best practices in scholarship through its publications, upgraded syllabi, SPA passage rates, variety of assessments, and knowledge and integration of diversity into instruction and field experiences. Technology is integrated throughout the program and numerous resources and tools are available for use by faculty and students. Assessments and data collected through the internet are used to adjust and redesign programs. Unit faculty serve on numerous important committees throughout the institution, in administrative roles, and in the educational community as well as the community at large.

COE faculty are actively engaged in clinical settings and regularly collaborate with P-12 faculty through activities with field students, professional development institutes, leadership in professional organizations, and service projects, grants and publications.

COE faculty teaching, scholarship, service, and collaboration are comprehensively evaluated annually. A move to the new SIR II assessment system will provide more detailed information on course/instructional effectiveness. Numerous opportunities for financial assistance and professional renewal are available to faculty. Pathways for collaboration and support are in evidence, as reported in faculty interviews, through the exhibits, and in conversations and presentations by Kean University administration, faculty, clinical supervisors, candidates, and PDS personnel.

5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
Target indicators are most acutely evidenced in faculty dispositions. Evidence of faculty dispositions to be actively engaged in scholarship, service and teaching, were reported in interviews, in conversations with administration, faculty, candidates, and in faculty scholarly publications and research. One hundred percent of faculty have earned doctorates, have contemporary professional experiences, are meaningfully engaged in scholarly activities, and work in schools in a variety of capacities. Clear and compelling evidence was presented in publications, interviews, and observations of COE faculty modeling best practices in teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as in the evaluation of professional performance and the facilitation of professional development.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation | Met
Advanced Preparation | Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The COE serves as the professional unit for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. The dean is the senior academic officer of the COE and within the college, the dean has responsibility for fostering excellence in programs, instruction, and research. The dean also defines the administrative role
of the chairs and directors of academic departments. Interviews with the dean indicated her commitment to fulfill the mission of the university to educate highly qualified educators for urban settings. Susan Polirstok, Dean, said, “It is the responsibility of Kean COE to train teachers who are prepared to be elements of change in educational settings.” The provost indicated that as the standards for faculty continue to rise at Kean, unit faculty continue to exceed expectations for meeting these standards.

Committees represent the organizational structure of the unit. The COE Administrative Council, chaired by the dean, consists of the associate dean, the executive assistant to the dean for students, and seven department chairpersons. The COE Retention and Tenure Committee includes one elected member from each department and school, a faculty union observer, and two student representatives. The COE curriculum committee reviews and approves all new courses, revisions of courses, and programs following approval by department committees. There is also a Teaching Performance Center Field Experiences Advisory Committee, a Community of Practice Committee, and NCATE Steering Committee, and the newly formed Progressive Science Initiative Advisory Committee. Collaboration among committees and among partnerships with P-12 practitioners was evident through conversations with members of the PDS Clinical Faculty, members of the Field Services Committee, the School District Grant Partners and the Progressive Science Initiative Partners. The unit also collaborates with the New Jersey Department of Education to develop alternative routes for prospective teachers.

The operational budget for the unit for the fiscal year 2010-2011 is $14,515,282. External funds for the fiscal year totaled $2,259,038. The non-personnel has an operating budget increase of 43.99%. The budget is adequate to support the unit's teaching, service and scholarship. Travel allocations are available for professional development, release time for untenured faculty and a sabbatical leave program. The budget supports 21 professional development schools staffed by clinical faculty who are present in the schools 3 days per week.

Kean University faculty are unionized and governed by an agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Council of New Jersey State College Locals, AFT, AFL-CIO. There are 74 tenured full-time faculty in the unit supported by 29 full-time program staff and one program counselor in special education. Eighteen part-time clinical instructors, 74 supervisors of field experiences and 15 graduate assistants with non-teaching responsibilities contribute to the efficient and effective implementation of programs within the unit. Faculty report being satisfied with the faculty workload policy within the unit. Support personnel in the Teaching Performance Center routinely assist full-time, part-time and clinical faculty with data collection & placement information.

Facilities for the unit are adequate. Hennings Hall is the home for the COE and a new Science and Technology Center provides space for research, virtual experiences in teaching, conferences, and faculty meetings, and a new Human Rights Institute. The new Speech and Hearing clinic received 7.5 million for renovation and new equipment. The Nancy Thompson Library provides a range of resources for the COE. The university’s recent investment in technology has provided the unit with a database to track certification of teacher education graduates and a presence on Facebook for faculty and candidates. Admission, retention and exit criteria, programs of study, grading policies and student services are available online.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

A new College of Education website was rolled out in December of 2009, allowing for direct access to the COE NCATE website and critical components of the unit assessment system, such as links to online assessments and follow up surveys. This data is available without password protection. The Kean University undergraduate and graduate catalogues are online allowing for frequent updates.
A new unit Community of Practice Committee was created to strengthen P-12 partnerships and provide more field experiences for candidates. A Teacher Education Council was created to strengthen partnerships with the Arts and Sciences faculty. The goal of this committee is to collaborate and move toward an improved shared vision in the preparation of content area teachers.

The President of Kean encourages faculty in the unit to be innovative in creating new programs and departments and to host conferences that demonstrate Kean's leadership in 21st Century skills and pedagogy. The unit has grown in its ability to receive grant funding. In 2009 the unit received 6.5 million in funding from outside grants. The College of Education became an Alternate Route provider for the state of New Jersey by developing and implementing courses that provided content for Alternate Route teachers in the region. The unit has become a leader in preparing professional educators and recruiting alternate route teachers to Kean for coursework which provides them the opportunity to earn credits toward obtaining a Masters degree at Kean.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Kean University and the unit are committed to preparing teacher education candidates to become excellent teachers. The unit offers state-of-the-art technology, excellent facilities, professional development opportunities and collaborative efforts with P-12 partners. Faculty and support personnel are knowledgeable of programs, assessment practices and candidates. Through interviews and group meetings it is clear that through curriculum and assessment, faculty are engaged in promoting the SPECTRUM conceptual framework and the mission of the unit to create pathways for candidates that will help them become career professionals.

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The COE has ongoing interactions with all other colleges in the university. The dean is well known across campus and is well respected. The value of the COE is respected among other elements of the university. The COE has been a model for assessment practices and program improvement. The COE has been a source of steadfastness through changes in university leadership and organization. The mission of the unit is and always has been to prepare excellent teachers for P-12 students.

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not
been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons Interviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: