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**OVERVIEW**

**A. Institution**

**A.1. What is the institution's historical context?**

New Mexico Highlands University [NMHU] is one of seven four-year universities in New Mexico. The main campus is located in Las Vegas, New Mexico, which was founded in 1835 as a land grant community. In 1893, the Territorial Legislature of New Mexico established a normal school that became New Mexico Highlands University in 1941 to reflect the addition of graduate programs. NMHU was among the founding institutions to be accredited by NCATE in 1954.

Besides the Las Vegas main campus, the SOE serves three centers: Rio Rancho (1995), Santa Fe (1996), Farmington (1996). Additionally, the SOE serves three sites: Two locations in Española (1996) and one in Raton (2008). San Juan Community College accommodates the NMHU Farmington Center. Santa Fe Community College houses the NMHU Santa Fe Center.

Highlands prides itself on affordability and accessibility. We are an open-enrollment institution with an extensive scholarship program that, in conjunction with state scholarship programs, ensures that any first-time freshman is eligible to receive a tuition scholarship. With a candidate body that is 48.8% Hispanic, NMHU is a federally recognized [Hispanic Serving Institution](http://www.hacu.net/assnfe/CompanyDirectory.asp?STYLE=2&COMPANY_TYPE=1,5).

Highlands has experienced an unprecedented number of changes in key leadership positions during the past decade. Continual changes in leadership and direction significantly impeded our ability to develop a comprehensive and university-wide plan. We are now in a period of stable leadership. It is a significant goal for the University to capitalize upon this stability by engaging in a transforming phase of assessment and development ([*Self Study Report*](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=1808), pp. 6-8).

During the last NCATE accreditation visit in 2006, the SOE failed Standard 2. Although the SOE appealed, NCATE revoked NMHU SOE’s accreditation. New NMHU administrators acted to ameliorate the revocation. The SOE was reorganized into departments; a new Dean was hired in 2008. [The President charged the Dean to restore the SOE to prominence](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540). Since then, SOE’s goal has been reaccreditation. Pursuing the SOE’s goal, a culture of assessment developed.

**A.2. What is the institution's mission?**

NMHU identifies itself as a liberal arts institution. The core curriculum lies at the heart of the educational experience. In 1941, the New Mexico Normal School became NMHU as the mission was extended beyond teacher education. In 2005, Governor Richardson signed Senate Bill 161 that mandated a 35 credit-hour general-education common core curriculum. All NM higher education institutions accept each other’s common-core requirements. Candidates easily transfer within the state university system without repeating general education core courses. Today, NMHU offers graduate and undergraduate programs in arts and science, business, education and social work.

NMHU Mission states that it will provide “Education through teaching, research, and service.” The University’s Vision states that “[NMHU] will provide an inspiring learning environment that promotes excellence, empowerment, transformation, and global understanding.” These are the core values that support NMHU’s mission and vision:

Advancement of knowledge Candidate success

A diversity of ideas, peoples and cultures Accessible education

Community Individual well-being

Sustainable practices

[North Central Association [NCA] and Higher Learning Commission [HLC]](http://www.ncahlc.org/) traits anchor NMHU’s core values. The NCA traits are: Mastery of Content Knowledge and Skills, Effective Communication Skills, Critical and Reflective Thinking Skills, and Effective Use of Technology. Through the Outcomes Assessment process, these NCA/HLC traits link to the SOE’s conceptual framework.

**A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?**

New Mexico Highlands University [NMHU] is a public state-funded higher education institution. NMHU is an open-enrollment institution. All undergraduate candidates with a high school degree or equivalency are invited to attend NMHU. For more than a century, New Mexico Highlands University has served as a leading academic, cultural and economic engine for the communities of northern New Mexico. NMHU continues its historic mission on its main campus in Las Vegas with centers in Farmington, Santa Fe and Rio Rancho. NMHU has sites in Raton, Roswell, Albuquerque and two sites Española. The School of Education [SOE] does not offer programs at the Roswell and Albuquerque sites.

New Mexico is the fifth largest state by area. The Raton center is 377 highway miles from the Farmington center. The SOE service area extends from the Oklahoma and Texas panhandles west to the four-corners area of Arizona, Utah, Colorado and New Mexico. From the Colorado state line south to the Albuquerque metro area, the SOE serves candidates from the Diné (Navajo) nation and the Pueblos along the Rio Grande. Seventy-six percent of undergraduates originate from New Mexico. NMHU’s candidates reflect northern New Mexico’s Spanish heritage.

The Rio Rancho center is a suburban center near the Albuquerque metro area (population 528,497). However, northern New Mexico is rural. SOE-served centers are in cities with an average population of 38,242 and an average household income of $42,400 ($627 below [NM’s aggregate average](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2492)).

**B. The unit**

**B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?**

The School of Education [SOE] is the professional education unit at New Mexico Highlands University [NMHU]. Besides the main campus, the SOE serves three centers and three sites. Each center director coordinates candidate services with the SOE Dean during NMHU Deans and Directors meetings.

The Dean heads the SOE. During the President’s Cabinet meetings, he communicates with other deans and NMHU directors. With the recent exception of the Rio Rancho [RR] center, center directors are not SOE faculty, nor SOE administrators. They supervise center non-academic operations. They are not involved in academic decisions or advising. Starting August 2011, the [Vice President of Academic Affairs appointed a Rio Rancho Center Director with a co-title of SOE Associate Dean](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540). Since August 2011, there are two SOE associate deans. The main-campus SOE Associate Dean is the NCATE coordinator.

[Since 2009, there are five SOE departments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540)- Special Education (undergraduate/graduate), Teacher Education (undergraduate), Curriculum & Instruction (graduate), Counseling (graduate) and Educational Leadership (graduate). Each elects a department chair. Each department may elect a Faculty Senator. [The Faculty Senate](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/index.aspx) holds general NMHU faculty meetings.

The College of Arts and Sciences [A&S] offers the majors for secondary education candidates. The [SOE A&S faculty liaison](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2493) meets with each[A&S department](#College_Arts_and_Science_Activities_Log) to prepare for accreditation. A&S and the SOE faculty collaborate in an integrated curricular [Learning Community](http://www.nmhu.edu/future/orientation/firstyearexperience.aspx).

**B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit?**

**Table 1**

**Professional Education Faculty (Fall 2010 – Spring 2011)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Professional Education Faculty | Full-time in the unit | Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the unit | Part-time at the Institution & the unit (adjunct faculty) | Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice | Total # of Professional Education Faculty |
| Number of Faculty | 30 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 91 |

**B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach?**

Through Banner, the NMHU Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research [[OIER](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/institutionalresearch/OIERreports.aspx)] generated these Fall 2010 data. NMHU official census counts report Fall enrollment data. Prior to Fall 2011, the official census reports aggregated the Santa Fe center and Española sites into one location “Santa Fe/Española.” Secondary program candidates commit to an A&S major and minor in secondary education. These data represent accepted candidates (n = 335) to the SOE committed to an initial licensure program.

Of the 335 declared candidates, 90.7% pursue Bachelor’s degrees (n = 304) and 9.3% pursue licensure (n = 31). Programmatically, Elementary Education is the largest initial licensure program with 63.3% (n = 212), followed by Early Childhood Multicultural with 20.5% (n = 69), then Special Education with 12.5% (n = 42) and finally, Secondary Education with 3.6% (n = 12).

The largest center is Rio Rancho with 52.2% (n = 175) of the admitted SOE candidates. The main campus (LV) houses 32.5% (n = 109) of the initial licensure candidates, followed by Farmington with 7.7% (n = 26), then Santa Fe/Española with 3.9% (n = 13) and finally, Raton with 3.6% (n = 12) of all declared candidates. During Fall 2011, an unofficial RR center count, revealed that as many as 5% of initial licensure candidates were undeclared.

**Table 2**

**Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status (Fall 2010 census)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Award Level**  **(e.g., Bachelor's**  **or Master's)** | **Number of**  **Candidates**  **Enrolled or**  **Admitted** | **Agency or**  **Association**  **Reviewing**  **Programs (e.g.,**  **State, NAEYC,**  **or Bd. of**  **Regents)** | **Program Report**  **Submitted for**  **National Review**  **(Yes/No)** | **State Approval**  **Status (e.g.,**  **approved or**  **provisional)** | **Status of**  **National**  **Recognition of**  **Programs by**  **NCATE** |
| Early Childhood Multicultural Education [ECME]  Las Vegas | Bachelors  Licensure | 34  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ECME  Rio Rancho | Bachelors  Licensure | 20  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ECME  Farmington | Bachelors  Licensure | 13  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ECME  Santa Fe / Española | Bachelors  Licensure | 1  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ECME  Raton | Bachelors  Licensure | 1  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Elementary Education [ELEM]  Las Vegas | Bachelors  Licensure | 62  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ELEM  Rio Rancho | Bachelors  Licensure | 113  9 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ELEM  Farmington | Bachelors  Licensure | 7  1 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ELEM  Santa Fe / Española | Bachelors  Licensure | 10  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| ELEM  Raton | Bachelors  Licensure | 10  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Special Education [SPED]  Las Vegas | Bachelors  Licensure | 13  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Rio Rancho | Bachelors  Licensure | 13  8 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Farmington | Bachelors  Licensure | 4  1 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Santa Fe / Española | Bachelors  Licensure | 2  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Raton | Bachelors  Licensure | 1  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Secondary Education [SEC]  Las Vegas | Bachelors  Licensure | 0  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SEC  Rio Rancho | Bachelors  Licensure | 0  12 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SEC  Farmington | Bachelors  Licensure | 0  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SEC  Santa Fe / Española | Bachelors  Licensure | 0  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SEC  Raton | Bachelors  Licensure | 0  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |

**B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals?**

Through Banner, the NMHU Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research [[OIER](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/institutionalresearch/OIERreports.aspx)] generated these Fall 2010 data. NMHU official census counts report Fall enrollment data. Prior to Fall 2011, the official census reports aggregated the Santa Fe center and Española sites into one location “Santa Fe/Española.” These data represent accepted candidates (n = 397) to the SOE committed to an advanced and other school professionals licensure program.

Of the 397 declared candidates, 95.7% pursue Master’s degrees (n = 304) and 4.3% pursue licensure (n = 31). Programmatically, Counselor Education is the largest other school professionals licensure program with 37.5% (n = 149), followed by Educational Leadership with 25.9% (n = 103). Curriculum & Instruction is the largest advanced program with 21.7% (n = 86), the Special Education with 14.9% (n = 59).

The largest center is Rio Rancho with 49.9% (n = 198) of the declared advance and other school professionals licensure candidates. The main campus (LV) houses 25.9% (n = 103) of the advance and other school professionals licensure candidates, followed by Santa Fe/Española with 11.8%% (n = 47), then Farmington with 11.3% (n = 45) and finally, Raton with 1.0% (n = 4) of all degree-seeking candidates. During Fall 2011, an unofficial RR center count, revealed that as many as 18.1% of advanced and other school professional licensure candidates were non-degree seeking. These high levels of non-degree seeking data precipitated special attention to the enforcement of Graduate Gateway Alpha, requiring candidates to file a Program of Study after 12 graduate credits were earned.

**Table 3**

**Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status (Fall 2010 census)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Award Level**  **(e.g., Bachelor's**  **or Master's)** | **Number of**  **Candidates**  **Enrolled or**  **Admitted** | **Agency or**  **Association**  **Reviewing**  **Programs (e.g.,**  **State, NAEYC,**  **or Bd. of**  **Regents)** | **Program Report**  **Submitted for**  **National Review**  **(Yes/No)** | **State Approval**  **Status (e.g.,**  **approved or**  **provisional)** | **Status of**  **National**  **Recognition of**  **Programs by**  **NCATE** |
| Counseling [COUN]  Las Vegas | Masters  Licensure | 47  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| COUN  Rio Rancho | Masters  Licensure | 85  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| COUN  Farmington | Masters  Licensure | 13  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| COUN  Santa Fe/ Española | Masters  Licensure | 3  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| COUN  Raton | Masters  Licensure | 1  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Curriculum & Instruction [C&I]  Las Vegas | Masters  Licensure | 22  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| C&I  Rio Rancho | Masters  Licensure | 28  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| C&I  Farmington | Masters  Licensure | 4  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| C&I  Santa Fe/ Española | Masters  Licensure | 30  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Raton | Masters  Licensure | 2  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Educational Leadership [EDLD]  Las Vegas | Masters  Licensure | 16  3 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| EDLD  Rio Rancho | Masters  Licensure | 47  12 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| EDLD  Farmington | Masters  Licensure | 13  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| EDLD  Santa Fe/ Española | Masters  Licensure | 10  2 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| EDLD  Raton | Masters  Licensure | 0  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| Special Education [SPED]  Las Vegas | Masters  Licensure | 15  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Rio Rancho | Masters  Licensure | 26  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Farmington | Masters  Licensure | 15  0 | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Santa Fe/ Española | Masters  Licensure | 2  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |
| SPED  Raton | Masters  Licensure | 1  -- | Board of Regents  NMPED | No | Approved  Approved | Not a SPA  Not a SPA |

**B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?**

[NCATE defines a “distance learning program”](http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/NCATEGlossary/tabid/477/Default.aspx#D) as “a program in which over half of the required courses in the program occur when the learner and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time.” In Fall 2011, the Higher Learning Commission reviewers will visit to [accredit NMHU’s distance education programs](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002417-NMHUSubstan-7112011102431.pdf). According to NCATE’s definition, no SOE programs reach the 50% threshold. The SOE faculty offers many hybrid courses- part face-to-face and part distance education. These courses are not considered purely distance education courses. Only those sections of courses that Banner designates “distance education” are counted in this review. [Reviewing the 7068 SOE courses since Fall 2009, only 568 courses (8.0%) are offered via distance education](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2494). Since Fall 2009, these are the percentages of distance education courses offered:

**B.5 Percentage of Banner-Designated Distance Education Courses by Program**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Percent Distance Education** |
| Counseling | 1.1% |
| Early Childhood Multicultural Education | 42.9% |
| Educational Leadership | 8.0% |
| Elementary Education | 3.1% |
| General Education / Secondary Education | 7.6% |
| Reading Education | 11.7% |
| Special Education | 4.4% |

Only 116 SOE courses of 7068 SOE courses (1.6%) are offered off-campus, away from our centers or main campus. The SOE offers no alternative licensure programs.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

**C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements?**

**the vision and mission of the unit**

**philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit**

**knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit**

**candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards**

**summarized description of the unit's assessment system**

The NMHU Mission statement works in conjunction with and in support of the School of Education [SOE] conceptual framework.  The SOE conceptual framework includes the SOE Vision, Mission, Philosophy and Purpose Statements, and Knowledge Bases. Both the NMHU Mission statement and the SOE conceptual framework originate from the same gestalt. Both promote skill development, advancement of knowledge and practices, professional and personal growth as stated in the NMHU core values and NCA/HLC candidate traits. Both share the goals of providing candidates with ample performance-based opportunities through field placements in enriching [culturally-diverse learning environments](#Table_10).

School of Education Vision Statement

“The NMHU School of Education envisions programs that lead to candidate intellectual transformation and the preparation of thoughtful professional educators and counselors. The School of Education envisions graduates that are ready to engage as reflective practitioners and will be prepared for inclusive and diverse professional environments.”

School of Education Mission Statement

“The NMHU School of Education prepares teachers, counselors, and administrators for diverse and inclusive environments through excellence in teaching, research, and service.” [[Revised 11.4.10](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533)]

Philosophy Statement

“We believe in democratic access to an education, both theoretical and authentic, that allows the reflective learner – who previously developed cultural schemas and pre-existing diverse cognitive processing skills - to construct a knowledge base, practice the skills and develop the professional dispositions in an authentic setting needed to excel in education, administration, counseling or other self-determined endeavors.”

From the [educational themes surveyed](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506) during the [November 2008 faculty retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2507), the SOE philosophy statement developed. Also, it integrates core values of NMHU’s Strategic Planning Committee.

    \* Advancement of knowledge                                 \* Accessible education

    \* Candidate success                                         \* A diversity of ideas, peoples and cultures

    \* Community                                                           \* Individual well being

    \* Sustainable practices

A [professional literature](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2504) corpus supports our philosophy statement. The NMHU philosophy denotes that in our democracy, education should be accessible to all. However, the candidate undergoes an intellectual and professional winnowing process that leads all to change, many to self-determined success and some to leadership (Ellis, 1998; LaFollette, 1953). With the help of educational theorists and practitioners, the learner constructs an expanding knowledge base of best educational practices (Beane and Apple, 1995; Fogarty, 1995). The use of technology not only delivers an expanding knowledge base, but it integrates with new schema to produce new cognition. The new knowledge, skills and professional dispositions integrate with existing cultural schemas through the diverse processes of cognition unique to all individuals (Birden, 2003; Holland and Cole, 1995). The new transformative knowledge bases, educational skills and professional dispositions are best attained and applied in authentic settings for the purposes of teaching / counseling / administering, research, and service (Giroux, 1988; Dockery, 2009).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the School of Education is to provide highly qualified, entry level Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and/or Special Education teachers and other professional personnel such as, educational leaders and counselors, to serve New Mexico and/or national PK-12 school districts. The program is embraced by the following themes: diversity, leadership, culturally inclusive, authentic setting(s), practice, reflective practitioner, professionalism, and knowledgeand steeped in a conceptual framework that fosters democratic access to an education, allowing the reflective practitioner to continue to develop cultural schemas, diverse cognitive processing skills to construct a knowledge base that is entwined ourSchool’s themes.

Institutional Standards

[NMHU has four traits](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001555-NewMexicoH-6292009125843.pdf) all university graduates are expected to attain. The four traits are assessed as learning outcomes. These were established by surveying faculty and staff. The four traits are:

**\* Mastery of content knowledge and skills \* Effective communication skills**

**\* Critical and reflective thinking skills         \* Effective use of technology**

Knowledge Bases:

Theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies

The eight SOE themes, while gleaned from the faculty through a democratic process, each originated from a [substantial research and literary base](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2505).

    \* Diversity                          \* Reflective Practitioner        \* Professionalism

    \* Culturally Inclusive         \* Authentic Settings               \* Leadership

    \* Practice                            \* Knowledge

The purpose of this section of the Conceptual Framework is not intended to be a comprehensive review of each theme, but rather an introduction to the scholastic support of each. The SOE conceptual framework was derived from professors’ understanding of academic literature. The SOE’s Eight Themes -the foundation for the SOE’s Conceptual Framework -align well with the [INTASC Principles](http://cte.jhu.edu/pds/resources/intasc_principles.htm) and [the New Mexico Public Education Department [PED] Competencies](#PED_Competencies_All) for teachers, school counselors and administrators. The PED Competencies are required for licensure in New Mexico. The SOE themes align with the broader NMHU mission statement, NCA/HLC traits and other institutional philosophical statements.

Candidate Proficiencies

The SOE broad goals originate from the SOE’s Eight Themes identified through a faculty survey during the [November 2008 retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2507). They are based in New Mexico Highlands University traditional historic mandates and its modern societal imperatives. Likewise, the [SOE’s Eight Themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2505) also are the origin of the candidate proficiencies in all of our programs, both undergraduate (teacher education) and graduate (teacher education, counseling and educational leadership). The overarching standards for all candidate proficiencies, both undergraduate and graduate, are the [INTASC Principles](http://cte.jhu.edu/pds/resources/intasc_principles.htm). The New Mexico PED developed specific candidacy / licensure standards for:

Teacher Education – The Nine [Teacher Competencies](http://bit.ly/NMPED)

School Counseling – The Eight [School Counselor Competencies](http://www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/nmac/parts/title06/06.063.0006.htm)

Educational Leadership – The Nine [Educational Administration Competencies](http://www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/nmac/parts/title06/06.062.0002.htm)

The SOE’s broad goals are:

1. A pragmatic goal- provide candidates with the excellent educational opportunities to become licensed teachers, counselors and/or administrators in the state of New Mexico.
2. A second pragmatic goal- provide quality academic programs that lead to undergraduate and/or graduate education degrees.
3. Constructivist goal- while candidates engage in reflective thinking, they transform themselves through the professional and academic winnowing process.

These School of Education’s broad goals are achieved through the adherence to the specific [INTASC Principles](http://cte.jhu.edu/pds/resources/intasc_principles.htm) and the narrower, New Mexico PED Competencies for teachers, school counselors and administrators. Our [SOE’s Eight Themes align well with the INTASC Principles and the PED Competencies](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501) for teachers, school counselors and administrators.

In the sets of candidate proficiencies, academic preparation, standard adherence, technology usage, leadership and professional expectations and effective practices and the pursuit of educational excellence in authentic settings are evident. During Fall 2009, SOE faculty adopted [Chalk & Wire](http://www.chalkandwire.com) [C&W] as a platform to create candidate electronic portfolios. C&W tracks candidates’ progress as they address the competencies of the licensure areas. As a self-study process, faculty use C&W data to assess programmatic strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of modification. The transformative learning process does not end at graduation or when licensure is achieved. Even those who may leave our program before graduation or licensure may construct identities that redefine self-determined success.

The SOE faculty and administration assess [dispositions](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) in the Teacher Education program. The SOE faculty and administration have developed disposition inventories and NMHU’s legal counsel has approved them. Dispositions are assessed in departmental-designated courses. [Dispositions correspond to the SOE’s Eight Themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531).

SOE’s Assessment System

[Initial programs](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2502) have [three gateways](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543): 1. Gateway Alpha, Admission to the School of Education;

2. Gateway Beta, Admission to Clinical Practice; and 3. Gateway Gamma, Program Completion.

Advanced programs have [three gateways](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543). Advanced programs require no internship or student teaching because all candidates are licensed teachers. SPED candidates may enter the graduate program without a teaching license. However, they complete the initial license program first and then continue as an advanced candidate. All C&I candidates hold teaching licenses upon acceptance into graduate school. [Curriculum & Instruction and Special Education](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2500) each have three gateways: 1. Gateway Alpha, Admission to the SOE; 2. Gateway Beta, Entry to the Field Project/Thesis track or Entry to the Comprehensive Exam track; and 3. Gateway Gamma, Program Completion.

Other school professional programs have [four gateways](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543) because of a required internship. [Counseling and Educational Leadership](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2503) each have four gateways: 1. Gateway Alpha, Admission to the SOE; 2. Gateway Beta, Entry to Internship; 3. Gateway Gamma, Internship Completion; and 4. Gateway Delta, Program Completion.

**C.3. How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?**

The process of revising the previous conceptual framework started during a [two-day retreat in November 2008](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2507). Faculty from all SOE locations and our stakeholders determined our collective purpose, mission, values and vision. The former conceptual framework needed replacement.

In groups, faculty discussed our candidate population, service area culture, and history. A faculty member used faculty-identified terms to construct a survey, distributed it and reported the results. All faculty members selected the terminology that described the SOE’s culture, candidates, and professional activities. The descriptors that received 50% (10 of 20 faculty votes) became the [SOE’s themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506).

During the [November 2010 data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533), the SOE reviewed the mission statement. The word “administrators” was added to the mission statement with a majority vote. NCATE officials suggested the addition of a SOE purpose statement. In March 2011, an Assessment Team majority approved a faculty’s draft of it.

**STANDARDS**

**STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS**

**1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates.**

**1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs?**

The establishment of the three gateways during the initial teacher licensure program has increased dramatically the percentage of SOE candidates who pass the three New Mexico Teacher Assessment [NMTA] exams. Passing the NMTA Basic Skills exam with a score of 240 is required for SOE admission. To receive a grade for Field Base [FB] 2, candidates must prove that they passed NMTA Content exam. A NMTA Content exam passing score is required before candidates are admitted into FB3 (student teaching). Since 2010, no one is allowed to student teach without a NMTA Content passing score. Overall, according to the [Title II Report 2009 - 2010](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495), of 107 program completers who took the NMTA Content exam, 88% passed. This is well above the 80% required by NCATE. All programs with sufficient cell sizes (n >=10) reported high pass rates (87% - 100%). Early Childhood Multicultural Education [ECME] candidates (n=15) are not required to test with the NMTA Content exam. Therefore, ECME results are reported with the required NMTA Competency exam.

**Table 4**

**Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation**

**For Period: 2009-2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Name of Licensure Test** | **# of Test Takers** | **% Passing State Licensure Test** |
| Overall Pass Rate for the unit (across all programs for the preparation of other  school professionals) | [New Mexico Teacher Assessment](http://www.nmta.nesinc.com/NM12_overview.asp) [NMTA] Content Exam | [107](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) | [88%](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) |
| Elementary Education | NMTA Content Exam - Elementary Education | [57](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) | [89%](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) |
| Special Education | NMTA Content Exam –  Special Education | [18](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) | [100%](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) |
| Early Childhood Multicultural Education | NMTA Competency Exam – Early Childhood | [15](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) | [87%](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495) |

**1a.2. What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?**

Data from key assessments indicate candidates in initial preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards are summarized in Table 1a.2. These data come from several sources including the “TEP / Application to SOE form (hardcopy 2009-2010) – GNED 201 grade, SPED 214 grade, MATH 140 grade, ENG 112 grade, GPA after 24 credits, NMTA Basic Skills passing rate;” “Application to the SOE form (C&W 2010- 2011);” and “Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory” – Item #6 Written communication. Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory uses the rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

Table 1a.2 indicates that the majority of candidates (a range of 62.5% to 100.0% with hardcopy TEP forms) across initial programs demonstrated the content knowledge at admission to the SOE in the required core courses. With the inception of Chalk & Wire SOE admissions in 2010, the rate of demonstrated content knowledge in required core courses will be near 100% (92.8% to 100.0% with C&W forms). The admission process at Undergraduate Gateway Alpha is more rigorous with the C&W admission process. The Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory data indicate a high level of written communication skills (3.69 of 4.00).

With Chalk & Wire, all of the criteria in the course-based rubrics are aligned to PED Competencies with content expectations that are aligned to professional and institutional standards.

[Key Assessment Data for 1a.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1a.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1a.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?**

Data from key assessments that indicate advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards are summarized in [Table 1a.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542). The data in the table are excerpted from the graduate program admission form and the oral exam form. The table shows that nearly all Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] (93.2%) and Special Education [SPED] candidates (96.4%) had an undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0, suggesting that candidates entered these two programs from (primarily) undergraduate teacher training programs where they had performed well. The table indicates that 88.8% of the SPED candidates received a rating of at least 3 [“Proficient”]of 4 on the graduate writing rubric. With the graduate oral exam rating form, C&I and SPED candidates achieved mean ratings of 3.60 and 3.76 (of 4.00), respectively on the item, “Command of subject matter,” and mean ratings of 3.57 and 3.72 on the item, “Knowledge of literature in fields of specialization.” Together, these data indicate that the majority of Special Education and C&I candidates have adequate content preparation and good writing skills upon program entry, and that by the end of their programs they receive high mean ratings on content knowledge as defined by the standards in their specialty areas.

**1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?**

Our most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Survey Item 1 asked alumni of initial programs and employers to rate “Preparation in the major content area.” Of 28 alumni responding to that item, 17.9% rated themselves as “Very Satisfied” and 78.6% were “Satisfied.”

Of the 33 employers who responded to Item 1, 24.2% were “Very Satisfied” and 72.7% were “Satisfied.” The alumni mean rating for this item was 3.14 (of 4 maximum) and the employer mean rating was 3.25. These results indicate that the majority of alumni and employers are satisfied with candidates’ preparation in major content areas.

**1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates.**

**1b.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?**

Multiple assessments triangulate the SOE’s understanding of how initial licensure candidates perform based on the criterion of pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state and institutional standards.

When candidates apply for SOE admission, they are required to state the grade earned in Field Base 1 [FB1]. Through the hardcopy TEP form, used in 2009-2010, of the 110 applicants, 84.6% earned a “Satisfactory” (Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory) grade in FB1 (GNED 251 or ECME 300). With the C&W electronic submission, 100% of the 14 applicants met this requirement. The improved statistic occurred because of better monitoring of Undergraduate Gateway Alpha.

During FB2 and FB3 (student teaching), the Field Base Disposition Inventory, Item #1 “School policies and activities” assess the pedagogy criterion. The 118 candidates assessed in 2010-2011 received a very high mean rating of 3.91 (of 4.00). All initial licensure assessments use the same rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level. The 25 SOE applicants assessed with the Field Base Disposition Inventory, 100% received an aggregate score of three (3) or better.

The Instructional Dispositional Inventory assesses students’ skills in the university classroom. Items #9 Adjusts performance based upon reflection and/or input, #5 Oral communication (e.g. grammar, voice modulation & clarity of delivery) and #3 Preparation assess pedagogy. All initial licensure assessments use the same rating scale. 153 candidates were assessed with these criterion. With Item #9, the mean score was 3.78 (of 4.00). Item #5 registered a mean score of 3.75 and Item #3 reported a mean of 3.66. The three scores exceeded faculty assessors expectations of a “3=Satisfactory.”

While in FB3, university supervisors observe and assess student teaching performance. Of the 110 candidates assessed, 87.2% received a 3.0 (of 4.0) using the common initial licensure scale. Cooperating teacher ratings convey that 97.1% of 104 assessments attained a 3.0 rating or better. The 3.0 rating is the unit’s expectation. These ratings exceed expectations.

Standardized test scores attest the SOE candidates perform well with pedagogical content knowledge. 89% of Elementary candidates (n= 57) earned a 240 score or better on the NMTA Content Exam. With the same exam, 100% of Special Education candidates (n= 18) earned a 240 score better. Early Childhood candidates write the NMTA Competency Exam. Of the 15, 87% scored 240 or better to pass the exam.

All measures indicate that SOE candidates perform well with the pedagogy criteria.

[Key Assessment Data for 1b.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1b.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1b.2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice.**

The SOE graduate administrative assistant surveys all advance-program candidates (n= 33), using the Graduate Student Exit Survey, at the completion of their oral exam. NCATE divides “advance programs” into two categories. Educational Leadership and Counseling candidates are “other school professionals.” Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] and the Special Education [SPED] candidates meet NCATE criteria as “advanced teacher candidates.” The Graduate Student Exit Survey uses the scale: 4=Very satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 2=Dissatisfied and 1=Very dissatisfied.

The SPED and C&I respondents (n=14) self assessment with the descriptor “know…theories related to pedagogy and learning” yielded the mean rating of 3.61 (of 4.00). C&I candidates rated themselves 0.05 higher than SPED respondents.

The SPED and C&I respondents (n=14) self assessment with the descriptor “use a range of instructional strategies and technologies” yielded the mean rating of 3.67 (of 4.00). C&I candidates rated themselves 0.17 higher than SPED respondents.

The SPED and C&I respondents (n=14) self assessment with the descriptor “use a range of instructional strategies and technologies” yielded the mean rating of 3.64 (of 4.00). SPED candidates rated themselves 0.05 higher than C&I respondents.

The SPED and C&I respondents (n=14) self assessment with the descriptor “use a range of instructional strategies and technologies” yielded the mean rating of 3.71 (of 4.00). SPED candidates rated themselves 0.10 higher than C&I respondents.

All advanced graduates indicate with a range of scores (3.61 to 3.71) that they are rate the criterion closer to the “Very satisfied” than the “Satisfied” level. These mean scores exceed the unit expectation of “Satisfied.”

[Key Assessment Data for 1b.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

**1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate?**

Our most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Graduates’ preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills was assessed through items 2 through five of the alumni and employer surveys. Both groups were asked about their level of satisfaction with preparation in four specific pedagogical areas: classroom management skills; curriculum development skills; assessment techniques; and effective teaching skills.

Alumni and employers expressed general satisfaction with all four areas (all means approximately 3 or higher). Of these four areas, alumni rated their preparation in classroom management skills and effective teaching skills relatively highest (both with means of 3.0), while preparation in curriculum development skills and assessment techniques were rated slightly lower (means of 2.93 and 2.96 respectively).

Employers rated their satisfaction with preparation in all four areas higher than the alumni, with preparation in assessment techniques and effective teaching skills receiving the highest mean ratings of the four (3.25 and 3.23 respectively) while satisfaction with preparation in classroom management skills (3.16) and curriculum development skills (3.07) receiving the lowest relative ratings among the four areas.

**1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates.**

**1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning?**

Data from several key assessment sources document candidate professionalism, pedagogical knowledge and skills. The [Instructional Dispositions Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532), administered in designated classes, has several items that assess professionalism. Candidate performance in those items (#1, #2, #4 and #7) is summarized in Table 1c.1. The data show that candidates received mean ratings ranging from 3.53 to 3.84 on the four-point rubric.

A second assessment of professionalism is item #2 (relationship with the cooperating teacher) on the [Field Base Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). Candidates received a mean rating of 3.91 (of four) for that item. The NMTA Teacher Competency Exam (subareas #3 and #4) provides a third assessment of professionalism. Table 1c.1 shows that passing rates on the four sections of those subareas are 71%, 78%, 84% and 40%.

In general, these data suggest that SOE candidates have high mean rating on the disposition inventories. A majority of candidates meet the criteria on the NMTA professionalism subareas. The 40% passing rate on subarea 3 for Early Childhood suggest an area that needs attention.

The instructional dispositions inventory, administered in designated classes, has several items that assess pedagogical knowledge and skills. Candidate performance in those items (#3, #5 and #9) is summarized in Table 1c.1. The data show that candidates received mean ratings in a narrow range from 3.66 to 3.78 on the four-point rubric. A second source, the TEP / Application to the SOE form, indicates that 84.6% of candidates who provided data, earned a grade of “satisfactory” (on a binary scale) during Field Base I. Likewise, from the same source, two disposition inventories have high percentages of candidates who earned a 3.0 (of 4.0) -Instructional dispositions 94.58% and Field Base dispositions 100.00%.

Two Field Base 3 observation forms assess pedagogical skills and knowledge. From the University Supervisor observation form, 87.27% of candidates scored a 3.0 “Satisfactory” or better (of 4.0). From the [Cooperating Teacher observation form](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf), 97.12% of candidates scored a 3.0 or better on the 4.0 rubric.

Cumulatively, these data suggest that candidates achieve high mean ratings on indicators that assess pedagogical knowledge and skills. Chalk & Wire SOE applications will increase the Field Base 1 “satisfactory’ rating to almost 100% due to closer monitoring of Undergraduate Gateway Alpha.

[Key Assessment Data for 1c.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1c.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it?**

Table 1c.2 summarizes data from key assessments that indicate initial candidates of consider school, family, and community contexts and prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching and learning; and can analyze educational research findings. These data are excerpted from the [Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) and the [Field Base Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). The table shows that on the two items related to school, family, and community (Item 2 and Item 10), initial candidates received mean ratings of 3.91 and 3.88 of 4. On the item linked to self-reflection (Item 8), candidates received a mean rating of 3.78. They received a mean rating of 3.91 on Item 1, linked to Philosophies. These means are all relatively high, and reflect assessments taken during the program (pre-service disposition inventory) and at the end of the program during the capstone student teaching semester (field-base disposition inventory).

[Key Assessment Data for 1c.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1c.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession?**

[Table 1c.3 summarizes data from key assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542) that indicate advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of school, family and community contexts; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their practice and the profession. The data in the table come from the Graduate Oral Exam and Graduate Student Exit Survey. Mean ratings on the oral exam item linked to reflection (consistency of thinking) were 3.57 for C&I and 3.79 for Special Education (of 4).

The Graduate Student Exit Survey uses the scale: 4=Very satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 2=Dissatisfied and 1=Very dissatisfied. The item on the Graduate Student Exit Survey linked to school, family, and community (Item #8) had mean ratings of 3.75 for C&I and 4.00 for Special Education. Mean ratings for research and policy (Items 2, 4 and “use of relevant factors in arriving at conclusions”) were also high for both C&I (3.63, 3.63, and 3.60) and Special Education (3.83, 3.58, and 3.79). The unit expects mean score of 3=Satisfied. These scores exceed unit expectations.

**1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate?**

The most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Graduates’ preparation in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills was assessed through items 6 through 8 of the alumni and employer surveys. Respondents were asked about their level of satisfaction in three areas: collaboration with colleagues, collaboration with parents and community members, and ability to work with diverse populations.

Alumni were satisfied with their preparation to collaborate with colleagues (mean rating of 3.07) and their preparation to work with diverse student populations (mean rating of 3.21); they were somewhat less satisfied with their preparation to collaborate with parents and community members (mean rating of 2.72).

Employers were satisfied with candidate preparation in all three areas, with collaboration of colleagues receiving a mean rating of 3.34, collaboration with parents and community members receiving a mean rating of 3.23, and ability to work with diverse student populations receiving a mean rating of 3.25.

**1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates.**

**1d.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn?**

Data from key assessments that indicate candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences are summarized in Table 1d.1. These data come from several sources including the “Instruction, Assessment and Learning Environment” subarea (Subarea 2) of the NMTA Competency exams for Elementary, Secondary, and Early Childhood candidates; subareas 2 ( “Assess Students with Disabilities and Develop Individual Plan”) and 3 (“Promote Development and Learning in Students with Disabilities”)of the NMTA Special Education Content exam; Item 9 of the [Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) (“Adjusts performance based on reflection and/or input”); and Item 9 of the Field Base 3 University Supervisor Observation form (“The teacher demonstrates willingness to implement appropriate modifications/adaptations”).

The table shows that the majority of candidates across initial programs demonstrated an adequate level of preparation (a scale score of 240 or higher) to assess and analyze student learning and to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences. Passing rates ranged from 60% (Early Childhood) to 100% (Special Education), with the Secondary pass rate being 78% and the Elementary pass rate being 81%. In addition, 95% of Special Education candidates met or exceeded the criterion for Subarea 3 on the NMTA Special Education Content exam, which assesses ability to promote development and learning through inclusive instruction. Ideally, 80% or more of the candidates in each program would meet or exceed the 240 criterion, so these data suggest room for improvement in these areas for Early Childhood and Elementary candidates. Candidates received mean ratings of 3.78 and 3.30, exceeding the criterion of 3.0, on the Instructional Disposition Inventory and University Supervisor Observation form items that assess ability to adjust instruction.

[Key Assessment Data for 1d.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1d.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1d.2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning?**

[Table 1d.2 summarizes data from key assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542) that show the degree to which advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an understanding of major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; applying them in practice; analyzing student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning. These data are taken from two sources - the several subareas of the graduate Oral Exam Rating form and Item 4 of the graduate exit survey. Three subareas of the Oral Exam Rating form are used to assess theory and concepts related to assessing student learning (Command of subject matter, Knowledge of literature, and Consistency of thinking). Both Special Education and Curriculum and Instruction candidates achieved mean ratings higher than the criterion three (3) of five(5) in these subareas, with means ranging from 3.57 to 3.79. The subareas “application of subject matter to the solution of problems” and “Use of relevant factors in arriving at conclusions” from the oral rating form were used to assess ability to analyze data and to make data-driven decisions. Both Special Education and Curriculum and Instruction candidates received mean ratings in these areas above the criterion of 3, with ratings ranging from 3.51 to 3.79. The area of Resources was assessed using Item 4 on the Graduate Exit Survey, and candidates from both programs again received ratings above 3 on a four-point scale (mean of 3.63 for Curriculum and Instruction and 3.58 for Special Education).

**1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate?**

Our most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Graduates’ ability to help all students learn was assessed through Item 9 on the alumni and employer surveys.

Over 90% of alumni and employers reported being satisfied or very satisfied with graduates’ ability to help all students learn, with the alumni mean rating for being 3.18 and the employer mean rating being 3.25 (of 4.00).

**1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

**1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs?**

Table 5 summarizes the pass rates of School Counseling and Educational Leadership candidates on the NMTA School Counselor and Educational Administrator subtests. The table shows that 100% of the candidates in both programs met or exceeded the NMTA criterion scale score of 240 on their respective subtests, with School Counseling candidates achieving a mean score of 258.8 and Educational Leadership candidates achieving a mean score of 265.6.

**Table 5**

**Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals**

**For Period: Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Name of Licensure Test** | **# of Test Takers** | **% Passing State Licensure Test** |
| Overall Pass Rate for the unit (across all programs for the preparation of other  school professionals) | NMTA School Counselor | 5 | 100%  240 passing score  258.8 mean NMHU |
|  | NMTA Educational Administrator | 17 | 100%  240 passing score  265.6 mean NMHU |

[Counseling Preparation Comprehensive Exam Scores [CPCE]](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499)

**1e.2. What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?**

Additional data from key assessments that indicate other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards are summarized in [Table 1e.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542). These data come from the Graduate Program Admission form, the [CPCE](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499) exam taken by Counseling candidates, the comprehensive exam taken by Educational Leadership candidates, and the field project and thesis rating forms used for Educational Leadership candidates. Over 90% of candidates in both programs had an undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher, indicating that they had an adequate level of content knowledge upon program entry. In addition, over 95% of the Educational Leadership candidates met or exceeded the criterion writing rubric score of 3.0 (of 4.0) on their writing sample. On the [CPCE](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499) exam, candidates achieved mean scores of 11.85 of 17 on the Human Growth and Development category and 9.00 of 17 on the Social Cultural Foundations category; an acceptable CPCE subcategory mean score is 9 or higher, so both means meet or exceed that score. One hundred percent of Educational Leadership candidates passed the capstone written comprehensive exam (score of 70% or higher) or wrote field project or thesis papers that were rated “Satisfactory.”

[Key Assessment Data for 1e.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1e.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?**

In Spring 2011, we launched our most recent alumni and employer surveys, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. 75 alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the SOE’s initial and advanced programs.

Satisfaction with the knowledge and skills of graduates of other school professional programs was assessed through Items 1 through 9 on the both surveys. Alumni of the two advanced programs expressed a generally high satisfaction level with their knowledge and skills, with the mean ratings for all 9 items being 3.30 or higher. Alumni’s highest levels of satisfaction were in the areas of collaboration with colleagues (mean 3.48), effective counseling or leadership skills (3.47), and ability to work with diverse student populations (3.47). Alumni rated with relatively lower mean ratings, but still well above 3.0, classroom management skills (3.30), collaboration with parents and community members (3.31), and assessment techniques (3.35).

Employer satisfaction was generally high across all nine items. All mean ratings were above 3.0. Employers’ highest satisfaction level was with collaboration with colleagues (3.34), preparation in the major content area (3.25), assessment techniques (3.25), ability to work with diverse populations (3.25), and ability to help all students learn (3.25). Employers rated with relatively lower mean ratings curriculum development skills (3.07) and classroom management skills (3.16).

**1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

**1f.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work?**

Data from multiple measures indicate that other school professional candidates create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental level of students; the diversity of students, families and communities; and the policy within which they work. Eighteen key assessment criteria are offered in the Key Assessment Data section. Against the criteria “Environment and Climate,” Counseling candidates’ ratings (n= 16) are in a range between 2.78 to 3.15 (of 4.00). The mean rating of 2.78 (n= 7) on the CPCE (C4- Group Work) is passing according to CPCE. All seven students passed the CPCE. The other three scores exceed unit expectations of 3.00. Educational Leadership [EDLD] candidates’ mean ratings (n= 129 and n= 14) are in a range between 3.58 and 3.98 (of 4.00). These ratings exceed the unit’s expectations.

Against the “Development” criteria, the two COUN assessments have a mean rating of 2.78 (n= 7) and 3.03 (n= 16). The EDLD assessment (n= 14) mean score is 3.79. These mean scores all meet SOE expectations. Against the “Diversity” criteria, the three COUN assessments (n= 7 and n= 16) have range of mean scores from 2.11 (on the CPCE) to 3.06. Although acceptable, these lower scores represent an area of potential growth for the COUN program. The two EDLD assessment for this criterion range between 3.58 (n= 129) and 3.86 (n= 14). These exceed unit expectations of a mean of 3.00. Finally, against the “Policy” criteria, the two COUN mean scores range from 2.58 (n= 7 CPCE) to 2.90 (n= 16) of 4.00. These scores are acceptable, although slightly lower. The two EDLD assessments mean scores range from 3.58 (n= 129) to 3.86 (n= 14) and meet unit expectations.

In comparison to the statewide PK-12 student demographics, [PK-12 school districts in SOE’s service area](#Table_10) highlight a similar mean percentage of Hispanic students (57%), slightly fewer Caucasian students (25%), more Native-American students (15%), fewer African-American students (1%) and similar percentage of Asian / Pacific Islander students (1%). About 73% of the PK-12 students that we serve receive free and reduce meals; 27% have Special Education designations and 15% are English-Language learners. Therefore, it is imperative that our candidates create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work. Data from key assessments indicate that they do.

[Key Assessment Data for 1f.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1f.1](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate?**

Our most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Graduates’ ability to create positive environments for student learning was assessed by Item 11 on the alumni and employer surveys. Over 90% of the alumni of advanced programs were either very satisfied or satisfied with their preparation to create positive environments for student learning, and the mean rating for this item was one of the highest on the survey (3.51).

Employers also rated this highly, with 27.3% reporting being very satisfied and 69.7% being satisfied with the preparation of NMHU graduates in this area. Item 11 had a mean rating of 3.28 on the employer survey.

**1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates.**

**1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?**

Four different professional dispositions inventories in initial, advance and other school professional programs are use to monitor candidates’ affective progress. NMHU legal counsel approved the content and the use of all dispositional forms. At the initial licensure level, every program uses two different assessments: [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) and [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). At the advanced licensure level, Curriculum & Instruction and Special Education use the Instructional Dispositions form. [Educational Leadership](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2509) [EDLD] and [Counseling](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2508) [COUN], other school professional programs, modified existing dispositional forms.

Unit faculty assesses the dispositions of pre-service candidates at the beginning of their program of study in Introduction to Teaching [GNED 201] and Introduction to Special Education [SPED 214] through the use of the Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory. Professors of record assess the in-class dispositions of candidates. All departments, including the advanced program - Curriculum & Instruction - designated specific “disposition” courses where they administer the Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory.

The second set of dispositions, Field Experience Disposition Inventory assesses candidates in authentic settings of practicum experiences. Candidates are assessed in Field Base 2 and Field Base 3 (student-teaching). Field Base 1 is not assessed with the Field Experience Disposition Inventory because it is observational experience. Professors of record may use a hardcopy of the disposition forms, which is sent either to the Field Base Coordinator in Las Vegas or the Rio Rancho SOE Administrative Assistant, for data entry. During the SOE transition to Chalk & Wire [C&W], also they may enter the data directly onto the C&W system. The hardcopies are eventually sent to the department chairs for inclusion in student files.

[Educational Leadership](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2509), [Counseling](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2508), and Curriculum & Instruction all administer and control the dispositional assessment internally. With the data they receive, department chairs advise students.

Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory and Field Experience Disposition Inventory both use the same rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level. The EDLD Dispositional Inventory uses the rating scale for observed behaviors: 4=All of the time, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely and 1=Not at all. EDLD assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Sometimes” level. The COUN Disposition Inventory uses the rating scale: 4=Distinguished, 3=Proficient, 2= Apprentice and 1=Novice. COUN assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3= Proficient” level.

At all licensure levels, faculty use the disposition results only as cursory evidence of patterns of behaviors. If needed, administrators and department chairs remove students from programs only when larger, pervasive issues are supported by other sets of evidence.

**1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn?**

The [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532), Item #13 requires professors of record to assess the criterion, “Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.” During 2010-2011, based on this criteria, classroom instructors assessed 153 candidates (n=153) with hardcopy inventories. During the same period, 37 candidates were assessed through Chalk & Wire [C&W] inventories. All the initial licensure assessment instruments use the rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

Assessed with the hardcopy inventory, the 153 candidates attained a mean rating of 3.89 (of 4.00). Through C&W, the 37 candidates attained a perfect rating of 4.00 on Item #13. Both mean ratings are near proficient.

The [Counselor [COUN] Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p.9), Item #3 requires professors to assess the criterion, “Acceptance (being able to regard client unconditionally, despite differences in cultural heritage, values, or belief systems. Sixteen (16) candidates were assessed with this inventory. The COUN Disposition Inventory uses the rating scale: 4=Distinguished, 3=Proficient, 2= Apprentice and 1=Novice. COUN assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3= Proficient” level.

The 16 candidates attained a mean rating of 2.93 (of 4.00). This rating is slightly (0.07) below the expected level of proficient performance.

[Key Assessment Data for 1g.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1g.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities?**

Table 1g.3 summarizes data from key assessments that indicate whether candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.1.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues and communities. Data in the table come from the [CPCE](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499) exam and the [Counselor Dispositions Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9). Several CPCE categories provide information regarding demonstration of professional dispositions in working with students (C6 – Appraisal; C4 – Group Work; C5 – Career and Lifestyle Development; and C1 – Human Growth and Development). The mean scores on these four categories range from 1.00 to 11.85 of 17, so all four means exceed the minimally acceptable CPCE category mean of 9. Three areas on the Counselor Dispositions Inventory assess demonstration of professional dispositions in working with students (#1 – Empathy; #2 – Genuineness; and #3 – Acceptance). The three mean ratings in these areas were 3.09, 3.08, and 2.93 (of 4) respectively; the criterion of 3 was met for two of the three areas, while the mean of 2.93 on Acceptance indicates an area for further attention. Two CPCE categories relate to professional dispositions in working with families (C4 – Group Work and C2 – Social Cultural Foundations). The means for those two categories were 11.85 and 9.0, with both means meeting or exceeding the CPCE criterion of 9. One CPCE category (C8 – Professional Orientation and Ethics) and one Counselor Disposition area (#7 – Competence) assess professional dispositions in work with colleagues. The CPCE C8 category mean of 11.00 exceeds the criterion of 9, and the Counselor Disposition mean rating for Area #7 was 2.90, which falls short of the criterion of 3 and suggests an area for further attention. Two CPCE categories provide assessments of professional dispositions related to working with communities (C4 – Group Work and C2 – Social Cultural Foundations); these two means were 11.85 and 9.00 respectively, and both meet or exceed the CPCE minimally acceptable category mean of 9.

[Key Assessment Data for 1g.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 1g.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate?**

The most recent alumni and employer surveys were conducted in Spring 2011, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey initially was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. Seventy-five alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488).The employer survey initially was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379).The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the unit’s initial and advanced programs.

Item 10 on the alumni and employer surveys was designed to assess graduates’ demonstrations of professional dispositions, asking about graduates’ “ability to work successfully in a professional environment,” which is considered to be an overarching dispositional question.

Graduates of both initial and advanced programs expressed generally high levels of satisfaction with their preparation to work successfully in a professional environment, with the mean rating on Item 10 being 3.18 for graduates of initial programs and 3.51 for graduates of advanced programs.

Employers also expressed a high level of satisfaction with graduates’ ability to work successfully in a professional environment, with over 90% indicating they were satisfied or very satisfied with NMHU graduates in this area. Item 10 had a mean rating of 3.28 on the employer survey.

**STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION**

**2a. Assessment System**

**2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?**

The School of Education [SOE] assessment system has as its foundation the [alignment of course outcomes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501) in both initial and advanced level programs with:

1. The unit’s [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and the [SOE themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506);

2. [New Mexico Public Education Department [PED] Competencies for teachers, school](#PED_Competencies_All)

[counselors and administrators;](#PED_Competencies_All)

3. [INTASC Principles](http://cte.jhu.edu/pds/resources/intasc_principles.htm); and

4. [NMHU Institutional Standards](#NMHU_Institutional_Standards).

In addition, some faculty link course outcomes to the standards of professional education organizations.

The SOE collects data from thee triangulated measures: [Key (Gateway) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543), [supplementary (other course-level) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539) and qualitative assessments. Assessment data linked to intended candidate outcomes are collected and aggregated at three levels - individual, program, and unit – and used for two primary purposes: to monitor individual candidate progress through unit programs and, secondly, to provide the basis for decisions about program content and unit operations. The assessment system summarized here is described in greater detail in the [Unit Assessment System](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2544).

*Individual level*. At this foundational level, assessment information is collected for each candidate. Assessment information is generated through several sources. 1. Course-level assessments are used by instructors to evaluate individual candidate performance, to make instructional decisions, to provide course performance feedback to candidates, to determine whether candidates have mastered course outcomes, and to assign course grades. With the syllabus, faculty align course outcomes with the [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework), [New Mexico PED Competencies](#PED_Competencies_All), [NCA/HLC traits](#NMHU_Institutional_Standards), and [INTASC standards](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501). As a result of this alignment, the same course level assessments that determine attainment of course outcomes, also provide information about attainment of these broader outcomes.

2. New Mexico Teacher Assessment [NMTA] is required by the NMPED for New Mexico teaching, counseling, and administrative licenses and endorsements. NMTA subtests (Basic Skills, Content, and Competency) comprise several of the assessments specified at the different gateways in the [Unit Assessment System](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2544).

3. Individual candidate files serve as the source for the variety of other assessments specified in unit gateways including grade point average, grades in designated courses, applicant writing samples, disposition ratings, student teaching and internship ratings, student teaching portfolios, and, at the graduate level, applicant writing samples, letters of reference and scores or ratings of the capstone assessment (field project, thesis, or comprehensive exam).

4. Assessment information is collected through various methods at the individual candidate level. They include exit surveys, course evaluations, alumni and employer surveys.

*Program level*. At the second level of the assessment system, the *program* level, assessments collected at the individual level are aggregated by program. The Assessment Team and program faculty analyze and contextualize programmatic assessment data summaries to monitor candidate performance. Faculty use the data, in part, to make programmatic changes. Annual program reviews of NMTA content passing rates ensure that each program’s curriculum maps address areas identified as relative weaknesses in the NMTA profiles.

*Unit level*. At the third level of the assessment system, the *unit* level, the Assessment Team and program faculty review [gateway performance data](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543) for larger unit changes that affect multiple programs. An example of programmatic changes made at this level occurred in the Fall 2010. A preliminary Rio Rancho census report indicated that 20.4% of potential SOE graduate candidates had not declared a Program of Study [POS]. Graduate policies require that after 12 credits, graduate candidates must complete a POS. Those candidates without POS were sent warning letters. For those who did not comply, an advisement hold prevented further registration until the candidate submitted an approved POS.

**2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6?**

At both the initial and advanced levels, the unit uses assessment [data at key transition points, or gateways](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543), to monitor candidate progress and make decisions. The number of gateways and the assessments vary somewhat between initial and advanced programs, and are summarized in Tables 6a (initial license), 6b (advanced licensure) and 6c (other school professionals).

**Table 6a**

**Unit Assessment System: Transition/Gateway Point Assessments for Initial Programs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gateway Alpha: Admission to School of Education** | **Gateway Beta: Entry to Clinical Practice** | **Gateway Gamma: Exit from Clinical Practice & Program Completion** |
| 1. New Mexico Teacher Assessment (NMTA) Basic Skills Exam score of at least 240;  2. Overall GPA of at least 2.5 (based on a minimum of 24 credit hours);  3. A “C” or better in GNED 201 (Introduction to Teaching), SPED 214 (Introduction to Special Education), GNED 251 (Field Based I) or ECME 300 (Professionalism);  4. A score of at least “3” of “4” on a designated writing assignment in GNED 201 or ECME 300;  5. Dispositions rating of …  6. A “C” or better in ENG 112 (Composition); and  7. A “C” or better in MATH 140 (College Algebra). | 1. NMTA Content Exam score of at least 240;  2. Overall GPA of at least 2.75;  3. Two of three reference letters from unit faculty with a disposition rating of acceptable; and  4. Dispositions mean rating of at least 3 of 4 from Field Based II or a designated class in the major. | 1. NMTA Competency score of at least 240;  2. Field Based III (Student Teaching) [University Supervisor](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) mean rating of at least 3 of 4 by the final (3rd) classroom observation;  3. Field Based III Cooperating Teacher mean rating of at least 3 of 4 by the final (3rd) classroom observation;  4. Dispositions mean rating of at least 3 of 4 in Field Base 3. |

Note: competency score not required

**Table 6b**

**Unit Assessment System: Transition/Gateway Point Assessments for Advanced Programs in Curriculum & Instruction and Special Education**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gateway Alpha: Program Admission** | **Gateway Beta: Eligibility for Thesis, Field Project or Comprehensive Exam** | **Gateway Gamma: Program Completion** |
| 1. Undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0; 2. 2. A writing sample with a rating of at least “3” on a four-point rubric; and 3. Two affirmative letters of recommendation. | For the field project or thesis:  1. Rating of “satisfactory” on the proposal hearing form; and  2. Approval of the NMHU Institutional Review Board [IRB].  For the comprehensive exam option, the key assessment is: 1. Completion of the graduate Program of Study with a GPA of at least 3.0. | 1. End of Program GPA of at least 3.0; 2. Written comprehensive exam score of at least 70% (for comprehensive exam option); 3. Orals mean rating of at least “3” on a five-3point scale; 4. Rating of at least “Satisfactory with revisions” on the thesis and field project clearance form (if that option has been chosen); and 5. Completion of the graduate exit survey. |

**Table 6c**

**Unit Assessment System: Transition/Gateway Point Assessments for Other Sch in Counseling and Educational Leadership**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gateway Alpha: Program Admission** | **Gateway Beta: Entry to Internship** | **Gateway Gamma: Internship Completion** | **Gateway Delta: Program Completion** |
| 1. Undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0;  2. An interview rating of at least 3.0 on a 4.0point scale (Counseling);  3. A letter of goals rated at least 3 on a 4 point scale; and  4. Two affirmative letters of recommendation. | 1. Completion of core course requirements with a GPA of at least 3.0;  2. Professional dispositions rating of at least 3 on a 4 point scale;  3. Completion of practicum with grade of at least “S.” | 1. GPA of at least 3.0; 2. Completion of at least 200 internship hours (Educational Leadership);  3. Professional site supervisor evaluation rating of at least --- of ---; and  4. Professional disposition rating of at least “3” on a 4 point scale. | 1. End of Program GPA of at least 3.0;  2. Orals mean rating of at least “3” on a five-point scale;  3. Written comprehensive exam score of at least 80% (for the Educational Leadership comprehensive exam option);  4. Rating of at least “Satisfactory with revisions” on the thesis and field project clearance form (Educational Leadership, if that option has been chosen);  5. [CPCE score](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499) of at least 70 (Counseling);  6. Professional paper rating of at least “Satisfactory with changes” (Counseling); and  7. Completion of the graduate exit survey. |

**2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?**

The [Unit Assessment System](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2544) is based on a system originally formalized in 2006. The system is based on transition points and associated assessment data being used by the unit to monitor candidate progress. It serves as the basis for unit and program level decisions.

In 2008, the new Dean established an Assessment Team to serve in a faculty advisory capacity. As one of its tasks, the Assessment Team reviewed the existing assessment system and made recommendations to modify it based on NCATE guidelines. A new assessment system was drafted and revised within the Assessment Team. The system was presented to unit faculty during unit-wide meetings for comment. In January 2009, the SOE established a [data assessment policy](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2541). It was amended in August 2009 to formally empower the Assessment Team. Pursuing the SOE’s goal of reaccreditation, a culture of assessment developed.

During the [November 2010 data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533), SOE and Arts and Sciences faculty, representatives from regional school districts, and community members reviewed the assessment system and data. All discussed the implications of the data. The retreat increased awareness of and the unit received the participants regarding unit outcomes and operations.

The Assessment Team, which includes department chairs, meets weekly. Elements of the assessment system are a regular agenda item at the meetings. The Assessment Team is the initial body who discusses and makes recommendations about any issues related to the operation of the assessment system. This system oversees candidate assessment and the improvement of the unit’s operations. Minor adjustments to the assessment system are made by the Assessment Team. Major issues are brought to unit meetings to ensure faculty input.

The Assessment Team first reviews the data summaries generated from the assessment system. Faculty members responsible for summarizing assessment information typically present the information to the Team. The data serve as the basis for dialogue about unit or program operations and content. Data are presented to the faculty through unit, center and/or department faculty meetings. The data generated through the assessment system serve as a basis for decisions that need to be made by faculty at the program or unit levels.

**2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?**

The Assessment Team oversees the procedures used at all levels of the assessment system. For example, the Team has discussed the fairness of requiring at least a “C” in Algebra 140 (College Algebra) as an [Undergraduate Gateway Alpha](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2502) assessment for all Education majors. The Assessment Team reviewed rubrics proposed for assessing graduate writing samples. The team discussed issues of validity- Does the rubric reflect desired writing characteristics? Also, it pondered inter-rater reliability- How many raters should rate each writing sample? Fairness was a prime consideration- What should the graduate application state about the writing sample so that the rubric is fairly applied? Discussions start at the Assessment Team meetings, and continue at department, center and/or unit faculty meetings.

The assessments [four NCA/HLC traits](#NMHU_Institutional_Standards) and the [New Mexico PED licensure competencies](#PED_Competencies_All)- help ensure fairness and accuracy of the inferences (i.e., validity) stated based upon several assessments. These include the [alignment of course-level assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501) and the NMTA exams with intended course outcomes, New Mexico PED licensure competencies, [INTASC Principles](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501), and components of the conceptual framework. Field-base assessments, such as [university supervisor](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) and [cooperating teacher ratings](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) of candidate performance in field settings (student teaching and internships), are aligned with this same set of competencies, standards, and outcomes.

[Multiple assessments at each gateway](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543) and at the course level are used as the basis for any decision about an individual candidate or a program. This focus on several measures reflects the awareness within the unit that any singular assessment can provide misleading information (e.g., an individual candidate may have a bad day). The triangulation of information from these assessments serves as the basis for valid and reliable procedures.

Fair, accurate, consistent, and bias-free course-level assessments measure outcomes. Any instructor may create a C&W assessment. Currently, instructors use 21 C&W rubrics. Instructors log onto C&W and assess candidate submissions. Through the Chalk & Wire [C&W] platform, faculty assess candidates’ submissions with rubrics whose criteria align with NMPED competencies.

**2a.5. What assessment and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?**

The [Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx) reviews undergraduate programs at the institutional level. The Office of Graduate Studies reviews the graduate programs. *The Undergraduate Academic Program Review Manual* and *The* *Graduate Program Review Manual* guide the review process. Generally, programs are reviewed every five years. For academic programs holding accreditation from an external organization, the program reviews coincide with the accreditation process. Program faculty members initiate the review process. After the Dean’s approval, Academic Affairs Committee forms a subcommittee consisting of three members of the committee. The subcommittee members analyze the report and provide feedback to the program faculty. The faculty members consult with the Dean. Together, they draft a revision and discuss it with the subcommittee members. The Academic Affairs Committee sends the review, with their comments and any recommendations, to the Vice President of Academic Affairs [VPAA]. Graduate Academic Program Review follows a similar process, but is overseen by the Office of Graduate Studies.

Stakeholders recognize programmatic successes and challenges for the program. They discuss future plans. During subsequent program reviews, each program discusses how they responded to the feedback from the prior review. In addition, the VPAA may initiate a program review independent of the regular five-year review cycle, when the VPAA cites programmatic concerns.

Internally, the SOE faculty and administration use [initial](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2502), [advanced](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2500) and [other school professionals’ gateway assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2503) to improve candidate preparation. Gateways require multiple measures of candidate progress. The Assessment Team, the community-based Advisory Council, center and department faculty review the [gateway assessment data](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543).

Besides these gateway assessments, the unit uses enrollment data, budget projections, course evaluations, and alumni and employer surveys as the basis for program management and improvement. The unit files several required reports annually (e.g. PEDS, [Title II](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495), EARS).

Candidate exit surveys ask about systems operations. The Assessment Team reviews these data and recommends system improvements based on survey results. For example, to improve advising and student-support services, the administration recently reorganized the Rio Rancho staff.

**2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

**2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?**

**How are the data collected?**

The SOE collects data from thee triangulated measures: [Key (Gateway) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543), [supplementary (other course-level) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539) and qualitative assessments. Candidates formally apply for a gateway summative review. The submission of a candidate application (e.g. SOE admission application) initiates a gateway review. If the requirements are not met, the candidate may not proceed to the next gateway. The gateways represent a formal review at the start, mid-point and end of a candidate’s progression. Supplementary assessments include course-based assessments that align to PED Competencies. Supplementary assessments are formative in nature and originate at the course level. Departments determine the courses where required supplementary assessments occur. However, individual instructors may choose to include additional supplementary assessments. Qualitative assessments may include informal assessments such as student complaints or a candidate’s programmatic recommendations during an oral defense. Generally, qualitative assessments occur more organically.

The SOE data collection is in transition between paper-based and electronic data systems. The initial licensure gateway assessment system exemplifies the transition. To more efficiently manage data, the unit is converting to Chalk & Wire [C&W], an online assessment system that creates a relational data to store individual candidate data. Since Fall 2010, all initial program applicants use C&W for SOE admission ([Undergraduate Gateway Alpha](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2502)). However, candidates scan and attach digitized paper documents, such as transcripts, to their C&W SOE admission application. Once the Associate Dean approves the C&W SOE application electronically, an administrative assistant prints all pertinent admission documents and creates a redundant paper admission folder. The Assessment Team specifically requested this redundancy.

Faculty collect other data for initial programs. Disposition forms are collected either through C&W or with a hardcopy. The Associate Dean reports C&W data. The Assessment Coordinator analyzes and reports hardcopy assessment data. Administrative assistants at all SOE sites digitized the paper files prior to 2011. In the future, C&W data may integrate with candidate data stored in the NMHU’s Banner data management system. Undergraduate Gateway Beta and Gamma, all the advanced and other-professional gateways have yet to be converted into the C&W system. They are paper-based reviews. Alumni and employer survey data regarding program quality have been most recently collected using [Survey Monkey](http://www.surveymonkey.com/). Surveys were sent to program completers from the last five years and employers in central and northern New Mexico.

The C&W system collects, compiles, aggregates, and disaggregates the data from supplementary assessments. Candidates upload assignments onto C&W. Faculty assess candidates’ submissions with rubrics whose criteria align with NMPED competencies. C&W Reporter provides data for each NMPED competency. C&W Reports generates departmental reports shared with department chairs. Faculty analyze data to monitor candidate growth and ascertain programmatic impacts.

The Assessment Coordinator keeps a master calendar for all required reports and assessments. Upon request, faculty may access the master calendar. The Assessment Coordinator constructs the calendar from previous years’ deadlines. The Associate Dean keeps a NCATE calendar. The Associate Dean sent a link via Outlook Express to the Assessment Team members for open access to the NCATE calendar. The Associate Dean designs the calendar from timelines provided on the NCATE website and he informs the Assessment Team of pending NCATE deadlines.

**From whom are data collected?**

Data are collected from applicants to initial and advanced unit programs, candidates who are enrolled in the programs, unit faculty, cooperating teachers and internship supervisors, alumni, and employers.

**How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**

Assessments are summarized and analyzed throughout the year. They are shared with unit faculty at several strategic times during the year. At the start of the Fall and Spring semesters, data from the previous school year or semester are shared with faculty and used as the basis for dialogue about unit and program strengths and potential areas for improvement. Then, throughout the year, as data are collected, analyzed, and summarized in reports, results are presented at faculty unit meetings. Typically, these data are previously shared with the Assessment Team. The team discusses issues such as which data are most important to share with the whole faculty or how to clarify data summaries. A primary intent in the assessment data summary is to use the data for program management and planning. In [November 2010, a day-long data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533), selected data were presented to SOE and Arts & Sciences faculty, and representatives of area public schools. Faculty members were assigned the responsibility of data analysis.

**Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data?**

The [Unit Assessment System](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2544) data management is a collective responsibility of the Dean, Las Vegas Associate Dean, and the SOE Assessment Team. They are assisted in data collection and summary activities by department chairs, unit secretaries, graduate assistants, and work study students. Responsibility for data summary, analysis and reporting is assigned by the Dean and Associate Dean, and those two individuals and faculty members who are members of the Assessment Team take the lead for different data sets and reports. For example, the Student Teaching Coordinator maintains the part of the database in which student teaching data and NMTA scores are stored. The coordinator regularly creates and presents reports summarizing those data. The Dean and Associate Dean typically take the lead on summarizing data for the reports that are required annually (e.g., [Title II](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495),, PEDS, EARS). A faculty member on the Assessment Team has the responsibility for alumni and employer surveys. Another member of the Assessment Team oversees Chalk &Wire data. This member has the lead role in rubric development, and, with a third member of the Assessment Team, summarizes C&W data.

**In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed?**

Data are summarized and analyzed in reports that contain tables, charts and/or graphs along with supporting narrative prepared by the individual with lead responsibility for a particular data set. Selected tables, charts and graphs are presented at Assessment Team meetings and to the unit by the faculty member who prepared them. Full reports of the data analysis are e-mailed to faculty.

**What information technologies are used to maintain the unit’s assessment system?**

Assessment data are stored and managed using a combination of C&W, Banner, Excel files and paper files. Candidate transcripts, used by faculty for advising and to track the progress of individual candidates, are stored and accessed through the university’s Banner system. As noted above, the unit is currently in the process of implementing C&W over a two-year timeframe. Since Fall 2010, data from applicants for initial programs and subsequent data collected from them after SOE admission is entered into C&W. Data formerly stored primarily in paper and Excel files and maintained by office staff are being transferred to C&W. Ultimately, all data for applicants and candidates in all programs that is not Banner-based will be stored in C&W.

**2b.2 How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?**

The SOE relies on two data-collection systems. The primary data-collection system requires hardcopy assessments that are sent to the Field Experiences Coordinator in Las Vegas, who serves an additional role of Assessment Coordinator. At the Rio Rancho center, the SOE Administrative Assistant receives hardcopy data – especially dispositional data – from instructors. In collaboration with the Assessment Coordinator, she prepares data spreadsheets. When finished, the Administrative Assistant sends spreadsheets electronically and the hardcopy instruments are delivered to the Assessment Coordinator in Las Vegas. Also, the Rio Rancho SOE Administrative Assistant prepares data reports, such as center census counts for the Associate Dean and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Assessment Coordinator receives all other hardcopy instruments from other centers, sites and the main campus. At the direction of the Assessment Team or the main-campus Associate Dean, he prepares written data reports. The Assessment Coordinator encodes the variables from observation rating scales. Data are disaggregated for each academic program, center and, most recently by gender. When requested, longitudinal comparisons are reported.

Outside assessors, like Pearson, report other data, such as New Mexico Teacher Assessment [NMTA] scores, to the Assessment Coordinator. The results are reported to the unit by program, but not by site. Therefore, the variables in outside data reports limit the quantity of disaggregated variables. NMTA scores are not reported by sites due to these limitations.

The Assessment Coordinator presents the data, without commentary, to the Assessment Team and, at times, during SOE faculty meetings. The Assessment Team comment and contextualize the data presented. In turn, participants at department meetings and center meetings review the reports, analyze the data specific to their situation and suggest possible programmatic modifications.

The SOE is transitioning to a secondary data-collection system through Chalk & Wire [C&W]. As familiarity increases, instructors and candidates gradually implement C&W in course assessments and collecting dispositions. Currently, the SOE uses C&W data to assess [NM Public Education Department](#PED_Competencies_All) competencies through the metric of course rubric criterion. C&W Reporter, the system’s assessment analysis tool, shows great promise. However, prior to this summer, the cell sizes of C&W data were small. The Associate Dean attended a C&W conference in Summer 2011 to learn how to use C&W Reporter. His level of familiarity has not reached the level of site-data disaggregation, although the assessment tool has this capability, even retroactively.

The SOE offers no alternate route programs or distance learning programs. Disaggregated data includes the Raton site, which is the only site where there is a majority of distance education sections. However, frequently the Raton data cell sizes are lower than 10 candidates, so data are not analyzed.

**2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?**

Two types of candidate complaints are recorded and processed for potential academic program adjustments or improvements: 1) candidate grade appeals, and 2) candidate complaints about instructors, staff members or agents of the University. Each is handled according to University guidelines outlined in [*The NMHU Student Handbook*](http://www.nmhu.edu/Currentstudents/studenthandbook.aspx) and protocols that respect both candidate and faculty rights.

Candidate grade appeals are handled and recorded in the following manner:

* Candidate meets with faculty member in an effort to resolve the conflict about a grade
* If conflict is not resolved, candidate may complete a grade appeal form
* Instructor then may respond to written appeal
* Department chair or dean then may meet with one or both, depending on availability and their willingness to meet
* Department chair or dean submits written recommendation to the [Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx) for their review and decision
* Candidate can appeal that decision once in a formal hearing with the Sub-Committee
* The Committee’s decision after that step is then final
* University, Department or dean can then analyze the final decision in terms of any needed changes to grading practices
* The Dean’s Office and the University maintain files on these appeals

The processes for handling candidate complaints about academic practices, instructors, staff members or agents of the University are outlined in [*The NMHU Student Handbook*](http://www.nmhu.edu/Currentstudents/studenthandbook.aspx). The Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, with candidate representation, regularly reviews University policies and practices. Candidates also have the right to file petitions, appeals and complaints regarding University policies and practices.

**2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

**2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?**

The SOE collects data from thee triangulated measures: [Key (Gateway) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543), [supplementary (other course-level) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539) and qualitative assessments. While the Assessment Team reviews data from all three measures, key gateway assessment data receives the majority of its attention. Supplementary (course-level) assessments receive the department chairs’ attention. All faculty, department chairs and administrators note qualitative data and share them accordingly.

Assessment data are collected, summarized, and presented to faculty throughout the year to serve as the basis for decision-making. Data summaries are typically first reviewed by members of the Assessment Team for clarity and provide input as to data that are most important to highlight for the full faculty at unit meetings. Twice each year, at the beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters, data from the previous year or semester are presented at unit faculty meetings to assist in planning and setting priorities for the semester. Data discussions in Assessment Team or unit-wide faculty meetings often continue in department or center meetings. Data-based program refinements may be initiated during meetings of the Assessment Team, the whole unit, or in department meetings.

[Key (Gateway) Data](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543)

The SOE Advisory Council meets each semester to review policies and key assessment data. Members include faculty members from other NMHU colleges, the Northeast Regional Educational Cooperative [[NREC](http://www.rec4.com/)] director and district superintendents. They advise the SOE Dean about possible programmatic improvements.

In November 2010, the unit convened a [data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533) involving unit faculty, Arts & Sciences faculty, and representatives of regional public schools to review key assessment data, write comments and discuss implications for program refinement. Advisory Council members participated in the data retreated.

The email-based Summer Data Discussions presented key and supplementary data reports to all summer-employed faculty for comment. The Summer Data Discussions provided the Assessment Team with agenda items for consideration in Fall 2011. Likewise, the August 2011 data retreat reunited adjunct and full-time faculty members who reviewed the *Institutional Report*.

Supplementary (Course-level) Data

Each semester, with the Knowledge of the Profession class, cooperating teachers discuss the SOE [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and clinical experiences. At the Rio Rancho center, cooperating teachers shared feedback about the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). Information suggested that candidates, despite two field-based experiences prior to the FB3 student teaching semester, were not wholly prepared to enter pre-service teaching. The SOE report card completed by candidates at the end of their program further revealed a need for further field experiences prior to student teaching. To address this, the Department of Teacher Education [increased the number](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2510) of hours for both Field Base 1 [FB1] (28 to 30 hours) and FB2 (42 to 60 hours). At Rio Rancho, the SOE eliminated eight-week option for FB1 and FB2. Candidates enroll in all FB courses for a 16-week full semester.

SOE faculty collaborates with other NMHU academic units. Starting Spring 2011, the Dean appointed a [SOE A&S faculty liaison](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2493) [A&S] departments. The liaison meets with A&S department chairs and faculty to prepare for the NCATE accreditation process. The liaison informs content-area departments of unit requirements. Through written reports, she describes A&S departmental concerns and considerations to the Associate Dean and the Assessment Team. The liaison prepares the secondary accreditation portfolios for the Board of Examiners review.

Qualitative Data

In 2009, the Special Education program changed after program faculty analyzed NMPED requirements, candidate feedback, and current program trends. One change was to emphasize the use of “person first” language.

Responding to [NM House Joint Memorial Bill 16](http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/11%20Regular/LESCAnalysis/HB0074.pdf) (2010), the Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] Reading faculty reanalyzed its program. The faculty analyzed the C&I Reading program and the NM Legislative Education Study Committee’s [LESC] definition of “the science of reading.” In Spring 2011, they met with other NM Reading faculty and administrators at the NMHU Rio Rancho center. They concluded that the Reading courses reflect the National Reading Panel’s current literacy research and exceeds LESC’s “the science of reading” precepts. The statewide faculty formed a committee to solicit future feedback from practicing teachers.

During 2008-2009, principals were evaluated with a new system, the New Mexico Highly Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation for Principals and Assistant Principals [[HOUSSE-P](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/new-mexico.pdf)]. In 2010, the Educational Administration [EDLD] faculty redesigned and [realigned its course to match HOUSSE-P](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2514). However, five HOUSSE-P standards – although widely used – were never legislatively codified as expected. Therefore, this year, the EDLD program reverted to the original nine [Educational Administration Competencies](http://www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/nmac/parts/title06/06.066.0002.htm).

**2c.2  What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?**

Since Fall 2009, the SOE has documented 93 programmatic changes and 52 data discussions. A dozen of the most significant data-driven changes are listed in [Key Assessment Data for 2c.2](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542). The University Studies degree existed prior to Fall 2010.  However, in Fall 2010 and into Spring 2011, SOE and A&S discussed how to implement the University Studies degree to help students who could not finish the SOE licensure program because of inabilities to pass through the initial licensure gateways.

**2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?**

Faculty access to the assessment data systems depends on rank, responsibility and purpose. The [Assessment Team creates and regulates the policies reflected in the assessment system](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2541). Senior faculty, department chairs, the Chalk & Wire [C&W] coordinator, NCATE coordinator, an adjunct faculty representative and SOE administrators constitute the Assessment Team. The regular Wednesday agenda items comprise assessment system policies and data. The Assessment Team initially reviews the assessment system. The members advise the C&W coordinator. The Assessment Team makes minor assessment system adjustments. For greater faculty involvement, general SOE faculty meetings address major assessment policy issues. Pursuing the SOE’s goal of reaccreditation, a culture of assessment developed.

Assessment data collection and access are more universal. Departments designated specific courses to assess candidates’ dispositions. These course instructors either use C&W or a hardcopy inventory to report dispositions. Any instructor may create a C&W assessment. Currently, instructors use 21 C&W rubrics. Instructors log onto C&W and assess candidate submissions. Once the assessment is complete, C&W automatically emails the result to the candidate. Candidates may log onto their C&W account and view assessment results.

The Assessment Coordinator prepares reports of the hardcopy assessments. The reports eventually reach most interested faculty through different levels of meetings. Likewise, the main-campus Associate Dean shares C&W aggregate data linked to NMPED standards with the Assessment Team.

The NCATE C&W Evidence Room stores 3000 plus digitized documents. Assessment Team members, faculty with assessment responsibilities, and *Institutional Report* committees may access all documents, including assessment reports and data.

Advisors use other data systems. Key faculty have enhanced access to Banner to obtain data needed for the annual SOE reports. NMHU is implementing [Degree Works](http://www.sungardhe.com/Solutions/DegreeWorks/), a universal-access online advising program that will integrate with the Banner system.

**2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?**

The SOE relies on two data-collection systems. The primary data-collection system requires hardcopy assessments that are sent to the Assessment Coordinator in Las Vegas. The Assessment Coordinator collects and organizes data, and prepares reports. He reports to the Assessment Team and, sometimes, at general SOE faculty meetings. Through department and center meetings, his reports are disseminated and discussed. The email-based Summer Data Discussions presented data reports to all summer-employed faculty for comment.

The SOE is transitioning to a secondary data-collection system through Chalk & Wire [C&W]. Instructors are implementing C&W in course and dispositional assessments. Faculty assess designated C&W submissions tied to [NMPED competencies](#PED_Competencies_All). C&W Reporter, the system’s assessment analysis tool, shows great promise. All department chairs are C&W sub-administers. Their status allows departments chairs to use C&W Reporter and construct their own data reports. However, prior to this summer, the cell sizes of C&W data were small. Even now, some departments have few data assessments. Teaching department chairs how to use C&W Reporter is a future goal. Until then, the main-campus Associate Dean disseminates C&W electronic reports to department chairs for their use.

The SOE Advisory Council meets each semester to review policies and data. Members include faculty members from other NMHU colleges, the Northeast Regional Educational Cooperative [[NREC](http://www.rec4.com/)] director and district superintendents. Advisory Council members participated in a November 2010 full-day [data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533). Faculty, the SOE Advisory Council and community stakeholders shared data and wrote comments.

Candidates use C&W to receive individual assessment data. They submit a C&W assessment to a specific instructor. Once completed, C&W automatically emails the result to the candidate’s NMHU account. Candidates log onto their C&W account and view assessment results.

**Optional**

1. **What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?**

The unit-wide adoption of [Chalk & Wire](http://www.chalkandwire.com) [C&W] is a particularly important transformation for the SOE. During Fall 2009, SOE faculty adopted C&W as a platform to create candidate electronic portfolios. C&W collects data as they address the competencies of the licensure areas. As a self-study process, faculty use C&W data to assess programmatic strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of modification.

The transformation to C&W takes time. User data seem to indicate, in its second year of implementation, faculty and candidates increasingly feel more comfortable with the technology. In December 2010, Associate Dean received the first C&W SOE admission application. Nine months later, 78 candidates submitted their C&W SOE admission applications. Currently, 21 instructor-created rubrics are used. These contain 156 assessment criteria each linked to NMPED Competencies. There are 2912 total data points. While there are still some “late adopters,” more accept its implementation and perceive its potential.

The NCATE C&W Evidence Room stores 3000 plus digitized documents. The documents are categorized according to NCATE standards into subfolders. Any faculty may access all documents, including assessment reports and data. With a searchable database, the digital archive increasingly serves the need for instant document retrieval.

C&W Reporter, the system’s assessment analysis tool, shows great promise. All department chairs may use C&W Reporter and construct their own data reports. However, prior to this summer, the cell sizes of C&W data were small. Teaching department chairs how to use C&W Reporter is a future goal. Until then, the Associate Dean disseminates C&W electronic reports to department chairs for their use.

The advantage of electronic portfolios and collection of evaluated student work for comparisons on a variety of levels systematizes what was once almost impossible to do. With the growth of our programs and our multiple sites, C&W will become an invaluable tool.

1. **What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

During Fall 2010, in the directed-study course, Analyzing Qualitative Literacy Research (RDED 435/535), six graduate candidates and one undergraduate candidate analyzed writing samples submitted during the previous three years. Kara Moloney Ph.D., the professor of record, pulled the writing samples from graduate candidate files at the Las Vegas campus. The NMHU graduate application requires a 100-word Statement of Educational Goals. Graduate applicants submitted the writing samples to satisfy, in part, a Graduate Gateway Alpha admissions requirement. This pilot study responded to a *NCATE Preconditions Report* requirement that SOE faculty rate graduate admissions essays.

Prior to the course, Dr. Moloney introduced a rubric that she developed to help students with writing academic essays. At the Assessment Team meeting, discussion varied about the expectations of students’ writing skills. Some expressed that at a mastery level, a student should spell correctly without mechanical or academic writing errors. The application suggests only a very generic writing requirement. The Assessment Team approved a pilot assessment instrument. Candidates used the pilot rubric to assess applicant writing samples. They noted the types of writing issues and mechanical issues, such as spelling, syntax, and punctuation.

Upon completion, the Assessment Team received [a report.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2529) Using the pilot rubric, very few of the writing samples examined would have met the Gateway Alpha requirement of scoring a 3 or better on a 4-point rubric. The guidelines for the writing sample included only a length-requirement, and did not specify the need to submit academic writing.

As a result of this study, departments adopted their own rubrics to assess graduate applicant writing. Now, the Graduate Application conveys more explicit writing guidelines. The results lead to a better structure of graduate admission essays and recommended rubrics that are now used for graduate program admission.

**STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE**

**3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

**3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?**

The unit maintains a variety of partnerships in the design, delivery, and evaluation of its field and clinical experiences. The unit is indebted to the public and private schools and the agencies across New Mexico that provide the laboratory for this most important phase of our programs.

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The unit’s partners include public and private schools in the Northern New Mexico region and Albuquerque. Some school districts maintain a high degree of interaction and involvement with the overall teacher training program. Furthermore, there is the professional development model that portrays a high level of involvement in the form of a schools-SOE collaborative partnership. The PDS model is explained. [For more details refer to 3a.1.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2534)

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Advanced programs for school professionals collaborate with schools and community organizations or specialized clinics in the design, delivery and evaluation of internships for candidates. Partners include public schools and health professionals in agencies, universities, hospitals, schools, VA centers, private practices, and correctional facilities. These are examples of the diverse settings available to candidates for field/clinical experience. [For more details refer to 3a.1.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2534)

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

There are no academic programs in the unit that meet NCATE’s definition of distance education. [For more details refer to 3a.1.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2534)

**3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The unit’s partners contributed to the design, delivery and evaluation of field and clinical practice in numerous ways. Each semester, with the Knowledge of the Profession class, cooperating teachers discuss the SOE [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and clinical experiences. Likewise, the respective center field experiences coordinator visits and informs cooperating teachers about their role and responsibilities. [Cooperating teachers evaluate candidates monthly](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2). Also, they provide formative daily assessments of the student teachers concerning their teaching performance. The field experiences coordinator reviews the monthly evaluations and addresses any needs identified.

At the Rio Rancho center, cooperating teachers shared feedback about the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531) .Information suggested that candidates, despite two field-based experiences prior to the FB3 student teaching semester, were not wholly prepared to enter pre-service teaching. The SOE report card completed by candidates at the end of their program further revealed a need for further field experiences prior to student teaching. To address this, the Department of Teacher Education [increased the number](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2510) of hours for both Field Base 1 [FB1] (28 to 30 hours) and FB2 (42 to 60 hours). At Rio Rancho, the SOE eliminated eight-week option for FB1 and FB2. Candidates enroll in all FB courses for a 16-week full semester.

At the Rio Rancho center, in Spring 2011, the unit’s C&I Reading faculty met other New Mexico institutions’ reading faculty and administrators. Collaboratively, they plan to revise comprehensive reading instruction programs. The statewide faculty formed a committee to solicit future feedback from practicing teachers.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Matching educational leadership and counseling candidates with supervisors and internship sites requires open communication between the unit and sites. This communication engenders modifications to academic coursework to more accurately reflect the current expectations for school administrators and counselors. For example, the current trend in school counseling is for candidates to follow the American School Counselor Association’s [[ASCA] National Model](http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/). This transition requires direct communication with current on-site supervisors who were trained in a previous model. Veteran school counselors’ expertise is essential to accommodate candidates’ existing schema into the ASCA model. Counseling site supervisors provide internship candidates’ midterm and final evaluations. During the semester, the faculty internship supervisor visits the site. Consulting with the site supervisor, they comprehensively assess the positive aspects and deficits of the counseling program.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Feedback regarding program needs and issues is communicated to the Raton site faculty or directly to the Las Vegas campus faculty.

**3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, pre-service teaching, and internships?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Through carefully structured field-based experiences, teacher candidates, faculty, and PK-12 partners engage in one of the primary purposes of the [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) “practice the skills and develop professional dispositions in authentic settings”.

For pre-service teaching, the placement process is completely collaborative. Candidates request three possible placements for student teaching. The Coordinator of Field Services and each teaching discipline’s program committee review the applications for approval. Approval is granted upon meeting the criteria established for pre-service teaching. The Coordinator of Field Services reviews the requests to determine classroom assignments with consideration of grade levels, subject areas, teacher credentials, diversity issues, schools needs, the needs of teacher candidates, and any special circumstances. A call is then placed to the school district and the placement is discussed and finalized.

Placements in all field and methods clinical experiences are made collaboratively with school administrators and faculty. NMHU faculty meet with PK-12 faculty to explain the expectations, discuss evaluation procedures, and answer questions. The cooperating teacher agreement defines the responsibilities, procedures, and assessment of the internship experience. These agreements are outlined in [*The Student Teaching Field Manual*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf). For more details, refer to [3a.3 Field Partners Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2511)

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Educational Leadership candidates

Arrangements for internships are established by an application signed by the site mentor, the candidate, and the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership. Internship sites are distributed throughout the state in (most often in the home district and school of a candidate), thus participation of individual schools or districts varies widely from semester to semester. Roles of university supervisors, interns, and site mentors (administrators) are clearly specified in the [*NMHU Educational Internship Manual*](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535). The manual defines the responsibilities, procedures, and assessment of the internship experience.

Counseling candidates

For counseling candidates, formal agreements are maintained with schools and agencies hosting interns, and the roles of the supervisors, interns, and building administrators are clearly identified in those agreements. The supervisor agreement defines the responsibilities, procedures, and assessment of the internship experience. These agreements, and the Counseling Program Student Handbook are viewed as developing documents and are reviewed annually. Input from on-site supervisors is solicited and considered when making updates. These agreements are outlined in [*The Counseling Program Student Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf). [For more details, refer to 3a.3 Field Partners Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2511)

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

[For details refer to 3a.3 Field Partners Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2511)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 3a.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The candidate contacts the cooperating teacher or mentor, meets school officials, visits the assigned classroom and plans the pre-service teaching experience. Cooperating teachers and mentors share class schedules, school regulations, materials, student population and content to be taught.

Sharing expertise and resources is primarily through the university supervisor who meets with the cooperating teacher and candidate. If needed, the Field Experiences Coordinators also provide services. Feedback is shared between [university supervisor](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536), [cooperating teacher](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2) and candidate through evaluation forms which serve as formative feedback. Pre-service candidates prepare a portfolio related to [Teacher Competencies](#PED_Competencies_All) in collaboration with the cooperating teacher which is then assessed by the university supervisor. Likewise, all student teachers are required to take the Knowledge of the Professioncourse concurrent with their student teaching. The course is extremely resourceful in providing an integration of knowledge and discussion of the teaching profession.

The unit houses the Northeastern NM State Curriculum Library, the only comprehensive curriculum collection in northeastern NM. Candidates can see and use classroom material and it is a resource for school district teaching teams to view state curriculums.

Cooperating teachers may choose one of three options including taking a course in student teacher supervision**.** For more details refer to [3a.4 Partner Support Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2512)

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Meetings of the intern, site mentor and university supervisor give the university supervisor opportunity to share expertise and answer questions. University supervisors provide resources, current research and additional support.

Counseling

Counseling interns become part of the school/agency team where they are assigned. They are to perform, under supervision, any and all duties that their supervisor deems them qualified. The site provides opportunity for a variety of supervised counseling activities. The candidate is provided with adequate work space, telephone, office supplies and staff to conduct professional activities. During the semester, the site supervisor and university supervisor meet to discuss the intern’s progress.

(3) Off-Campus/Distance Learning

[For more details refer to 3a.4 Partner Support Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2512)

**3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

**3b.1.What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Initial Programs

Gateway Beta (Admission to Clinical Practice). Admission to clinical practice requires candidates to file a formal application prior to midterm of the preceding semester. The following minimums must be met: 1. NMTA content score of at least 240; 2. Overall GPA of at least 2.75; 3. Two focused reference letters from unit faculty with evidence of appropriate dispositions; and 4. Evidence of appropriate dispositions from Field Base 2 or a designated class in the major.

Gateway Gamma (Program Completion). Key assessments and criteria used to determine whether a candidate becomes a program completer are: 1. NMTA Competency score of at least 240; 2. Field Base 3 (pre-service teaching) [university supervisor](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) rating of at least 3.0 by the final classroom observation; 3. Field Base 3 Cooperating Teaching rating of at least 3.0 by the final classroom observation; 4. Dispositions rating of at least 3.0 in Field Base 3.

All the initial licensure assessment instruments use the rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

Advanced Programs

Gateway Beta (Eligibility for Thesis, Field Project or Comprehensive Exam). Key assessments used to determine eligibility for the level capstone experience - which may be either a thesis, a field project, or a written comprehensive exam, all three of which are followed by an oral exam. The assessments and criteria for the thesis and field project options are: 1. Rating of “satisfactory” on proposal hearing form; and 2. Approval of the NMHU Institutional Review Board [IRB]. For the comprehensive exam option, key assessment is: Completion of the graduate Program of Study with a GPA of at least 3.0.

Gateway Gamma (Program Completion). Key assessments and criteria used at program completion are: 1. End of Program GPA of at least 3.0; 2. Orals’ mean rating of at least “3” on a five-point scale; 3. Written comprehensive exam score of at least 70% (for comprehensive exam option); 4. Rating of at least “Satisfactory with revisions” on the thesis and field project clearance form (if that option is chosen); and 5. Completion of the graduate exit survey.

The oral exam form needs revision. It is the only form that uses a five-point scale. The descriptors are not defined for each level.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Educational Leadership

* [Gateway Beta (Entry to Internship)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)
* [Gateway Gamma (Internship Completion)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)
* [Gateway Delta (Program Completion)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)

Counseling Gateways

* [Gateway Beta (Entry to Internship)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)
* [Gateway Gamma (Internship Completion)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)
* [Gateway Delta (Program Completion)](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

[For details refer to 3b.1. Entry Exit Explanation Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2513)

**3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals?**

At three different points in their advanced studies, elementary, early childhood, special education, and secondary teaching candidates gain on-the job experience through field placements in actual school settings. The final placement is a full pre-service teaching assignment undertaken in the candidate’s final semester of studies. These environments address both content and developmental levels, assuring a well-rounded, competent teacher education graduate.

Educational Leadership requires a 200-hour internship for one to six variable credits over two semesters (one academic year). Counseling requires two field-base courses for three credits each totaling 145 hours. Also, a three to six variable credit 600-hour practicum is required.

**Table 7**

**Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program** | | | |
| **Programs** | **Field Experiences** | **Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)** | **Total Number of Hours** |
| Early Childhood Multicultural Education | **GNED 251. Field-Based 1 Teacher Preparation Experience (l)** (See description for Elementary Education below.)  **ECME** **332. Curriculum Development and Implementation Practicum 1 (2)** This course provides opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge gained from Curriculum Development and Implementation I and develop skills in planning developmentally appropriate learning experiences for young children from birth through age eight, including young children with special needs.  **ECME****334. Curriculum Development and Implementation Practicum 2 (2)** This course provides opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge gained from Curriculum Development and Implementation II and develop skills in planning learning environments and implementing curriculum in programs serving young children, birth through age eight, including those with special needs.  **ECME 412. Teaching Rdg & Writing Pract (1)** This advanced practicum provides opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge gained from the course Teaching Reading and Writing. In kindergarten through 3rd classrooms,  Candidates will develop skills in organizing a literature rich environment, planning effective reading and writing instruction and assessment, and implementing culturally, linguistically and developmentally appropriate literacy curricula.  **ECME 425. Integrated Early Childhood**  **Curriculum Practicum (2)** This advanced course provides opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge gained from Integrated Early Childhood Curriculum and develop skills in planning and implementing developmentally appropriate learning experiences, integrated curriculum, and learning environments for children. Co-requisite: ECME 424.  **ECME 427. Methods & Materials for the**  **Primary Grades Practicum (2)** This advanced practicum provides opportunities  for candidates to develop, implement, and  evaluate developmentally appropriate and  integrated learning experiences for children in K-3rd grade. Co-requisite: ECME 426 | **ECME** **452. Early Childhood Education Student Teaching (12)** The student teaching experience in early childhood education has two components: 1.) placement and assigned tasks in an early childhood classroom with a mentor teacher, and 2.) a weekly seminar in which candidates review and reflect on their own teaching practice, make connections between theory and practice, study particular topics of interest, conduct self-evaluations, and contribute to group discussions. (16 weeks, 500 hours) | **788** |
| Elementary Education | **GNED 251. Field-Based 1 Teacher**  **Preparation Experience (l)** Initial observations of classroom environments; determining what classroom teachers do. The class combines field observations (30 clock hours) with an on-campus seminar.  **GNED 351. Field-Based 2 Teacher Preparation Experience (2); 1, 2** The development of analytical and reflective reports based on field observation (60 clock hours) of different methods and teaching strategies used in the classroom. These reports form the basis for class discussions. Candidates will also have the opportunity to implement classroom lessons. | **ELEM 451. Field-Based 3 Teacher Preparation Experience: Elementary (6)** Analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s own performance in student teaching, based on knowledge of the profession and reflective observation. (16 weeks, 500 hours) | 590 hours |
| Secondary Education | **GNED 251. Field-Based 1 Teacher Preparation Experience (l)** (See description for Elementary Education above.)  **GNED 351. Field-Based 2 Teacher Preparation Experience (2); 1, 2** (See description for Elementary Education above.) | **GNED** **451. Field Base 3 Teacher Preparation Experience: Secondary (6)** Analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s own performance in student teaching, based on knowledge of the profession and reflective observation. (16 weeks, 500 hours) | 590 Hours |
| **Special Education including M.A. Special Education w/licensure** | **GNED 251. Field-Based 1 Teacher Preparation Experience (l)** (See description for Elementary Education above.)  **GNED 351. Field-Based 2 Teacher Preparation Experience (2); 1, 2** (See description for Elementary Education above.) | **SPED 451. Field-Based 3 Teacher Preparation Experience: Special Education (6)** Analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s own performance in student teaching, based on knowledge of the profession and reflective observation. (16 weeks, 500 hours) | 590 Hours |
| **M.A. Curriculum & Instruction Reading Emphasis** | **511. Teaching and Diagnosis of Reading (3); 2, 2** An overview of teaching reading in the primary and intermediate grades and diagnostic tools and corrective instructional techniques in the classroom. Emphasis is placed on developing competencies in the teaching of reading and adopting reading instruction based on knowledge of reading process, methods, and materials. |  | 32 Hours |
| **Advanced Programs: Other non-licensure programs and continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation and/or the preparation of other school professionals are academic, not practice-based.** | | | |
| M.A. Educational Leadership |  | **EDLD 698. Internship in Educational Leadership (1–6 VC)** Provides field experience in selected schools for the school leadership graduate candidate. | 200 Hours |
| M.A. Counseling Professional, School, and Vocational Rehabilitation | **COUN 605. Pre-Practicum in Counseling Skills (3)** This course serves as the candidate’s first formal exposure to the actual practice of counseling. As such, it will introduce the candidate, within a safe and controlled setting, to the dynamics and process of the counselor’s role, including core counseling skills, structure of the interview, and counselor characteristics. (45 hours)  **COUN 634. Practicum in Counseling (3)**  Face to face experience in counseling and guidance in a supervised, recorded, and evaluated counseling setting. (100 hours) | **COUN 698. Internship/School, Professional, and Rehabilitation Counseling or Vocational Evaluation (3–6 VC)** The internship is the final and most comprehensive professional experience in the counseling program. The intent of the internship is to provide the candidate with closely supervised training at a site outside of the University environment which is congruent to his or her orientation within the counseling program. To insure that the candidates individualized career goals are met in the internship experience, arrangements for the internship are negotiated between the candidate, the on-site supervisor and the candidate’s supervising professor at New Mexico Highlands University. (600 hours) | 750 Hours |

**3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?**

The SOE ensures that candidates develop proficiencies stated through coursework, field-base, clinical and internship experiences. Syllabi align and curriculum is mapped to the conceptual framework, PED competencies, NCA/HLC traits and specific professional standards. To ensure achievement, the SOE collects data from thee triangulated measures: [Key (Gateway) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2543), [supplementary (other course-level) assessments](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539) and qualitative assessments. Assessment data linked to intended candidate outcomes are collected and aggregated at three levels - individual, program, and unit – and used for two primary purposes: to monitor individual candidate progress through unit programs and, secondly, to provide the basis for decisions about program content and unit operations. The assessment system summarized is described in greater detail in the [Unit Assessment System](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2544).

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Performance-based field experiences [align](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501) with the unit’s [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework); New Mexico Public Education Department [[NMPED] competencies](#PED_Competencies_All); [NCATE](http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd1) standards; and [NCA/HLC Student Traits](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/institutionalresearch/outcomesassessment/assesmentstudentlearning.aspx), [INTASC standards](http://www.wresa.org/Pbl/The%20INTASC%20Standards%20overheads.htm).

Program-specific matrices align curricula with competencies. Through field experiences, candidates demonstrate proficiency in those competencies. Standardized syllabus templates prompt faculty to indicate how course objectives and course requirements align to competencies. Through the Chalk & Wire [C&W] platform, faculty assess candidates’ submissions with rubrics whose criteria align with NMPED competencies. C&W Reporter provides data for each NMPED competency. Faculty analyze data to monitor candidate growth and ascertain programmatic impacts.

The unit requires field base evaluations in the areas of content and instructional practice; the learner and learning; and professional responsibility. Field Base 1 is observational and requires no direct candidate supervision from SOE faculty. Primarily, candidates attend classes in three different levels of schools (e.g. elementary, middle and high school). Instructors assess Field Base 1 [FB1] competencies with Introduction to Teaching (GNED 251) assessments. In FB2 and FB3 (student teaching), university supervisors assess candidates dispositional proficiencies with [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). During FB3, to insure consistent monitoring throughout the semester, cooperating teachers complete four [Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Forms](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2) and the university supervisor completes three [University Supervisor Observation forms](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536). These observation forms align to NMPED competencies and INTASC standards.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Educational Leadership candidates are rated throughout the internship on the basis of the following New Mexico [HOUSSE-P](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/new-mexico.pdf) ([Principal Competencies](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2514)): 1. Instructional Leadership; 2. Communication; 3. Professional Development; 4. Operations Management, and 5. Scope of Responsibilities. Evaluating candidate effectiveness requires internship mentor feedback. When the internship starts, each mentor and intern receives a current [*NMHU Educational Leadership Internship Manual*](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535). At the end of the first semester, the mentor completes a midterm evaluation, conferences with the intern, and updates the university supervisor. Upon completion of the second semester, the university supervisor receives the [mentor’s final evaluation](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535) (Appendix G), candidate’s logs and monthly reflections are submitted to the university supervisor.

Counseling

Evaluating candidate effectiveness requires internship site supervisor feedback. The counseling faculty adopted a standard evaluation form. Candidates give the evaluation form, a resume and an internship contract to the on-site internship supervisor. At mid-term and at the completion of the semester, the on-site supervisor completes the rating form, conferences with the intern, and updates the university supervisor. Additional comments from the on-site internship supervisor are included on the rating form.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

The Las Vegas faculty evaluate Raton-based candidates with the same procedures.

**3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?**

University supervisors and internship supervisors formally assess the use of technology as an instructional tool with field base or clinical experiences evaluation forms.

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The SOE faculty expects competent technological acumen of its candidates. Program completers need to use technology in professional settings with precision and innovation. The SOE competencies encourage early and repeated technological development for its candidates.

NMHU’s core curriculum requirement creates early technology requirements. In the SOE, candidates enroll in Computer Applications (GNED 4/544), required of candidates in all initial programs, except ECME, whose curriculum is state-determined. During field experiences, supervisors evaluate candidates on their competence in integrating technology into their lessons. First, the [Cooperating Teacher Evaluation form](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2) have, as a criterion, the technology usage. Second, the University Supervisor [Student Teacher Observation form](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) requires that the candidate use “a variety of teaching methods and resources” and demonstrate “a willingness to implement appropriate modifications/adaptations within the classroom.” Student teachers present evidence of technology applications from their classroom in their FB3 electronic portfolio developed during their student teaching semester.

Progressive use of Chalk & Wire [C&W] electronic portfolios ensures that candidates, both at the initial and advanced licensure levels, develop the opportunities to demonstrate facility with technology. Likewise, C&W provides the SOE a digital system for data collection and continuous assessment of field base and clinical experiences.

In addition to formal education and evaluation of the use of technology, the administration equipped SOE classrooms, at all sites, to be “smart classrooms.” Faculty use white boards, projectors, computer-assisted presentations and in turn, require candidates to utilize a variety of means to present assignments and projects. Candidates participate in Interactive Video Conferencing [IVC], BlackBoard, and Elluminate for the delivery, or enhancement, of some coursework.

Data reveal our candidates’ technological successes. To view a data discussion, [see 3b.4 Tech data discussion.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2516)

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals- Educational Leadership and Counseling

Internship candidates use the electronic C&W portfolio, attend classes in “smart classrooms”, present with technology, and participate through IVC, BlackBoard, and Elluminate delivery methods.

Graduate data indicate that the SOE achieves graduate technology competencies. To view a data discussion, [see 3b.4 Tech data discussion.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2516)

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Raton candidates have additional experiences with technology. [Distance learning formats deliver 77% of their coursework](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2494). Field-base and internship candidates present assignments through advanced technology.

In Spring 2011, student teachers in Knowledge of the Profession in every SOE site, with the exception of Rio Rancho, used C&W for their capstone portfolio submission. In Fall 2011, the Rio Rancho center student teachers will follow suit.

**3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Selection of school-based clinical faculty is vital to the preparation of teacher candidates and interns. All school-based faculty for clinical practice must have at least three years of teaching, one year at the current grade level/subject, be licensed in the subject/grade level they are teaching, and come highly recommended by the principal or building administrator. Principals are the best source of information on cooperating teachers. If a principal recommends that a teacher new to his/her building is well qualified, field experience coordinators are permitted to assign a candidate to them. This criterion is communicated by a Coordinator of Field Experience when collaborating with the building administrator for arrangement of placements.

To compile information regarding qualifications of cooperating teachers, the SOE began using a Cooperating Teacher Survey. Each school-based clinical faculty is asked to complete the survey which indicates current credentials and experience as a professional educator. A table of school-based clinical faculty members, along with their qualifications is attached.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Educational Leadership mentors are experienced, fully-licensed principals and central office administrators who are approved by the district superintendent or his/her designee.

Counseling

An internship on-site supervisor is chosen. They must be a licensed counselor, social worker or psychologist with appropriate credentials; have two years experience in the current position; and have the time/interest in supervision and training of an internship candidate. School counseling candidates must be supervised during internship by a licensed school counselor with at least two years experience.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Selection of supervisors for candidates at the Raton site is done through the Las Vegas campus using the unit’s standard procedures.

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 3b.5](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Field base coordinators provide a supervisor packet to university supervisors. It states the supervisor, cooperating teacher, and candidate expectations. The packet provides guidelines for candidate observations, conferencing and assessment. Supervisors must have experience and past or current certification in the area they supervise. When the semester starts, field base coordinators meet university supervisors. They inform supervisors about their roles, responsibilities, and SOE communication channels for student teaching questions, suggestions, and concerns.

Field base coordinators meet cooperating teachers and provide a manual listing their responsibilities. Together, they review the manual. Later, the candidate and cooperating teacher review [the manual](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) together.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

A semester prior to the internship, interns and their mentors meet for orientation. The orientation provides background information about the mentoring process. They discuss responsibilities, roles and expectations of interns, mentors and internship supervisors. Explained are placement procedures, contractual agreements, time lines and evaluation requirements/procedures. Interns and mentors develop a network.

Counseling

Counseling supervisors are apprised of the program's expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures for candidates in practicum and/or internship. They receive a copy of the Counseling Internship Agreement and Internship Syllabus. It states the candidate requirements and site supervisor responsibilities. Also, they are provided [*The Counseling Program Student Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) for reference. Candidates are encouraged to contact the university supervisor with questions and/or concerns.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Preparation of supervisors for candidates at the Raton site is through the Las Vegas campus using the unit’s standard procedures.

**3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?**

The [Field Base Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531), Item #2, formally assesses the criterion “Relationship with cooperating teacher.” This is an early indication of not only the candidate’s, but also the cooperating teacher’s interactions with each other. This may be an indication of the regular support for field base candidates. All the initial licensure assessment instruments use the rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

During 2010-2011, the 118 assessed candidates attained a very high mean rating of 3.91 (of 4.00). This is the highest rating of any criterion for any cell size above 100. The relationship between candidates and cooperating teachers is near proficient.

[The Educational Leadership 2 Final Evaluation](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535) (Appendix G), HOUSSE-P competency #1, formally assesses the criterion “The principal promotes the success of all students by maintaining a culture that supports student achievement, high quality instruction, and professional development to meet the diverse learning needs of the school community.” The 129 assessed candidates attained a high rating of 3.58 (of 4.00). The EDLD Final Evaluation uses the rating scale: 4=Exemplary, 3=Proficient, 2=Adequate and 1=Inadequate. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Proficient” level.

One Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination [[CPCE](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499)] scores category (C8 – Professional Orientation and Ethics) and one [Counselor Disposition](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9) area (#7 – Competence) assess professional dispositions in work with internship supervisors. The CPCE C8 category (n=7) mean of 11.00 exceeds the criterion of 9 and the Counselor Disposition mean rating for Item #7 (n=16) was 2.90, which falls short of the criterion of 3.00 “Proficient” level and suggests an area for further attention.

For this criterion, the following expectations form the basis of qualitative programmatic assessment. If school-based faculty fail to meet these expectations, mainly recognized through the flow of required paperwork, the university supervisor and, if needed, the field base coordinator intervene to rectify the problem.

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

University supervisors observe student teachers in the field three times. They meet with the candidate and cooperating teacher, discuss issues and give feedback. Candidates meet weekly in Knowledge of the Profession course to discuss related issues. University supervisors provide additional support to candidates not enrolled in the course.

[*The Student Teaching Field Manual*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) outlines expectations of the university supervisor. University supervisors should: observe/counsel early in the semester to allow time to improve performance; perform evaluations during field experience; document/discuss observation results and recommendations with candidate and cooperating teacher; immediately address unsatisfactory performance and along with cooperating teacher identify guidelines and expectations for the remainder of the program. At the semester’s end, all university supervisors submit (1) a written evaluation of the student’s portfolio, using the school of education 11-point rubric (ratings on a four-point scale) and (2) three written evaluations of the student’s teaching performance using the school of education observation form. The rubric aligns with the [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and competencies for pre- and in-service teacher.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership faculty adopted a standard evaluation included in [*The Educational Leadership Internship Manual*](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535) and provided to site mentors. Mentors complete evaluation, review it with candidate and forward to university supervisor at mid-term. Mentors complete an evaluation at each semester’s end. The university supervisor visits at least twice during both semesters.

Counseling faculty adopted a standard evaluation. Candidates provide a resume, the internship contract and an evaluation copy to the on-site internship supervisor. Supervisors complete evaluation, review it with candidate and forward to university supervisor at mid-term. Supervisors complete an evaluation at each semester’s end. The university supervisor visits at least once during the semester.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Candidates from the Raton Center follow the same procedures.

**3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?**

Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

NMHU is primarily a teaching institution with terminal degrees at the M.A. level. The unit’s primary focus is on the practical employment of research and candidates are provided opportunities through coursework and professional papers to explore current research and put that knowledge into action in their clinical practice.

All graduate candidates are required to take coursework in basic statistics essential to the collection, summarization, and interpretation of statistical data that the educator frequently encounters. In addition, candidates take coursework on educational research interpretation which prepares the potential research consumer to analyze and evaluate research critically, to understand fundamental research principles and techniques, and to design research stratagems for problem areas in education.

Educational leadership candidates can choose a thesis or project option for completion of their programs.

Counseling candidates prepare a professional paper which requires research of a specific issue in counseling.

Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Candidates from the Raton site take the same coursework and complete the same structured activities for analysis of data using the unit’s standard procedures.

**3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn**

**3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?**

1. Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

[Title II Report – Field Base 3 completers 2010](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2495)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **n=** | **Program** | **n=** |
| ECME | 9 | ELEM | 69 |
| ELEM & SPED | 9 | SEC | 7 |
| SPED | 14 | **TOTAL** | **108** |

Approximately 100 candidates complete Field Base 3(Student Teaching) annually. In 2008-2009, 105 candidates completed FB3. In 2009-2010, 108 candidates completed FB3. In 2010-2011, 90 candidates completed FB3. Of these, approximately 96% successfully complete clinical practice. There is no field base program for Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] and Special Education [SPED] graduate students at the advanced licensure level. All are licensed teachers at the point of finishing the advanced licensure program. With graduate SPED candidates, they may enter the graduate program without a teaching license. However, they complete the initial license program first before continuing with the advanced licensure program at the graduate level. All C&I candidates seeking advanced licensure are licensed teachers.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

In the Education Leadership [EDLD] program, during 2010-2011, 48 candidates enrolled in EDLD 698 II – Internship II. All EDLD internship candidates successfully completed the program.

In the Counseling [COUN] program, at Las Vegas, there are 7 – 12 candidates each semester, with 98% completion. At the Rio Rancho center, there are 10-15 candidates each semester, with 98% completion. At the Farmington center, there are about three each semester, with 98% completion. The completion eventually rises to 100% as candidates progress through each semester of internship. During 2011-2011, 48 candidates enrolled in COUN 698- Counseling Internship.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Statistics for the Raton site are included with the Las Vegas campus. Raton based candidates are enrolled as Las Vegas campus candidates and assigned advisors and receive support directly from the Las Vegas campus.

**3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Through the triangulation of supervision, candidates, university supervisors and school-based faculty support the field and clinical experience. Course instructors supervise field experiences. For clinical practice placements, candidates are assigned a cooperating teacher and university supervisor. In field and clinical experiences, cooperating teachers and university supervisors communicate regularly about the progress and needs of the candidate and share information about the environment and expectations of the PK-12 school. Both cooperating teacher and university supervisor evaluate candidates using a [Student Teacher Evaluation](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2) based on New Mexico PED’s Competencies for Entry Level Teachers. The cooperating teacher completes the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531) and shares it with the candidate.

Assessment is primarily the role of the cooperating teacher who is in the classroom with the candidate daily. The university supervisor serves in an advisory capacity and as a trouble shooter. The cooperating teacher shares informal observations with the candidate regularly and [formal observations monthly](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) (Appendix G-2). If issues arise with the candidate’s performance, the cooperating teacher contacts the university supervisor who will meet with both to resolve the issue.

During clinical practice, the school-based clinical faculty is required to observe and provide formal feedback to the candidate a minimum of four times each semester. The observation is completed in triplicate; original to the candidate’s permanent file; copies to the candidate and cooperating teacher. Each observation addresses domains of instructional planning and implementation, assessment, classroom management, family and community, professionalism and knowledge of content.

University supervisors must provide at least [three documented observations](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) of the candidate’s performance each semester. If a candidate is experiencing difficulty, increased contact is expected.

Candidates are evaluated on their ability to be self-reflective about their teaching effectiveness as it relates to student learning. Candidates prepare a portfolio based on the NM PED Competencies for Entry Level Teachers that requires compilation and analysis of evidence supporting the candidate’s understanding of the competencies. The portfolio is assessed by the university supervisor at the midpoint and end of clinical practice.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

The mentor and internship supervisor separately assess the intern and share evaluations during a joint exit interview each semester. Strengths and areas of growth are noted. Any deficiencies are noted with recommendations for improvement. Strategies for improvement are identified.

Counseling

Site supervisors complete an evaluation form for the candidate based on criteria established by the Counseling Program. University supervisors meet with site supervisors to verify candidate progress. University supervisors meet with candidates and, noting recommendations made by site supervisors, complete a [final dispositions assessment](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9) and determine satisfactory completion of clinical experience.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Roles for candidates, site supervisors, and university supervisors for Raton candidates follow the unit’s standard procedures.

**3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Reflection is a key component of our [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and it achieves primacy with candidate formation. Field Base 1 is a preliminary experience where candidates have the opportunity to participate in a variety of school activities. They complete a total of 30 hours of observation and write 60 one-page journals. Observations must include both Regular and Special Education and address all levels of instruction. Field Base 2 is an important step in the pre-teaching program. Candidates are required to complete 60 hours of observation and participation and write reflective journal entries, two pages each.

Every week, Knowledge of the Profession candidates continue this practice of reflection. Candidates discuss issues and reflect on their practice during the class. This provides them with the opportunity for feedback from both peers and University faculty.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Candidates write monthly observations, insights, and lessons learned from activities including comments on satisfaction with the activity and level of participation (Awareness, Observation, Cooperation or Collaboration, or Leadership). Candidates also take EDLD 680 Reflective Leadership, a capstone course, which provides an opportunity for reflection, application and integration of knowledge acquired in the program.

Counseling

Candidates keep a weekly log of hours spent on internship activities. Logs consist of daily notations indicating date and amount of time allotted to each activity; weekly summaries of experiences; reaction to experiences; information learned; and, future goals and problems.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Candidates from the Raton site take the same coursework and complete the same structured activities for reflective exercises as noted in the sample syllabi.

**3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The Teacher Education Department goal is for candidates to become competent, independent and effective practitioners. According to the SOE dispositions, candidates are expected to exhibit a professional demeanor in the school setting, a constructive relationship with the cooperating teacher and a respectful, accepting relationship with students that demonstrates behaviors consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

Both [cooperating teacher](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) and university supervisor evaluate development of such traits. Formative and summative evaluations address knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. Summative evaluation data is entered at the end of the semester and can be accessed through the Chalk & Wire Electronic Portfolio system.

Several assessments are used to demonstrate the candidates possess knowledge, skills and professional dispositions for helping all students learn:

1. NMTA Basic Skills test and Content Area exam are required for admission to Student Teaching.
2. The G.P.A. for admission to Student Teaching has been raised from 2.5 to 2.75.
3. A [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) form is used upon entrance to the program and completed at various points in the program to determine the candidate has the appropriate dispositions to be a classroom teacher.
4. Portfolios are used to demonstrate candidate meets all NMPED competencies, including one relating directly to knowledge and skills.

In advanced programs, candidates are licensed teachers with knowledge of and classroom experience related to assessment of student learning. Licensure training includes analysis of student, classroom and school performance data; making data-driven decisions of strategies for teaching/learning; and awareness/utilization of school/community resources that support student learning.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Professional dispositions are rated using a standard rubric. Candidate GPA, a written comprehensive exam (or thesis or field project) and an oral exam are used as assessments of content knowledge.

Counseling

[Professional dispositions](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9) are rated during the clinical experience. Candidate GPA, [CPCE scores](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2499), and the professional paper are used as assessments of content knowledge.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Candidates from the Raton site take the same coursework and complete the same structured activities for reflective exercises as noted in the sample syllabi. Data for the Raton site is included with the Las Vegas campus. Raton-based candidates are enrolled as Las Vegas campus candidates and assigned advisors and receive support directly from the Las Vegas campus.

[Key Assessment Data for 3c.4](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

**3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

Candidates are prepared for collecting and analyzing data through specific coursework and field-based experiences. Early childhood candidates take ECME 328 Assessment of Children & Evaluation of Programs to become familiar with culturally appropriate assessment methods and instruments, including systematic observation. During ECME 412 Teaching Reading and Writing Practicum, candidates apply knowledge, learning to develop curriculum and plan effective reading/writing instruction and assessment.

Elementary teacher candidates enroll in ELEM 361 Assessment and Evaluation of Students’ Problems, a class in construction and use of teacher-made and standardized tests. Gathering/interpreting data, reporting test information and development of a district-wide testing program is emphasized.

Those special education candidates who complete SPED 401 Diagnosis of the Exceptional Child receive practice in data-collection instruments/techniques, recording data, making referrals and developing an instructional program. They take two courses in curriculum and methods for students with mild, moderate and severe exceptionalities which cover an exam of curriculum content, instruction methods and individualized education programs appropriate for students with severe cognitive or behavioral exceptionalities. RDED 411 Teaching and Diagnosis of Reading is an overview of teaching reading in the primary and intermediate grades, diagnostic tools and corrective techniques. A two-hour lab is required to practice academic knowledge.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership/Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Educational Leadership candidates take EDLD 640 Supervision and Evaluation of Personnel to develop knowledge/skills for leaders to supervise teachers, staff and provide staff development.

Counseling

School counseling candidates take two courses that provide knowledge of assessment of programs and students: COUN 608 Appraisal of Individuals, Groups, and Families in Counseling and COUN 620 Organization and Administration of School Counseling Programs. Professional counseling candidates also take COUN 610 Assessment & Treatment Planning in Counseling. Throughout clinical experiences, interns practice their skills in assessment of both students and programs.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Candidates from the Raton site take the same courses and complete the same activities for reflective exercises as noted in the sample syllabi.

**3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?**

(1) Initial and Advanced Programs for Teachers

The regions in which candidates pursue field experiences and clinical practice are ethnically, socio-economically, and linguistically diverse. These factors, combined with the requirement that candidates pursue their field placements and clinical practice in different schools, helps insure experience with diverse students.

The quality and diversity of these experiences are strongly inferred from the demographics of the northern New Mexico, NMHU’s service area. Statewide, the New Mexico PK-12 enrollment was 56.7% Hispanic, 28.5% Caucasian, 10.7% Native American, 2.7% African-American, and 1.4% Asian-American.

In comparison to the statewide PK-12 student demographics, [PK-12 school districts in SOE’s service area](#Table_10) highlight a similar mean percentage of Hispanic students (57%), slightly fewer Caucasian students (25%), more Native-American students (15%), fewer African-American students (1%) and similar percentage of Asian / Pacific Islander students (1%). About 73% of the PK-12 students that we serve receive free and reduce meals; 27% have Special Education designations and 15% are English-Language learners.

The School of Education places great emphasis on this area. Beginning in Field Base 1, candidates are required to complete observations in Regular Education and Special Education and at all levels: Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary. The use of ITV for our Field Base classes has increased opportunities to discuss very diverse placements including in largely Hispanic Northern New Mexico, Farmington with a large Native American population, and Española with both groups heavily represented. The Teachers 4 Tomorrow [Learning Community](http://www.nmhu.edu/future/orientation/firstyearexperience.aspx), that integrates English with Introduction to Teaching class, visited a Santa Fe charter school precisely to provide candidates with the opportunity to observe a different setting. Candidates in Field Base 1 and 2 are further encouraged to observe in immersion and English Language Development settings. When candidates are ready for pre-service teaching, they are permitted to return to their community, sometimes even crossing state lines, particularly in the case of our Native American candidates.

(2) Programs for Other School Professionals (Educational Leadership and Counseling)

Educational Leadership

Field-based opportunities with diverse populations are ensured through school placements as described for candidates above.

Counseling

Counseling candidates take coursework specifically focused on diversity and multicultural counseling issues. Field-based opportunities with [diverse populations are ensured through school placements](#Table_10) as described for candidates above and also in non-profit agencies across northern NM and the Albuquerque area.

(3) Off-Campus and Distance Learning

Opportunities, as outlined above, are present for all field-based experiences.

**Optional**

**1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?**

The unit separated Field Base experiences into three semesters. The SOE program immerses candidates to classroom realities early in their program. Programmatically, Field Base [FB] 2 exceeds state requirements (from 42 to 60 hours) and FB3 (student teaching) exceeds the 14-week NM Public Education Department requirements. The SOE requires 16 weeks or more because candidates start at the beginning of the semester. This change was made in response to school personnel who requested this recommendation. The Assessment Team extended all FB experiences [FB1, FB2 and FB3] based from the Rio Rancho center to 16 weeks to properly assess dispositions. Previously, FB1 and FB2 met for eight weeks.

The unit collaboratively established six Professional Development Schools [[PDS](#PDS_sites)] that serve as lab schools. These sites include the [Los Niños Dual Language Elementary School](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408) program, Union Elementary School, and Armijo Elementary School from the West Las Vegas School District; Rio Rancho Middle School and Sandia Vista Elementary School from the Rio Rancho School District; and, Bloomfield High School. These collaborations are further enhanced through partnerships with the Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations [[CESDP](http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/youth-programs/enlace/index.html)] and the Northeast Regional Education Cooperative [[[NREC](http://www.rec4.com/)](http://www.rec4.com/)]. These PDS sites provide candidates with another diverse type of school context, the partnership model, instrumental to their acquiring knowledge of a wide variety of school settings throughout their teacher education preparation program.

**2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

During Advanced Educational Psychology (GNED 641), advanced licensure candidates and other school professionals analyze the theme of the integration of diversity throughout during the field-based (i.e. student teaching / internship) teaching and learning processes. Graduate candidates research classroom strategies that integrate diversity into the lesson. They develop exercises that support student teachers’ preexisting diverse experiences and backgrounds (schema development). Advanced licensure candidates and other school professions, then, extend the existing diversity schemas of student teachers with the development of:

1. discussion exercises,
2. rubrics to evaluate student teaching-based projects and oral presentations;
3. other assessment techniques
4. triangulation methods of evaluation (i.e., in the classroom, instructor-peer and self evaluations) and
5. implementation strategies for demonstrating the applications of different theories.

This candidate research is of particular focus in GNED 641.

**STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY**

**4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences**

**4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?**

In part, [NCATE defines “diversity”](http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/NCATEGlossary/tabid/477/Default.aspx#D) as, “Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area.” The SOE [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework), [themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506) and [philosophy statement](#SOE_Philos) address diversity. Effective and successful preparation of all candidates requires that equity issues are programmatically addressed.

The well–prepared professional delivers quality instruction, service, and leadership in diverse settings. Effective teaching integrates multicultural education precepts. Candidates’ cultures and languages inform curricular development and instructional techniques. The SOE faculty extends the traditional definition of “culture” to include a range of human characteristics which may result in bias from others. Such characteristics include, but are not limited to, race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, sexual preference, age, area of origin, exceptionality, gender, and language. Multicultural educators seek to engender respect and social equity in the classroom through the empowerment of diverse perspectives and facilitation of voice to underrepresented groups.

Faculty use the [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) to assess candidates in their first licensure courses - Introduction to Teaching (GNED 201) and Introduction to Special Education (SPED 214). The inventory includes diversity criteria #10- Demonstrates respect to others; #12- Demonstrates an appreciation of diversity in others; and #13- Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. The rating scale is: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

At the midpoint and end of their initial licensure program, faculty assess candidates in schools with the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531) .Specifically, these two criteria assess diversity: #11 – “Respects the cultural differences of students within the classroom”; and #12- “Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.” The rating scale is: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

During student teaching, candidates are assessed with the [University Supervisor Observation form](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536), (item #7 and [NMPED Teacher Competency #7](#PED_Competencies_All)): “The teacher recognizes and promotes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept within multicultural education.” The rating scale is: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level.

The SOE uses [Chalk & Wire](http://www.chalkandwire.com/) [C&W], to gather data related to NMPED Competencies, including diversity. The SOE faculty designated specific courses in each department with specific assignments to assess NMPED Competencies related to diversity. These materials are for programmatic assessment and are not necessarily graded. C&W uses the rating scale: 4=Exemplary, 3=Proficient, 2=Developing and 1=Emerging/Not present. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “2=Developing.”

In Advanced Programs, data related to diversity are collected and assessed according to: [NMPED School Counselor Competency G](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2496) (“The counselor will understand the cultural context of relationships, issues and trends in a multicultural and diverse society”) and [NMPED Administrative Competency D](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2497) (“Multicultural leadership - The multicultural leader promotes the success of all students by addressing the needs of multicultural, multilingual diverse populations”). These are measured through C&W rubrics and expect candidates to achieve a “2=Developing.”

**4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:**

 **awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and**

 **the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?**

Authentic diversity is defined in terms of ethnicity, gender, disability status, and other characteristics. Therefore, SOE programs prepare candidates to interact with [diverse student populations](#Table_10). The [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) infuses a diversity emphasis throughout course syllabi. Assessments used at the course level measure attainment of course diversity outcomes. Those used at the program and unit level monitor candidate performance related to diversity competencies. Both instruction and assessment need to be fair and free from bias.

Elementary Education Major and Licensure programs require candidates to matriculate in Principles of Multicultural Education (ELEM 317), in which candidates study educational trends, issues, and challenges. Candidates learn methods and strategies for teaching respect and tolerance. While this course specifically addresses diversity, other courses also include aspects of teaching/learning for diversity.

In English as a Second Language (ELEM 417/517), candidates learn methods and procedures to teach English Language Learners [ELLs). Candidates learn second language acquisition theories and basic elements of linguistic sound systems. In Theories and Principles of Bilingual Education (GNED 412), candidates learn the fundamental theories and principles of bilingual education and how to address diversity issues in the classroom. In Sheltered English for Content Area Instruction (GNED 420), candidates work toward mastery of linguistic, instructional, assessment, and classroom-management practices, which promote linguistic development in content-area classes.

Childhood Multicultural Education [ECME] program emphasizes a diverse and equitable curricula. During Family and Community Collaboration (ECME 303), candidates examine the involvement of families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds in ECME programs. Assessment of Children and Evaluation of Programs (ECME 328) familiarizes candidates with a variety of culturally appropriate assessment methods and instruments, including systematic observation.

Introduction to Special Education (SPED 214), required for the Special Education, Elementary Education, and Secondary programs, focuses on the implications of diversity in the field of special education. The Art and Science of Teaching in Secondary Schools (GNED 410/510) integrates the principles of diversity in an overview of lesson and unit planning in the secondary school and their implementation in a “micro-teaching” situation.

In field-based and practicum courses, candidates experience a variety of diverse settings that include ethnic, racial, socio-economic status, gender, linguistic, ability, and religious diversity.

At the Advanced level, several courses specifically focus on diversity. Socio Cultural Factors Affecting Education (GNED 645) is a core class for the Master's in Curriculum & Instruction [C&I]. The course emphasizes the identification of social/cultural factors of Hispanic and southwest Native-American cultures and how these factors influence educational practice.

In another core course of the C&I master’s program, Advanced Educational Psychology (GNED 641), candidates study a range of cognitive, socio-cognitive, and social learning theories. Learning experiences encourage students to apply these theories to the design and analysis of authentic, diversified instructional contexts that accommodate group and individual learner needs.

Multicultural Counseling (COUN 611) acquaints candidates with the contrast of values, attitudes, and lifestyles of the predominant ethnic groups regionally, nationally, and globally. Candidates are expected to integrate emerging cross-cultural counseling principles in their development of personal counseling approaches.

The entire Special Education program (at both initial and advanced levels) addresses exceptionalities. The course titled The Special Education Program (SPED 612) includes attention to cultural and linguistic diversity. Psycho-cultural/Psychosocial Aspects of Disability (SPED 674) provides an overview of psychosocial and psycho-cultural aspects of disabilities and explicitly addresses diversity in teaching and learning.

EDLD 635, Multicultural Leadership, prepares administrator candidates to address diversity issues within public education, including race, ethnicity, class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and ability.

**4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates’ proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?**

There are three key gateway assessments criteria that specifically and formally assess candidates’ proficiencies related to diversity. In addition, there are three supplementary assessments that are attached to NMPED licensure competencies. At the initial licensure level, the [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) Item #12 assesses “Demonstrates an appreciation of diversity in others” with a four-point rubric. All initial licensure assessments use the same rating scale: 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory, 2=Developing and 1=Needs Improvement. Faculty assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Satisfactory” level. Of the 153 candidates rated in 2010-2011, the mean score is 3.89. This rating signals a near proficient level of attainment for this criterion.

At the midpoint and end of their initial licensure program, faculty assess candidates in schools with the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531). Specifically, these two criteria assess diversity: #11 – “Respects the cultural differences of students within the classroom”; and #12- “Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.” Of the 118 candidates rated in 2010-2011, the mean score is 3.94 (of 4.00). Candidates achieve a near proficient level of attainment for this criterion.

With [Counselor Disposition](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) Inventory (p. 9), Item #3 “Acceptance (being able to regard client unconditionally, despite differences in cultural heritage, values, or belief systems)” and #8 Sensitive to issues of diversity (competent in counseling diverse clients) represent the diversity criterion. The 16 candidates scored a mean of 2.93 (of 4.00) for Item #3 and mean of 3.06 (of 4.00). The COUN Disposition Inventory uses the rating scale: 4=Distinguished, 3=Proficient, 2= Apprentice and 1=Novice. COUN assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3= Proficient” level. Therefore, the mean for Item#3 falls slightly below “Proficient” expectations and may need some attention. Item #8 slightly exceeds expectations.

The Educational Leadership Internship program competencies [align](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2514) with the [HOUSSE-P](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/new-mexico.pdf) standards. Mentors assess candidates on how well the Intern demonstrated practice with each standard. The second HOUSSE-P standard is, “The principal uses communication and relationship-building skills to engage the larger community in the knowledge of and advocacy for equity in meeting the diverse needs of the school community.” The 129 EDLD candidates attained a mean score of 3.58 (of 4.00) on this item. The EDLD Dispositional Inventory uses the rating scale for observed behaviors: 4=All of the time, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely and 1=Not at all. EDLD assessors expect candidates to achieve a “3=Sometimes” level. Therefore, the mean exceeded expectations.

In Spring 2011, we launched our most recent alumni and employer surveys, five years after the previous survey in 2006. The alumni survey was sent to 626 alumni; 138 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 488 alumni received the survey. 75 alumni completed the survey for a response rate of 15.4% (75/488). The employer survey was sent to 467 school principals; 88 of those surveys were undeliverable, so 379 principals received the surveys. Thirty-three principals completed the survey for a response rate of 8.7% (33/379). The surveys used a four-point Likert-type scale (Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied), with point values from 4 to 1 assigned to the response options, to rate 11 components of the SOE’s initial and advanced programs. The criterion receiving the second highest alumni rating was “the ability to work with diverse student populations” (3.47). Likewise, employers rated NMHU graduates on the criterion “the ability to work with diverse populations” with a 3.25, their second highest rating of 11 criteria.

[Key Assessment Data for 4a.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 4a.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

**4b.1. What opportunities do candidates have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?**

While some SOE faculty share similar backgrounds with the candidates, others originate from other cultural / linguistic groups. This provides candidates both role models and opportunities to interact with faculty whose backgrounds and experiences differ from their own. The use of ITV and online delivery promotes interaction among people from NMHU’s diverse service areas.

In GNED 410, Arts & Science of Teaching Secondary School, candidates teach simulated lessons - Reflective Teaching Lessons [RTLs] - to their classmates in preparation for teaching high school students in a lab situation. RTLs require that as many as three candidates teach at the same time. Through the use of technology, candidates may teach groups at other sites and at main campus. The ITV delivery system allows a unique beneficial dimension to instructional methods. During these RTLs, the professor participates as an observer. Candidates interact with the faculty member in a more informal way.

Candidates interact with diverse teachers and students at Professional Development Schools [[PDS](#PDS_sites)] throughout the state. In Rio Rancho, candidates take courses at Rio Rancho Middle School and Sandia Vista Elementary School. In Farmington, candidates participate in a Special Education PDS at Bloomfield High School. In Las Vegas, candidates take courses at [Los Niños Dual Language Elementary School](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408), Union Elementary School, and Armijo Elementary School in West Las Vegas.

The diverse professionals at the PDS sites interact with candidates on a regular basis. Other practicing professionals are invited as guest speakers in individual courses. Additionally, the SOE faculty place candidates various field-base sites and internship locations which give them opportunities to interact with diverse practicing members of their chosen profession.

**4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?**

The SOE faculty are diverse in background and experience. Some have lived abroad. Many are bilinguals. SOE faculty represent different regions of the United States. Experientially and academically, the faculty prepare candidates to work with diverse populations by drawing on their own diverse histories. Most faculty were public school practitioners in their areas of expertise. Some faculty are former foreign language teachers. In Fall 2011, the SOE hired two new full-time diverse faculty members– one Egyptian and the other Korean.

Faculty members bring their extensive experience of working with diverse populations to candidates through coursework, discussion, and demonstration. SOE faculty have worked in rural, suburban, and urban schools. Faculty teaching emphasizes culturally inclusive practice, especially (but not limited to) students of all ethnicities, races, religious groups, ages, exceptionalities, gender, linguistic backgrounds, and sexual orientations. All faculty have experience working with [diverse students in New Mexico](#Table_10), and many have worked nationally and globally. Many faculty graduated from universities which included an emphasis on diversity and the preparation of candidates to work with diverse populations. A faculty member holds degrees in Spanish and Ibero-American Studies.

Holding classes within Professional Development School [[PDS](#PDS_sites)] sites greatly increases candidates’ opportunities to work with diverse PK-12 students in authentic settings. [The contemporary professional experiences of PDS site professors](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2519) of record during Spring 2011 are highlighted in aqua.

**4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates?**

**Table 8a**

**Full-Time Faculty Demographics (Fall 2010)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs**  **N (%)** | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs**  **N (%)** | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs**  **N (%)** | **All Faculty in the Institution**  **N (%)** | **School-based Faculty**  **N (%)** |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | - | - | - | - | - |
| Asian | - | - | 1 (7%) | 3 (2%) | 1 (3%) |
| Black or African American, non-Hispanic | - | - | - | 3 (2%) | - |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | - | - | - | 1 (1%) | - |
| Hispanic or Latino | - | 5 (42%) | 6 (40%) | 38 (27%) | 11 (37%) |
| White, non-Hispanic | 3 (100%) | 7 (58%) | 8 (53%) | 92 (64%) | 18 (60%) |
| Two or more races | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - |
| Race/Ethnicity unknown | - | - | - | 6 (4%) | - |
| **Total Ethnicity** | 3 | 12 | 15 | 143 | 30 |
| Female | 2 (67%) | 8 (67%) | 12 (80%) | 62 (43%) | 22 (73%) |
| Male | 1 (33%) | 4 (33%) | 3 (20%) | 81 (57%) | 8 (27%) |
| **Total General** | 3 | 12 | 15 | 143 | 30 |

**Table 8b**

**Adjunct Faculty Demographics (Fall 2010)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs**  **N (%)** | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs**  **N (%)** | **Professional Education Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs**  **N (%)** | **All Faculty in the Institution**  **N (%)** | **School-based Faculty**  **N (%)** |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | - | - | 1 (6%) | - | 1 (2%) |
| Asian | - | - | 1 (6%) | 3 (2%) | 1 (2%) |
| Black or African American, non-Hispanic | - | 1 (3%) | - | 3 (2%) | 1 (2%) |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | - | - | - | 1 (1%) | - |
| Hispanic or Latino | - | 14 (40%) | 6 (38%) | 38 (27%) | 20 (37%) |
| White, non-Hispanic | 3 (100%) | 20 (57%) | 7 (44%) | 92 (64%) | 30 (56%) |
| Two or more races | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - |
| Race/Ethnicity unknown | - | - | 1 (6%) | 6 (4%) | 1 (2%) |
| **Total Ethnicity** | 3 | 35 | 16 | 143 | 54 |
| Female | 2 (67%) | 20 (57%) | 12 (75%) | 62 (43%) | 34 (63%) |
| Male | 1 (33%) | 15 (33%) | 4 (25%) | 81 (57%) | 20 (27%) |
| **Total General** | 3 | 35 | 16 | 143 | 54 |

**4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?**

The SOE follows NMHU’s diversity hiring policy as described in [*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf). *The Faculty Handbook* (Section 3.5e) states, “School or College activities shall be conducted without discrimination on the basis of race, color, gender, age, religion, ethnicity or national origin, disability, or political or sexual orientation.”

In Section 6.D1, *The Faculty Handbook* states, in part, “[T]he faculty commits itself to recruit new faculty with the highest possible credentials and to create as diverse a faculty as possible.” In [*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf), Section 6.D describes in detail the hiring process. Those sections that specifically pertain to the recruitment of diverse faculty are described next.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Officer approves the position announcement before it is advertised. The institution’s standard position announcement template affirms its commitment to diversity and non-discriminatory hiring practices. The announcement states the SOE’s desire to attract candidates from diverse backgrounds including, but not limited to, professional experience working with people and/or places of diverse backgrounds. A description of NMHU, its centers and sites, and the service area are marketed as an incentive to attract candidates from diverse backgrounds.

*The Faculty Handbook* (Section 6.D1) suggests, “Since one goal of the advertising process is to create as diverse an applicant pool as possible, strong consideration should be given to advertising in journals/newspapers/etc. that have minority, female, and/or disabled readership. Another option to consider is mailing advertisements directly to institutions that graduate significant numbers of minority, female and/or disabled students in the field of interest.”

When diverse faculty commit to NMHU, the department chair collects and relays specific civic, cultural, social and, in some cases, religious events that may interest the new hire. Faculty invite new faculty to social activities.

**4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates**

**4c.1. What opportunities do candidates have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?**

Candidates have a variety of experiences working with individuals of diverse backgrounds through their interaction in class discussions and group work. In both main campus and center classes, candidate diversity includes native-born New Mexican students of European, Hispanic and Native background from rural and urban communities, students from throughout the United States and foreign-born, international students. The unit has served candidates from Africa, India, Pakistan, and Russia and students representing the continental United States and Hawaii.

In addition to ethnic, racial and geographic diversity,the unit also provides opportunities for candidates who vary in religion, gender, area of origin, language, sexual orientation, and ability. Candidates in areas with less on-site diversity have opportunities to interact with candidates of diverse backgrounds through distance education classes offered online and via interactive television [ITV]. In Spring 2011, undergraduate SOE classes averaged 7.5 candidates. Graduate SOE class averaged 5.8 candidates. Because class sizes are small and instruction is delivered using a variety of student-centered techniques, candidates have many opportunities to interact with each other during class time and out-of-class group projects. Out-of-class meetings among candidates are accomplished using Blackboard chat rooms and well as face-to-face.

The unit also provides a variety of field-based experiences ranging from [Professional Development Schools](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408), to the Language Immersion Program, in which candidates have opportunities to interact with individuals from diverse populations. The Language Immersion Program is a week-long experience, conducted totally in Spanish, which provides candidates with an opportunity to experience diversity from a linguistic and a cultural perspective.

**4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs?**

**Table 9**

**Diversity of Candidates**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)** | **Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)** | **All Students in the Institution n (%)** | **Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)\*** |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 32 (9.4%) | 23 (7.4%) | 261 (6.8%) | 9.4% |
| Asian | 3 (.9%) | 2 (.6%) | 48 (1.3%) | 1.4% |
| Black or African American, non-Hispanic | 9 (2.6%) | 9 (2.9%) | 219 (5.7%) | 2.1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  | .1% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 180 (52.6%) | 143 (45.8%) | 1782 (46.7%) | 46.3% |
| White, non-Hispanic | 107 (31.3%) | 118 (37.8%) | 1194 (31.3%) | 40.5% |
| Two or more races |  |  |  | 3.7% |
| Other | 1 (.3%) | 5 (1.6%) | 194 (5.1%) |  |
| Race/ethnicity unknown | 10 (2.9%) | 12 (3.8%) | 120 (3.8%) |  |
| **Total** | 342 | 312 | 3818 |  |
| Female | 288 (84.2%) | 258 (82.7%) | 2433 (63.7%) | 50.5% |
| Male | 54 (15.8%) | 54 (17.3%) | 1385 (36.3%) | 49.5% |
| **Total** | 342 | 312 | 3818 |  |

\*United States Census Bureau, State of New Mexico, 2010

**4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?**

Institutions in other areas of the country often need to specially target diverse candidates because the ambient homogeneity in which they are located. Unlike those institutions, ambient diversity surrounds NMHU. The SOE is located in the first [minority-majority state](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002417-NMHUSubstan-7112011102431.pdf) (p. 12) in the continental United States, with Hispanics comprising 45.6% of the population, followed by American Indians (9.7%) and African Americans (3.1%). It is a relatively poor state, with a median household income that is 16% lower than the country as a whole. Seventeen percent of the population lives below the poverty level, compared to 13.2% across the country.

These demographics are the heart of NMHU’s mission and the SOE conceptual framework. The SOE recruitment and retention policy serves populations who have traditionally been under-served in higher education, specifically Hispanic and Native American communities. The SOE is a catalyst for educational and economic advancement, by providing an affordable, accessible university education for New Mexican families currently struggling with below-average incomes and above-average poverty rates. NMHU’s open-enrollment policy and [inexpensive tuition](http://www.nmhu.edu/future/tuition/index.aspx) help us attract and keep New Mexico’s diverse candidates. To maintain candidate diversity, the SOE targets our local New Mexico Schools.

The SOE actively works with the NMHU recruitment office in efforts to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups. In Spring 2011, the Dean and Associate Dean staffed a SOE information table at “College Night” where high school students from Albuquerque to Santa Rosa attended the Las Vegas event. Department chairs are required to participate in new student orientation and advisement sessions throughout the summer. The teachers of potential SOE candidates are a rich source of recruitment. Quality educational experiences, such as the Summer Institute, create the word-of-mouth excitement that continues to attract students. Student services aimed at diverse populations helps retain candidates*.*

**4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in PK-12 Schools**

**4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?**

Extensive and substantive field experiences and internships emphasize New Mexico’s diverse culture. Faculty use the [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532) to assess candidates in their first licensure courses- Introduction to Teaching and Field Base 1 [FB1]. The inventory includes diversity criteria #10- Demonstrates respect to others; #12- Demonstrates an appreciation of diversity in others; and #13- Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

FB1 candidates observe in multiple settings where students vary in socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, varying ability, language, and sexual preference and journal about their observations. University supervisors read and rate the journals and provide candidate feedback that includes reviewing diversity issues.

FB2 exposes candidates to English language learners and students with special needs. Faculty assess candidates in schools with the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531) .Specifically, these two criteria assess diversity: #11 – “Respects the cultural differences of students within the classroom”; and #12- “Demonstrates classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.”

University supervisors use this disposition inventory during FB3 (student teaching). In FB3, candidates directly experience very [diverse student populations](#Table_10). Candidates are assessed with the [University Supervisor Observation form](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536), (item #7 and [NMPED Teacher Competency #7](#PED_Competencies_All)): “The teacher recognizes and promotes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept within multicultural education.”

The Educational Leadership Internship program competencies [align](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2514) with the [HOUSSE-P](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/new-mexico.pdf) standards. Mentors assess candidates on how well the Intern demonstrated practice with each standard. The first HOUSSE-P standard is, “The Principal promotes the success of all students by maintaining a culture that supports student achievement, high quality instruction, and professional development to meet the diverse learning needs of the school community.”

The [Counseling Dispositions Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9) assesses criterion #8- Sensitive to issues of diversity (competent in counseling diverse clients).

**4d.2. How diverse are the PK-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice?**

The quality and diversity of candidates’ experiences are strongly inferred from the demographics of northern New Mexico, NMHU’s service area. Statewide, the New Mexico PK-12 enrollment is 56.7% Hispanic, 28.5% Caucasian, 10.7% Native American, 2.7% African-American, and 1.4% Asian-American.

In comparison to the statewide PK-12 student demographics, PK-12 school districts in SOE’s service area highlight a similar mean percentage of Hispanic students (57%), slightly fewer Caucasian students (25%), more Native-American students (15%), fewer African-American students (1%) and similar percentage of Asian / Pacific Islander students (1%). About 73% of the PK-12 students that we serve receive free and reduce meals; 27% have Special Education designations and 15% are English-Language learners.

Some candidates complete their Field Base 3 experience in Hispanic-serving schools in northern New Mexico with Hispanic populations of over 90% (West Las Vegas 95%, Mora 93%, Peñasco 90%), with increasing representation from Native Americans. The Farmington schools now teach a Native American population of over 30%. Many Farmington students live on the Navajo (Diné) reservation. Also, candidates complete their Field Base 3 experience in Pueblo Indian schools, small rural schools, or urban schools with recent immigrant populations. The Albuquerque Public Schools serve a significant first-generation Mexican-American population (17% English Language Learners).

**Table 10**

**District Demographics of SOE Field Base 3 (Student Teaching) Placements**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **% Female** | **% Male** | **%Caucasian** | **% African- American** | **% Hispanic** | **% Asian/Pacific Islander** | **% Native American** | **% English Language Learners** | **% Special Education** | **% Free/Reduce Meals** | **N = Total Students** |
| Alamogordo Public Schools | 49.1 | 51 | 51 | 7 | 37 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 16.6 | 56 | 6214 |
| Albuquerque Public Schools | 49 | 51 | 31 | 4 | 58 | 3 | 5.1 | 17 | 312 | 53 | 89,003 |
| Aztec Municipal School District | 49.1 | 51 | 61 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 17.3 | 50 | 3090 |
| Bernalillo Public Schools | 48.4 | 52 | 8.7 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 41 | 37 | 16.3 | 97 | 3308 |
| Belen Consolidated Schools | 49.4 | 52 | 25 | 2 | 71 | 0 | 1.8 | 5 | 19.3 | 82 | 4737 |
| Central Consolidated Schools | 48.3 | 52 | 8.4 | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 89 | 28 | 15.7 | 100 | 6766 |
| Des Moines Municipal Schools | 50 | 50 | 59 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 45 | 82 |
| Dulce Independent Schools | 48.5 | 52 | 1.2 | 0 | 5.3 | 0 | 94 | 35 | 14.4 | 100 | 682 |
| Española Municipal Schools | 50.8 | 49 | 2.6 | 1 | 90 | 0 | 6.5 | 27 | 11 | 100 | 4195 |
| Farmington Municipal Schools | 49.1 | 51 | 42 | 2 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 11 | 11.9 | 46 | 10,467 |
| Jemez Valley Public Schools | 46.3 | 54 | 17 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 50 | 16 | 17.7 | 64 | 356 |
| Las Vegas City Schools | 50.9 | 49 | 9.8 | 1 | 87 | 1 | 1.3 | 22 | 15.9 | 57 | 2003 |
| Los Lunas Public Schools | 48.3 | 52 | 25 | 2 | 66 | 1 | 6.6 | 11 | 14.5 | 68 | 8642 |
| Maxwell Municipal Schools | 40.8 | 59 | 48 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.4 | 100 | 98 |
| Mora Independent Schools | 51.5 | 49 | 6.6 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0.2 | 11 | 13 | 99 | 546 |
| Moriarty Municipal Schools | 48.7 | 51 | 59 | 1 | 37 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 12.1 | 51 | 3429 |
| Peñasco Independent Schools | 47.5 | 53 | 2.3 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 7.5 | 20 | 14.5 | 84 | 518 |
| Raton Public Schools | 50.8 | 49 | 37 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0.9 | 12 | 18.1 | 59 | 1369 |
| Rio Rancho Public Schools | 48.8 | 51 | 47 | 5 | 41 | 3 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 12.5 | 35 | 16,023 |
| Santa Fe Public Schools | 49.2 | 51 | 18 | 1 | 77 | 2 | 2.7 | 30 | 13.1 | 67 | 12,501 |
| Santa Rosa Consolidated Schools | 47.1 | 53 | 5.3 | 0 | 93 | 2 | 0.3 | 19 | 11.1 | 91 | 641 |
| Socorro Consolidated Schools | 49.2 | 51 | 21 | 2 | 71 | 11 | 4.6 | 0.6 | 15.2 | 55 | 1726 |
| Taos Municipal Schools | 47 | 53 | 14 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 6.8 | 13 | 16.5 | 100 | 2702 |
| West Las Vegas School District | 49.5 | 51 | 3.2 | 1 | 95 | 0 | 0.6 | 26 | 12.7 | 100 | 1647 |
| **TOTALS** | **48.6** | **51** | **25** | **1** | **57** | **1** | **15** | **15** | **27** | **73** | **180,745** |

**4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?**

The unit’s [Professional Development Schools](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408) Model [PDS], and Field-Based Experiences provide diverse experiences to candidates. Through the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531), [university supervisors](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002007-STmanual20-129201014535.pdf) formally assess candidates with the criterion “The NMHU Pre-service teacher respected the cultural differences of students within the classroom.” Also, they assess candidates with the criterion “The NMHU Pre-service teacher accepted suggestions and constructive criticism from the Cooperating Teacher.” With the “cultural differences” metric, 118 candidates rate 3.96 (of 4.00). With the “constructive criticism” metric, 118 candidates rate 3.96 (of 4.00). These ratings illustrate candidates are using their skills to teach [students from diverse groups](#Table_10).

The [Counseling Dispositions Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/002002-Handbook_-_C-129201011657.pdf) (p. 9) assesses the criterion “Being able to regard clients unconditionally, despite differences in cultural heritage, values, or belief systems.” The Educational Leadership Dispositions Inventory assesses the criterion, “Demonstrates an awareness that cultural differences and similarities exist and have an effect on values, learning, and behavior.”

Instructors of record expect all field-based candidates to write a reflective journal. University supervisors read and rate the journals. The candidates incorporate this feedback in their teaching.

In methods courses, candidates are required to plan and deliver lessons, in lab situations and in the classrooms. They receive feedback from their peers and from their course professor. In lab situations such as GNED 410/510, local high-school students hired by NMHU provide feedback to candidates. Candidates complete a component of the lesson plan which requires that they reflect after the lesson is taught. The reflection about diversity is expected.

In Field Base 3, candidates are required to create a portfolio of their experience. Reflection about diverse groups of student is a major component of the portfolio.

**4d.4. Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of PK-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here.**

[Dispositional Data](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2517)

**Optional**

**1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?**

The unit prepares candidates to integrate principles of multicultural education in everyday lessons. Respect for others is taught to children the same way that any values are taught—by modeling it, by practicing inclusive behaviors and by recognizing contributions of diverse groups to our society.

The SOE partners with independent organizations that add to the unit’s diversity. The administrators in these organizations also teach SOE courses integrating their research into the curriculum. The following partnerships are entwined strongly with the SOE:

The unit established the [Center for the Study of Diverse Populations [CESDP]](http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/youth-programs/enlace/index.html) which is housed in the Teacher Education Center [TEC]. CESDP faculty study the unmet needs of populations who encounter barriers to services and opportunities, and develops strategies for removing those barriers. The [Southwest Comprehensive Center for Region IX](http://www.nmhu.edu/academics/graduate/educationgrad/resources/index.aspx) is CESDP’s cornerstone.

[Literacy Council](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=462) of Northeastern New Mexico is based in the TEC Curriculum Library. The Literary Council provides tutoring services to help adults learn to read.

NEREC #4 ([Northeastern Regional Education Cooperative](http://www.rec4.com/)) is located in the TEC. Candidates are encouraged to attend NREC organized workshops, institutes and meetings. Practicing teachers and candidates attend these functions thus adding to their schemas. NREC offered day-long workshops on Special Education and the Law.

The [Spanish Immersion Program](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001680-SummaryofP-727200980914.pdf) prepares candidates before they take La Prueba, the NM Spanish proficiency exam. A SOE faculty coordinator offers opportunities to experience diversity from a linguistic and cultural perspective.

[Vistas Sin Limites](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/programs/vistassinlimites/index.aspx) is a non-profit vocational service agency that provides services to individuals who are developmental delayed, who struggle with mental health and or substance abuse issues. It is [CARF](http://www.carf.org/home/) accredited.

[ENLACE](http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/youth-programs/enlace/index.html) is a statewide educational initiative designed to increase opportunities for Latinos to enter and complete college.

**2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

[Lori Rudolph, Ph.D](http://www.mepja.org/node/143/). presented her [research](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/research/FRC/frcgrants.aspx): *Palestinian Women: Trauma Coping and Resilience* at the NMHU Faculty Research Day in Spring 2011 at Las Vegas. Previously, during the faculty meeting of 25 October 2010, Dr. Rudolph shared her experience of working with her former colleague, Areej Jafari. Ms Jafari is a noted speaker with valuable experience and insight regarding the treatment of women in Palestine. [Jafari presented](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2530) at the Rio Rancho center on 5 November 2010. Dr. Rudolph emphasized this type of speaking engagement would contribute to the strengthening of our culture at NMHU, developing community.

Palestinians are the longest-standing refugees in modern history. The special needs of and challenges faced by Palestinian refugee women in particular are varied and complex. Since the onset of the second Intifada or uprising, the political, economic and social situation in Palestine has drastically deteriorated due to an escalation in the Israeli occupation and the resulting collapse of the Palestinian economy. The capacity of Palestinian women to cope with this new situation has been declining, and the number of women dependent on emergency assistance, particularly food assistance, has risen.

Women are subjected in to increasing violence and additional responsibilities within their households due to the death, imprisonment or unemployment of male members. The occupation has a particularly strong impact on women residing in refugee camps. With many men jailed or restricted in their ability to travel, women are increasingly the sole providers for and caretakers of their families.

Dr. Rudolph explored the ways in which Palestinian women at a refugee camp experience conflict, and the types of survival mechanisms and strategies of resistance they developed. Special consideration was given to the relationship between armed conflict, trauma coping and resilience from a gendered lens.

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS,

PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

**5a. Qualified Faculty**

**5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full and part-time professional education faculty?**

**Table 11**

**Qualification Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Full-Time Faculty** | | | | | |
| **Links to Curriculum Vitae** | **Contract** | **Title** | **Department** | **Site** | **Terminal Degree** |
| James Alarid | Tenured | Professor & Dir. of [Vistas Sin Limites](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/programs/vistassinlimites/index.aspx) | Special Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction in Education - 1976 – Univ. of New Mexico |
| Michael Anderson | Admin | Dean | School of Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Administration, Curriculum and Instruction - 1997 - Univ. of Nebraska - Lincoln |
| Dave Braun y Harycki | Admin / Tenure Track | Associate Dean /  Associate Professor | School of Education / Curriculum & Instruction | Rio Rancho / Las Vegas | Ed.D. Administration, Curriculum and Instruction - 2001 – Univ. of Nebraska - Lincoln |
| Jim Burns | Tenure Track | Dept Chair | Educational Leadership | Las Vegas/ Española | Ed.D. Educational Leadership and Policy Studies - 2007 - Univ. of Vermont |
| Patricia Martinez Burr | Term | Assistant Professor | Counseling & Guidance | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Candidate Family Studies - ABD - Univ. of New Mexico |
| Kathryn Dziekan | Term | Assistant Professor | Counseling & Guidance | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Rehabilitation Counseling - 2003 - Syracuse Univ. |
| Jayni Flores | Tenure Track | Associate Professor | Teacher Education | Rio Rancho | Ed.D. Curriculum and Instruction/Bilingual Education - 1985 - New Mexico State Univ. |
| Joan Gallini | Tenured | Associate Professor | Teacher Education | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Educational Research - 1979 - Florida State Univ. |
| Geri Glover | Term | Associate Professor | Counseling & Guidance | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Counseling - 1996 – Univ. of North Texas, Denton, TX |
| Aline Harrison | Term | Assistant Professor | Teacher Education | Santa Fe | Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction - 2008 - Univ. of South Florida |
| Stella Helvie | Tenure Track | Dept Chair | Special Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Early Childhood Education - 1980 - Texas Woman's Univ. |
| Emma Hummel | Term | Assistant Professor | Teacher Education | Farmington | M.A. Education/Early Childhood Reading - 1983 - New Mexico State Univ. |
| Michael Immerman | Tenured | Associate Professor | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction (Mathematics Education) - 1986 – Univ. of New Mexico |
| Meryl Kravitz | Tenured | Professor | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Educational Foundations/Linguistics - 1985 - Univ. of New Mexico |
| Effie Laman | Tenure Track | Assistant Professor | Special Education | Rio Rancho | Ed.D. Special Education - 2006 - Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, TX |
| Belinda Laumbach | Term | Visiting Professor | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Multicultural Teacher and Childhood Education - 1994, Univ. of New Mexico |
| Karen Lehman | Term | Assistant Professor | Special Education | Farmington | Ed.D. Special Education - 2008 - Washington State Univ. |
| George Leone | Tenured | Dept Chair | Counseling & Guidance | Las Vegas | Ph. D. Counselor Education - 1990 - St. Louis Univ. |
| Doug Main | Tenure Track | Associate Professor | Counseling & Guidance | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Rehabilitation Education and Research - 2002 - Univ. of Arkansas |
| Alice Menzor | Tenured | Dept Chair | Curriculum & Instruction | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Bilingual Education, Reading & Linguistics - 1984 - Univ. of New Mexico |
| Kara Moloney | Term | Assistant Professor | Curriculum & Instruction | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Literacy Studies - 2008 - Univ. of Nevada, Reno |
| Chris Nelson | Tenured | Professor | Special Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Educational Psychology - 1984 - Univ. of Kansas |
| Carolyn Newman | Tenured | Dept Chair | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction - 1993 - Univ. of Texas |
| Seonsook Park | Term | Visiting Professor | Curriculum & Instruction | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Literacy and ESL Education - 2009 - Univ. of New Mexico |
| Lori Rudolph | Tenure Track | Assistant Professor | Counseling & Guidance | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Counseling - 2002 - Univ. of New Mexico |
| Susan Rumann | Term | Visiting Professor | Special Education | Rio Rancho | Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction/Bilingual Ed - 1994 - NM State Univ. |
| Joseph Sabutis | Tenure Track | Assistant Professor | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Physics - 1983 - Univ. of Pittsburgh |
| Loretta Salazar | Term | Emeritus Associate Professor | Teacher Education | Las Vegas | Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction in Multicultural Teacher Education - 1997 – Univ. of New Mexico |
| Gayle Talaga | Term | Assistant Professor | Curriculum & Inst/ Ed Leadership | Farmington | Ed.D. Higher Education - 1992 - Indiana Univ. |

**5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?**

The unit is comprised of the following departments: Teacher Education, inclusive of Early Childhood Multicultural Education, Elementary Education, TESOL and Bilingual Education, and Secondary Education; Educational Leadership; Curriculum & Instruction; Counseling; and, Special Education. Ninety-three percent of full-time tenure, tenure-track, and retain-term faculty members hold terminal degrees. Of the 29 currently listed [faculty one is ABD and one earned an MA in Early Childhood Education and was a public school educator for 20 years.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2519) All have practical experience in their fields in PK-12 public school settings. Counseling faculty have practical experience in clinical settings. Faculty experience in program supervision, development. implementation, and evaluation qualifies them for their roles within the unit.

The unit gives preference to candidates with terminal degrees when hiring full-time faculty. The unit hires adjunct faculty when full-time tenure, tenure-track, and retain-term faculty have reached their teaching load, and to supervise candidates during field-based experiences. Most [adjunct faculty members have extensive backgrounds](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2518) as teachers and administrators in PK-12 public school settings.

When adjunct faculty candidates have similar backgrounds, holding terminal degrees are given hiring preference. Candidates ultimately benefit from faculty with strong PK-12 backgrounds. Their authentic clinical experiences help bridge the gap that often exists between theory and practice.

**5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?**

The unit follows the NMPED requirements that all PK-12 school-based faculty members (i.e., licensed practitioners in PK-12 schools who provide instruction, supervision, and direction for candidates during field-based experiences) be licensed in the areas they teach. All school-based faculty members are licensed teachers.

Field Base 3 coordinators and cooperating schools monitor the selection of school-based clinical faculty to ensure that they are highly qualified master teachers. The selection of school-based clinical faculty is vital to the preparation of the teacher candidates and interns. All school-based faculty for clinical practice must have at least three years of teaching experience with one year at the current grade level/subject, be licensed in the subject/grade level they are teaching, and be highly recommended by the principal or building administrator. When candidates are assigned to private schools, the unit requires equivalent competency for school faculty, including state Public Education Department teacher licensure.

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

All unit full-time faculty are qualified to be clinical faculty. Clinical supervisors of school-based candidates have a minimum of three years of PK-12 public school experience as teachers, counselors, program evaluators, and/or administrators before they are assigned to supervisory roles. University supervisors are contracted to conduct a minimum of three classroom observations and to [evaluate candidates](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2536) in the field. [The contemporary professional experiences of full-time faculty, who were university supervisors](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2519) of field-base candidates during Spring 2011, are highlighted in yellow.

Clinical university supervisors, who are not full-time faculty, meet the same requirements as full-time faculty. Often, they are retired PK-12 public school educators with extensive experience as teachers, counselors, and/or administrators. [The contemporary professional experiences of part-time faculty, who were university supervisors](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2518) of field-base candidates during Spring 2011, are highlighted in yellow.

The unit defines contemporary experience as employment and/or extensive involvement in the PK-12 setting during the past five years. In 2008, the unit established a priority to take teacher education into the field. During 2009, a Professional Development School [[PDS](#PDS)] with an emphasis in bilingual teaching was established at [Los Niños Dual Language Elementary School](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408) in Las Vegas City Public Schools. Since then, more PDS sites were piloted in Rio Rancho at Sandia Vista Elementary School (Curriculum & Instruction – Reading) and at Bloomfield High School (SPED). SOE center faculty from Rio Rancho and Farmington supervise candidates at all the [PDS sites](#PDS_sites). [The contemporary professional experiences of PDS site professors](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2519) of record during Spring 2011 are highlighted in aqua.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework and current research and developments in the fields?

The Assessment Team continuously develops, revises, and approves a standardized SOE syllabus template that reflects the philosophical and research concepts, instructional techniques, curricular development and assessment practices in a course. In each syllabus, faculty align course outcomes with the [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework), [New Mexico PED Competencies](#PED_Competencies_All), [NCA/HLC traits](#NMHU_Institutional_Standards), and [INTASC standards](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501). As a result of this alignment, the same course level assessments that determine attainment of course outcomes, also provide information about attainment of these broader outcomes.

In 2009, the unit adopted Chalk & Wire [C&W]. Since then, departments designated C&W assignments. The SOE uses C&W data to assess candidate attainment of [NMPED](#PED_Competencies_All) competencies through the metric of rubric criteria.

Faculty review the conceptual framework with candidates at the start of a course. Some instructors key assignments directly to the conceptual framework. In Spring 2010, the Classroom Management professor asked student teachers to use the eight SOE themes to build their management plan.

Prima facie evidence suggests that programmatic changes demonstrate an integration of instructional practices, including current research and developments in the field. In 2009, the Special Education program changed after program faculty analyzed NMPED requirements, candidate feedback, and current program trends. One change was to emphasize the use of “person first” language.

Responding to [NM House Joint Memorial Bill 16](http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/11%20Regular/LESCAnalysis/HB0074.pdf) (2010), the Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] Reading faculty reanalyzed its program. The faculty analyzed the C&I Reading program and the NM Legislative Education Study Committee’s [LESC] definition of “the science of reading.” In Spring 2011, they met with other NM Reading faculty and administrators at the NMHU Rio Rancho center. They concluded that the Reading courses reflect the National Reading Panel’s current literacy research and exceeds LESC’s “the science of reading” precepts.

During 2008-2009, principals were evaluated with a new system, the New Mexico Highly Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation for Principals and Assistant Principals [[HOUSSE-P](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/new-mexico.pdf)]. In 2010, the Educational Administration [EDLD] faculty redesigned and [realigned its course to match HOUSSE-P](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2514). However, five HOUSSE-P standards – although widely used – were never legislatively codified as expected. Therefore, this year, the EDLD program reverted to the original nine [Educational Administration Competencies](http://www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/nmac/parts/title06/06.066.0002.htm).

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Introduction to Teaching (GNED 201) informs candidates about the historical, philosophical and sociological foundations of education. In GNED 201, instructors assess candidates with [Pre-service Instructional Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2532). At all levels, faculty use the disposition inventories to counsel and advise candidates especially if warning signs are evident. GNED 201 candidates co-enroll in Field Base 1 [FB1]. They observe for 30 classroom-hours at three school levels. Candidates write a journal about their observations. Self-reflection is an assessed requirement.

Candidates continue the self-reflective process in FB2. Candidates observe for 60 classroom-hours. They reflect about their observations in journals and lesson plans. They apply academic concepts as they support their conclusions. In FB2, instructors assess candidates with the [Field Experience Disposition Inventory](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2531) .

Secondary education minors experience teaching in a lab setting in The Art and Science of Teaching in the Secondary Schools course. Peer feedback and self-reflective opportunities proliferate.

In RDED 315 and RDED 411/511, candidates develop a literacy-focused lesson plan with the classroom teacher during a 30-hour practicum. After candidates teach the lesson, they reflect about it from development to implementation and future revisions.

The NCA/HLC traits describe the institutional expectations of critical thinking. Every syllabus has these critical thinking expectations stated.

Classroom Management candidates write a comprehensive plan. Later, candidates implement the plan and self-assessment during student teaching.

Dispositions inventories related to unique programmatic requirements have been created to assess candidates’ dispositions in advanced and clinical programs.

Educational Leadership candidates write, implement and analyze action research projects. Internship experiences include self-reflection. Comprehensive exam questions require reflective thinking and problem solving skills. The thesis and oral defense must demonstrate critical thinking focused on the thesis topic and the supporting research.

**5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?**

The unit faculty is committed to excellence in teaching and in the scholarship of instruction. Course syllabi offer evidence that faculty engage candidates in diverse research-based, “Best Practice” methods for delivery of course content and for the assessment of candidate performance. Additionally, in the [Professional Development School](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408) model, these methods are field tested in authentic PK-12 school settings. Given the number of faculty members in the unit and the wide variety of theoretical views represented, it is not surprising that there exists a great deal of diversity in the types of instructional and assessment strategies modeled. Such diversity serves to expand and to enrich the educational experiences of candidates. Within this climate of diversity, however, there is faculty-wide agreement on the SOE’s [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework) and [themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506).

Instructional strategies used and modeled by unit faculty include lecture, small- and large-group discussion, student projects, micro-teaching, field-based instruction, coaching, live modeling, problem resolution exercises, case studies, simulations, collaboration, service learning, analysis of DVDs, technology-assisted instruction, hands-on experiences, action research and many others. Additionally, unit faculty members are strongly committed to the use of inquiry-based instructional approaches.

Faculty members also present and model a wide variety of assessment methods that demonstrate alternative ways of evaluating candidate performance. Examples of these assessment approaches include tests and quizzes, the muddiest point, human tableau, direct observation, discourse analysis, case study evaluations, candidate papers, candidate journals, and candidate problem-solving performances.

In 2009, the unit adopted Chalk & Wire [C&W] for candidate portfolio development and data management. Since then, departments designated assignments which candidates must complete as part of the course requirements and upload to C&W for assessment. Candidates may re-submit C&W assignments, ultimately providing formative assessments.

Faculty model differentiated instructional approaches to adapt to the instructional media used. When using ITV, Eluminate or Blackboard, faculty accommodate instruction[refer to the next section, 5b.4 for further details].

**5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?**

A strength of the SOE is the faculty use of instructional technology. Faculty integrate PowerPoint presentations, web pages, wikis, blogs, online discussion forums, podcasts, and videos into their instruction.

During the 2007 regular legislative session Senate Bill 209 sponsored the enactment of a statewide cyber academy and became law. NMHU is one of five higher education institutions to be involved in the first cohort through [IDEAL-NM](http://www.ideal-nm.org/). Unit faculty members have been involved in technology integration since that time.

The commitment to technology integration within the unit is reflected by the adoption of Chalk & Wire [C&W] in 2009-2010. Through C&W, candidates create electronic programmatic portfolios. In designated courses, candidates submit work via C&W. Technology integration occurs in the coursework for Teaching and Diagnosis of Reading (RDED 411/511). It addresses the NMPED and IRA Standard, “Use of technology to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.”

In Reasoning Skills for the School (GNED 425/525), candidates use media and technology to access, organize, create, and communicate information to solve problems and construct new knowledge, products, and systems. Candidates access, organize, create, apply, communicate, and evaluate information efficiently and effectively from a variety of print, non-print, and electronic sources to meet instructional goals. Candidates apply technological and information skills to areas of personal and academic interest by actively and independently seeking information, and demonstrating critical, discriminating reading and listening.

The Curriculum & Instruction [C&I] graduate program added technology as an area of concentration. The PK-12 and SOE collaboration created this concentration to respond to the instructional technology needs of school administrators.

In 2009-2010, candidates in C&I for Students with Moderate to Severe Exceptionalities (SPED 420/520) studied at Rio Rancho Middle School and Helen Cordero Elementary School [Albuquerque], as part of a Professional Development School Model. They developed a website with hotlinks for teachers to access and obtain community recreation and agency referral information. Many RDED candidates present their research projects with podcasts, videos, screen casts, or through online-presentation-programs.

All initial candidates enroll in Computer Applications in Education (GNED 444). In many courses, students utilize technology in course presentations like demonstrations of lesson plans. Also, students present their oral defenses through these technologies.

Unit faculty deliver distance education to all centers and sites with BlackBoard, Web CT, and Eluminate Live. Also, faculty use Instructional Television [ITV], Document Cameras, Instructor Work Stations, LCD projectors, microphones and speakers, remote controls and cameras, and Smartboard Technologies. [Educational Outreach Services](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/distancelearning/index.aspx) staff provide additional technology training during Faculty Development Week.

**5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?**

Candidates evaluate unit faculty in every course taught. These evaluations by candidates allow faculty to regularly assess their teaching. It helps them identify strengths and areas of needed improvement.

*The Annual Report of Faculty Activities* is a self-assessment tool that shows the faculty member’s productivity in teaching, scholarship and service over the past academic year. Participation in the evaluation process is considered part of a faculty member’s service to the institution. Documentation of these activities is not required in the report, however faculty is responsible for maintaining documentation in his/her office and supplying it upon request. Faculty members annually submit updated current curriculum vitas to the Chair, who forwards them to the Dean, VPAA and Human Resources.

Peer evaluations include categorical and narrative ratings, including classroom observation. These are forwarded to the Chair who performs an independent evaluation. If wide discrepancies exist, the Chair notes these and describes how (if at all) these discrepancies were reflected in his/her own evaluation. Transcribed/collated evaluations, including the Chair’s evaluation and recommendations are sent to the faculty member and discussed in a meeting with the Chair. Upon meeting and discussing evaluations with the Chair, the faculty member has the option to submit to the Chair any material in response to the evaluation materials previously discussed. Materials are forwarded to the Dean for review and any appropriate action.

If it is determined a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward promotion, or in cases in which a serious deficit in performance is identified, a meeting is held with the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean to discuss appropriate action. At the conclusion of the Annual Review process the faculty member develops a Faculty Professional Plan [FPP]. The FPP presents teaching, scholarship and service goals for one to five years and a strategy for meeting those goals. It reflects scholarship standards developed by the unit. FPPs are updated annually and submitted to the Chair. Plans are kept in the faculty member’s department file. The Chair meets with faculty members at the beginning of the Spring semester to discuss the FPP and help identify resources needed to reach their goals. This process allows faculty to reflectively and systematically assess their work as they develop and submit their FPP.

**5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship**

**5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?**

The role of research and scholarship at NMHU, and the ways in which scholarship supports learning, are acknowledged and supported by policies throughout the institution. [*The NMHU Handbook on Research Policy*](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/research/reseachhandbook/index2.aspx) contains statements of scholarly expectations.

A university-wide commitment to scholarship, research, and creative activity is evident in Article 22 - Mentoring and Faculty Professional Plans of the NMHU [Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf) [CBA]. The Faculty Professional Plan [FPP] reflects the scholarship standards developed by the unit. CBA Article 23.4.2 states, “Because what is considered appropriate scholarship, research, and creative activity may vary between disciplines, each academic unit will create its own criteria.” Later, it continues, “At the time of development of the criteria, each academic unit shall submit its criteria for scholarship to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review.”

In Spring 2010, SOE faculty created a scholarship matrix. The highest scholarship expectations are, “The faculty member has achieved recognition beyond the local region for scholarship or creative endeavor. Dissemination of data or creative material has resulted in the faculty member's work having an impact on theory and practice in the field. Students are direct beneficiaries of these activities as participants in their execution. In fields where external support can be obtained, either for funding or disseminating scholarship, such support is received by the faculty member. The faculty member’s performance fully demonstrates the criteria for scholarship in Section 23.4.2.”

After review, the Faculty Affairs Committee rejected the matrix. They concluded that CBA Section’s 23.4.2 language did not support the evaluative function of SOE scholarship matrix. However, they stated that it could be used as a non-evaluative statement of scholarship expectations. Currently, the scholarship matrix serves as a suggested, but non-prescriptive, statement of scholarly expectations.

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship?

The Survey of Faculty Non-Teaching Productivity illustrates the types of [scholarship activities](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2537) that faculty members do. The 2009-2010 survey of activities documents a high level of faculty scholarly activity. Of the 29 full-time unit faculty, 11 responded to the survey. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the respondents overall, and thirty-six percent (36%) of unit respondents participated on an externally funded grant in some capacity. Seventy-three percent (73%) of the respondents and eighty-two percent (82%) of unit respondents published or presented their work.

In the 2008-2009 academic year, the School of Education faculty productivity includes 15 publications (articles, chapter, books, and monographs); 91 presentations across New Mexico, 12 states and Washington DC, and six countries including Iceland, Mexico, Northern Ireland, Palestine, Taiwan, and Wales; and over $600,000 funded grant proposals. Approximately 72% of the SOE faculty published or presented at conferences. Seventeen of the 29 full-time faculty serve on local, regional, and national professional boards.

Research is not seen as an activity separate from teaching, but rather it is seen as a way of enhancing teaching. Dr. Burns, Educational Leadership Chair, says, “Being both a qualitative researcher and an instructor of Action Research in education, I truly enjoy actively engaging my students as researchers. What is wonderful about this process is the relationships that common engagement (and perhaps love) for research produces. Last semester, two Educational Leadership graduate students co-authored a publication for a study in which they assisted with the statistical analysis. Two recent Educational Leadership graduates presented their research at the 2009 Center for Teaching Excellence’s 17th Annual Action Research Conference.”

Candidates in Special Education presented research during the 2010 University’s Faculty Research Day. The data presented highlights a [STEM STARS Project](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=317), awarded to the SOE and the Math/Science Departments by the National Science Foundation [NSF]. The focus of the grant is to increase the number of students with disabilities in STEM education. This data was again presented by special education faculty at a 2010 Joint Annual Meeting [JAM 10] of NSF grant awardees.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

**5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?**

[NMHU’s mission](#NMHU_Mission_Statement) emphasizes service. Faculty serve a broad range of constituencies, including those that are culturally, ethnically and economically diverse. Faculty assist international candidates, Native-American organizations and Hispanic groups.

The [SOE’s mission](#SOE_MS) includes a significant service component, to serve New Mexicans through education, research, extension education, and public service. Specifically emphasized are innovative practices, overcoming barriers to learning, international activities, technology and literacy for New Mexico’s diverse populations.

[Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf) [Article 23] guides SOE faculty in NMHU’s service expectations to the unit, NMHU, and broader communities. The Curriculum & Instruction Masters cohorts delivered in Albuquerque and Santa Fe schools exemplify the SOE’s responsiveness to PK-12 school district needs. [Professional Development Schools](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=408) further integrates the SOE and school districts.

Other units’ and SOE’s faculty collaborate through [Professional Learning Communities](http://www.nmhu.edu/future/orientation/firstyearexperience.aspx) and candidate orientation sessions. SOE and A&S faculty created a University Studies major for candidates who cannot finish a SOE degree.

Likewise, faculty are officers of professional associations. Through these professional associations, faculty present papers, conduct hands-on workshops for other practitioners. Through these associations, faculty provide expertise at the local, state, national, and international levels. Examples of faculty involvement with professional associations include:

1. Chair and host a three-day the [American Council for Rural Educators](http://www.acressped.org/) [ACRES] conference in Spring 2011 located in Albuquerque,
2. Present at the [New Mexico IDEA Panel](http://www.ped.state.nm.us/SEB/idea/index.html) in Fall 2010,
3. Present at the [National Council for Exceptional Children](http://www.cec.sped.org/am/template.cfm?section=Home) [CEC] annual conference, 2010 and 2011,
4. Present at the [National Middle School Association](http://www.amle.org/) [NMSA/AMLE] annual conference.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in PK-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels. What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities?

A review of specific service activities from [SOE full-time faculty](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2520) vitas (n=29) yielded the following data. “Full-time faculty” constituted retained-term, tenure-track and tenured who were on staff in Spring 2011. The limitation of the study only included service activities started Fall 2008 and ended Spring 2011. However, if the faculty member was employed at another institution during part of the term of the study, the study still counted the service activity.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Types of  Service Activities** | **Full-time faculty**  **n= 29** | **%** |
| PK-12 schools | 8 | 27.5 |
| Local service | 23 | 79.3 |
| University committees | 14 | 48.2 |
| State service | 23 | 79.3 |
| National service | 10 | 34.4 |
| International service | 5 | 17.2 |

**5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance**

**5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, and graduate teaching assistants?**

The NMHU [Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 23)](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf) [CBA] governs faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure procedures for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The evaluative process depends on peer review. All CBA members participate in Annual Evaluation and submit an Annual Report of Faculty Activities. Peers review their colleagues' materials, conduct classroom observations, and write evaluation reports. Prior to the CBA, [*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf) regulated the peer review process of all faculty members.

Three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) define faculty performance. Each category’s criterion constitutes different CBA evaluations. Reflecting [NMHU’s mission statement](#NMHU_Mission_Statement), the demonstration of teaching excellence and candidate attention is scrutinized.

Types of Evaluation

Annual Evaluation: All CBA faculty members participate in an annual evaluation. Formative in nature, implemented plans showcase a faculty member’s development. Other CBA-described evaluations mirror the annual evaluation process.

Reappointment Review: All tenure-track faculty members hold one-year probationary appointments until granted tenure. Such appointments are subject to renewal on an annual basis at the sole discretion of the institution. During the faculty member’s first two years at NMHU, renewals are announced by 15 March. During a faculty member's third and subsequent years of probationary status, renewals are announced by the Friday before the Spring semester begins. The sixth year of probationary status is the Tenure Review Year.

Promotion/Tenure Evaluation: Tenure-track applicants for tenure, and promotion to associate professor or full professor undergo a summative evaluation of their performance and contributions to the institution. The peer evaluation results establish the faculty’s tenure or promotion recommendations to the administration. The administration informs the faculty member of its decision by the last day of the Spring semester.

Term and Retained-Term Faculty: [*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf) (Section 6) defines other non-CBA contractual positions. It defines term and retained-term contracts. “Faculty employed under a retained term contract must be given notice if the University determines not to re-hire the employee during the subsequent academic year in accordance with the same schedule as applies to Tenure-Track contracts.” Term faculty may not expect re-employment.

Term faculty are at-will employees. The Dean reviews the performance of term employees and provides recommendations to the VPAA.

The unit does not have teaching graduate candidates.

**5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations?**

**Annual Report of Faculty Activities**

Each year, except for the first year of employment, each faculty member shall submit to the Chair, three (3) weeks after the beginning of the Fall semester, an Annual Report of Faculty Activities. The Annual Report shall present the faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service over the past academic year. While documentation of these activities is not required in the report, the faculty member is responsible for maintaining such documentation in his or her office and supplying the documentation upon request. In addition, faculty members submit an updated current curriculum vitae to the Chair who forwards it to the Dean, VPAA, and Human Resources.

The foundation of the evaluation process is the triad of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to present evidence of his or her achievements and activities in each of the three areas. The criteria do not comprise a prescription to be followed, but rather an outline to be embellished and fleshed out so as to make the most compelling case possible to his or her colleagues. It should be recognized that teaching, scholarship, and service activities may overlap. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to include such activities under multiple headings for evaluation. In evaluation, faculty should explain and document how they contribute to the overall university mission through education, research and scholarship, and service. Bargaining unit faculty members are evaluated on the following categories: Teaching and Advisement; Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity; and Service.

To be awarded tenure and/or promotion, faculty members are required to demonstrate competence in all areas. For details refer to [the Collective Bargaining Agreement Section 5e.2 Evaluation Criteria.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2521)

**5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?**

Each Fall semester, when the peer annual review process concludes, every tenured and tenure-track faculty member develops a faculty development plan [FDP]. In it, the faculty member presents teaching, scholarship, and service goals for the coming year and a strategy for meeting those goals during the year. The FDP reflects the unit’s scholarship standard.

Illustratively, a FDP may include plans for the following: development of new courses, teaching methods or examination processes and the mastery of new subject matter or technologies. It may include a research agenda, writing projects and other creative work. Also, service activities within and outside of NMHU are outlined.

The demands of an individual’s career fluctuate eventually, so all three categories may not be included in every FDP every year. In such cases, the faculty member provides a brief statement acknowledging the lack of inclusion. Over the course of multiple years, however, activities related to each category should be included in each faculty member’s FDP, and every faculty member is evaluated on all three requirements for promotion and tenure. When designing an FDP, the faculty member is encouraged to review the unit’s scholarship matrixwhich provides examples of scholarship. In addition to scholarship, teaching and service information as related to the [conceptual framework](#Conceptual_Framework), the [unit’s mission](#SOE_MS) and [themes](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2506), and the results of the previous year’s annual review report are provided. The FDP should reflect the results of the peer annual review process, and include strategies for addressing any deficiencies identified during the annual review.

**5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

**5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?**

The faculty members and chair identify professional development needs for both individuals and the unit as they review the annual faculty professional activities reports and annual professional development plans. As defined in Article 22.2 of the NMHU [Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf), all faculty, regardless of their rank, shall participate in professional planning. Each Fall semester, after the conclusion of the Annual Review process, every tenured and tenure-track faculty member will develop a Faculty Professional Plan [FPP] in which the faculty member presents a set of teaching, scholarship, and service goals for the coming one to five years and a strategy for meeting those goals. It reflects scholarship standards developed by the unit.

FPPs are updated annually and submitted to the Chair. Plans are kept in the faculty member’s department file. The Chair meets with faculty members at the beginning of the Spring semester to discuss the FPP and help identify resources needed to reach their goals. This process allows faculty to reflectively and systematically assess their work as they develop and submit their FPP.

During the last 1.5 years, the Assessment Team and administration responded to the broader SOE and faculty needs through Chalk & Wire development. Also, department chairs learn more about their roles and responsibilities as the Collective Bargaining Agreement policies develop. Through discussions at the Assessment Team and Chair meetings, discussions clarified the faculty annual evaluation process. In department and center meetings, chairs, faculty and administrators share their understanding with other colleagues.

**5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?**

1. NMHU [Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf) (Article 14) and *The* [*Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf) support faculty sabbaticals. A sabbatical leave is awarded to provide time and resources for qualified members to revitalize themselves through writing, scholarship, travel, research, and/or further formal educational study.
2. Training provided through grant funding is available to faculty on a voluntary basis. One example of such training is the [STEM STARS Project](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=317) designed to increase the numbers of students with disabilities in STEM education.
3. In November 2008, NMHU Board of Regents approved expansion of an [Employee Educational Assistance Tuition Reduction Program](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/onlinedocuments/documents.aspx).
4. The [Genovevo Dominguez Pino Memorial Endowment for Faculty Development](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2527) is designed to provide faculty at NMHU an opportunity to further their development in the areas of teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service to the University and Community.
5. The [Nina Telsa Ballen Visiting Professor Endowment](http://its.nmhu.edu/www/onlinedocs/index.html) was formed to support an energized scholastic environment among the faculty at NMHU. The endowment brings a visiting scholar to NMHU for a two-week period each year.
6. The National Institutes of Health [NIH] awarded a grant to NMHU beginning in 2004. The grant can fund faculty development programs, including fellowships to provide release time for faculty to prepare and submit applications for research funding to the NIH.
7. Faculty Research Committee [FRC] funds are given for research seed money, in which the intent of the researcher is to gather preliminary data; tenure-track researchers who are just getting started and need funding to establish themselves at NMHU; and, researchers who are also concurrently pursuing external funding, especially for continuing initiatives.
8. Recently, a faculty member received a Fulbright Scholarship for her [research](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/research/FRC/frcgrants.aspx) with Palestinian women who experience trauma. NMHU will grant her a sabbatical for Spring 2012.
9. The Chalk & Wire Coordinator held faculty development sessions and [Educational Outreach Services](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/distancelearning/index.aspx) staff provide additional technology training during Faculty Development Week.

**5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, and graduate teaching assistants.**

The most recent [Faculty Development Survey](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2522) covered the time period from Fall 2009 through Spring 2011. [The 30 full-time faculty](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2523) (retained term, tenure track and tenured) participated in 57 (35.1%) professional development activities which took place on campus; 69 (42.5%) professional development activities took place off campus; and 36 (22.2%) professional development activities occurred via Webinar. Full-time faculty participated in a total of 162 professional development activities. On average, full-time faculty participated in 5.4 professional development activities during the time frame.

[The 60 part-time faculty](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2523) or adjuncts are not required to participate in professional development activities. However, they responded that they participated in 22 professional development activities.

Of these, 13 (59.0%) activities were located on campus; six (27.2%) activities occurred off campus; and three (13.6%) professional development activities were via Webinar.

The unit does not have teaching graduate candidates.

**STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES**

**6a. Unit Leadership and Authority**

**6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?**

The constitutionally-independent Board of Regents is at the apex of authority at NMHU. The Board of Regents hires and supervises the university president. In descending order, the hierarchical structure continues with the Vice President of Academic Affairs [VPAA], Associate VPAA, [the SOE Dean, the Associate Deans, five elected department chairs](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540), and SOE faculty. While the Dean assumes responsibility for the unit’s program, SOE faculty plan, review, deliver, assess and modify programmatic decisions. The SOE works closely with faculty across the campus. The general education core program for education candidates is taught in departments delivering content area instruction within the university. In the secondary education program, Arts and Sciences faculty administer content major programs. A [SOE A&S faculty liaison](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2493) collaborates with these units to ensure delivery of appropriate coursework necessary to complete [New Mexico Public Education Department](http://www.ped.state.nm.us/) [PED] licensure requirements.

The SOE is the unit with primary responsibility and authority to plan, deliver, operate and verify teacher education programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including BA and post- baccalaureate teacher licensure. While located primarily in the SOE, candidate preparation is a university-wide collaborative. At the undergraduate level, elementary, special education, and early childhood education candidates declare majors within the SOE. At the secondary level, teacher education candidates major in an academic area of their content.

SOE faculty under unit leadership endorsed the nine [New Mexico Teacher Competencies](http://bit.ly/NMPED) that [align](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2501) to the ten INTASC Principles, eight New Mexico School Counselor Competencies, and five New Mexico State School Administrator Competencies. All faculty monitor the appropriate standards and ascertain that standards are being met by all candidates seeking licensure at the completion of the licensure programs.

At the state level, Education Deans and Directors meet monthly. The invited members are public and private higher-education administrators of teacher preparation programs in New Mexico. Members include PED representatives, [Higher Education Department](http://www.hed.state.nm.us/) [HED] representatives, legislative education committee representatives and state and national accreditation consultants. Discussion topics include statewide education initiatives, accreditation visits, and legislative and budgetary information. The NMHU SOE Dean is a regular participant. His attendance has raised the NMHU SOE profile statewide.

The SOE Dean has campus-wide responsibilities for teacher education programs. He seeks participation and guidance from a wide range of constituencies to coordinate the University’s collaborative preparation of future teachers. The SOE Dean is an active member of the President’s Cabinet. The President’s Cabinet members include other units’ deans and academic program administrators, fiscal offices, candidate support services and infrastructure responsibilities. The President’s Cabinet meets twice monthly. In the meetings, the SOE Dean addresses issues affecting the SOE accreditation, programmatic changes and other SOE ancillary topics of concern to other programs.

The Dean is guided by the Assessment Team, comprised of SOE elected department chairs, field-experience faculty members, and other designated faculty members; the Dean’s Advisory Council, comprised of community members, LEA representatives, Northeast Regional Educational Cooperative [[NREC](http://www.rec4.com/)] director and district superintendents, and School of Arts and Sciences faculty members**.**

The Advisory Council, like all meetings at NMHU (with few exceptions), follows the [Open Meetings Act of New Mexico](http://www.nmag.gov/office/Divisions/Civ/OMAIPRA/default.aspx) and is open to anyone wishing to attend.

Formed in Fall 2009 when an ad hoc assessment committee combined with the department chairs committee, the Assessment Team serves as the unit-level leadership team. The Dean of the SOE sets the agenda based on member input. Changes within NMHU programs leading to licensure, endorsements, and degree plans are brought to the attention of the Assessment Team for discussion. Assessment data is reviewed and data-driven decisions are planned and implemented. The Assessment Team meets weekly to discuss and make decisions on issues surrounding teacher education. Departmental needs are forwarded for discussion. Pursuing the SOE’s goal of reaccreditation, a culture of assessment developed.

After discussion, policy issues and program changes needing university-wide committees’ approval are sent to the SOE general faculty for review and formal adoption during its monthly meeting. Faculty-controlled trans-university committees, e.g., [The Faculty Senate](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/index.aspx) and [Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx), formally review SOE policies and programmatic changes. These faculty committees, along with the President’s cabinet, are where SOE activities, assessment information and program development are shared with faculty and administrators from other units that help prepare SOE candidates.

**6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogs?**

Student Recruitment, Academic Support staff and the SOE faculty collaboratively recruit prospective, first-year, first-generation, non-traditional candidates and community college transfer candidates. NMHU recruiters and the SOE faculty together actively seek Hispanic and Native American prospects. A vibrant international candidate population integrates well into NMHU’s diverse environment.

Student Recruitment and Academic Support personnel plan recruiting events. Faculty and department representatives lead building tours of high school honors candidates. SOE faculty participate during Campus Day and College Night. NMHU recruiters travel to high schools and community colleges promoting SOE programs. Prior to each semester, NMHU advertises SOE programs through a variety of media in regions surrounding main campus, the three centers and three sites.

Faculty engagement through service and scholarship promote the SOE. Faculty and recruiters meet to share program changes. The SOE Assessment Team reviews brochures representing SOE programs. The Assessment Team reviews and standardizes SOE information distributed at the centers, the sites and main campus.

The Graduate office and SOE graduate departments collaboratively recruit. Grant-funded tuition opportunities attract graduate students. The [Land of Enchantment Teacher Quality Partnership](https://www.educatorsupportcenter.com/grants/letqp/) recruits new Special Education and Educational Leadership candidates.

NMHU website links to statements of recruitment policies. The SOE web pages link to graduate program admission requirements and licensure requirements. The Office of University Relations reviews all documents intended for external audiences including all information presented on the website. A [The Faculty Senate](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/index.aspx) subcommittee asks faculty to send departmental corrections and changes to the University Relations Office.

The VPAA approves all catalog academic descriptions and recruitment policies. The [Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx) and the Registrar’s Office approve all NMHU catalog information.

**6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?**

The Office of University Relations is responsible for all university publications and advertising. University Relations reviews every document intended for external audiences. This includes information presented on the website as well as printed materials.

NMHU Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs*,* 2011-2013 contain the academic calendar, admission, university and program information and grading policies. Both catalogs are updated/printed on a two-year rotation. A new University policy that allows catalogs to be updated electronically keeps the catalogs current. The information in the catalogs is approved by both the [Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx) and the Office of the Registrar. All descriptions of academic offerings must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Unit leadership is responsible for coordinating undergraduate and graduate catalog content, handbooks and unit program frameworks. Department chairs review catalogs for accuracy at a designated Assessment Team meeting.

The Board of Regents approves academic calendars. Academic Affairs governs grading policies developed by department faculty. Every effort is made to maintain consistency and accuracy.

**6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to candidate services such as advising and counseling?**

The Office of Academic Support (OAS) offers services with special emphasis on academic advisement. Staff is available to ensure assistance in assessing interests, skills and abilities.

The OAS advises freshman candidates and collaborates with SOE faculty. The OAS informs teacher-education prospects of required courses and programs of study.

NMHU offers free tutoring. Candidates may schedule or drop-in for individual sessions. Math tutors assist candidates who struggle with Math for Elementary Teachers 115, 130 and Math 140 (College Algebra). NMHU tutoring services aid those from diverse groups with cultural, social and academic support.

Faculty advise all levels of candidates. At undergraduate SOE admission or graduate programmatic admission, department chairs assign candidates to major advisors. During 2010-2011, a SOE initiative required non-degree seeking graduate candidates with 12 or more credits to complete the Graduate Admission Packet. With an approved Program of Study, candidates declare a specific graduate program. This initiative effectively enforced Graduate Gateway Alpha. Undergraduate Gateway Alpha enforces undergraduate SOE admissions or initial licensure admissions. Since Fall 2010, the Associate Dean reviews SOE admissions through Chalk & Wire [C&W], the electronic portfolio and assessment system.

Instructors introduce the SOE admission process in Introduction to Teaching. They advise about testing requirements and timelines. C&W posts reinforce the step-by-step electronic submission process.

At the graduate level, the Counseling Program requires an in-person interview during the admission process. The candidate is assessed and advising occurs. With an acceptance letter, the Dean assigns an advisor. During the first core-course, the Educational Leadership Chair introduces the program admission process and programmatic requirements. Other graduate programs advise candidates during regular meetings.

[For details refer to 6a.4 Advising Cont.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2524)

**6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?**

The unit ensures that participation in program design, implementation and evaluation includes content-area faculty and SOE faculty and administrators, teachers and administrators from PK-12 schools. The unit also provides mechanisms for collaboration within the university.

Each semester, the SOE Advisory Council meets and advises the Dean. Advisory Council members participated in a SOE-sponsored [November 2010 Data Retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533). Advisory Council members analyzed and recommended changes during their participation in the data-driven discussions. The Advisory Council members include faculty members from other NMHU units, and the Northeast Regional Educational Cooperative [[NREC](http://www.rec4.com/)] director and district superintendents.

Through undergraduate field-based experiences and graduate internship programs, cooperating teachers and site supervisors inform faculty about strengths and weaknesses of the program. Many unit [adjunct professors have deep connections to the school districts](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2518) in the regions surrounding the main campus, the centers and the sites. In some cases, practicing principals or instructional leaders are hired to teach unit courses. Many adjunct professors recently have retired from public school positions. At least five members of the New Mexico Association Middle Level Educators board of directors teach for the School of Education. Through the process of hiring, evaluating, and working with expert practitioners, the unit is provided a reflective lens into its practices.

SOE faculty members often provide in-service training to local school districts, further strengthening the collaborative relationship between the school and the unit. Faculty and administrators participate in classroom activities and attend school board meetings. During the last two years, faculty and administrators attended school board meetings in Kirtland (Farmington), Rio Rancho and Santa Fe. Relationships built through professional activities allow for continuing conversations between the public schools and the unit.

**6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?**

SOE faculty collaborates with other NMHU academic units. Starting Spring 2011, the Dean appointed a [SOE A&S faculty liaison](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2493). The liaison meets with A&S department chairs and faculty to prepare for the NCATE accreditation process. The liaison informs content-area departments of unit requirements. Through written reports, she describes A&S departmental concerns and considerations to the Associate Dean and the Assessment Team. The liaison prepares the secondary accreditation portfolios for the Board of Examiners review.

Prior to the establishment of a unit liaison to the A&S, content-area department chairs attended the SOE data retreat in November 2010. They participated as active members of subcommittees that reviewed assessment data and engaged in data-driven discussions and recommendations. The College of A&S faculty serve on the SOE Advisory Council. They meet each semester to review unit policies and activities. They advise the SOE Dean about possible programmatic improvements.

The College of A&S and the SOE faculty collaborate in a [Learning Community](http://www.nmhu.edu/future/orientation/firstyearexperience.aspx)- entitled Teachers 4 Tomorrow. For the last two Fall semesters, the course integrates English and Introduction to Teaching curricula.

In Fall 2009, National Science Foundation grant funded the [STEM STARS Project](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=317). The project sought to increase enrollment and graduation rates for students with disabilities in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math. SOE, Math and Biology professors collaborated with the project.

Faculty and administrators participate in pan-university committees. Each semester, the NCATE coordinator presents to [The Faculty Senate](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/index.aspx), representing all NMHU departments. College of A&S faculty senators have discussed the NCATE process. Likewise, [Academic Affairs Committee](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultysenate/academicaffairs.aspx) will receive an *Institutional Report* final draft. At the President’s Cabinet meeting, the SOE Dean regularly updates administrators from other units about the NCATE accreditation process.

**6b. Unit Budget**

**6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?**

The state, like the rest of the nation, is currently facing revenue shortfalls that result in significant cuts to state funding for higher education. The state general fund accounts for the largest proportion of appropriations for education (including higher education), [about 60% of total appropriations](http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lfc/lfcdocs/finance%20facts%20GF.pdf). Higher education is allocated about [15% of all state general funds](http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lfc/lfcdocs/finance%20facts%20GF.pdf).

The unrestricted operating budget for the unit for FY12 is 2.75 million with 2.1 million of that figure allocated for salaries. Professional salaries account for approximately 9% of that figure and fulltime faculty salaries for approximately 67%. The budget for salaries includes approximately 6% for two and a half support staff dedicated to the unit. Approximately $60,000 is budgeted for supplies and expenses, and $26,500 for travel.

The School of Social Work [SSW] has been chosen for comparative purposes. Both schools have field-based components, have BA and MA programs, accommodate full and part-time students, operate programs at several sites around New Mexico, and show rapid growth in the Albuquerque/Rio Rancho area.

The unrestricted operating budget for the SSW for FY12 is 1.8 million with 1.23 million of that figure allocated for salaries. Professional salaries account for approximately 19% of that figure and fulltime faculty salaries account for approximately 57%. The budget for salaries includes approximately 8% for two and a half support staff dedicated to the unit. Approximately $100,000 is budgeted for supplies and expenses and $12,900 for travel.

The SSW budgets for approximately twice as many professional staff; less than half the number of fulltime faculty; and, a similar number of support staff. The SSW budgets over twice as much for supplies and expenses to operate their unit and has the additional expense of a building lease.

According to the NMHU Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research [[OIER](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/institutionalresearch/OIERreports.aspx)], Fall 2010 census reports 319 SOE undergraduate candidates and 380 SOE graduate candidates. Comparatively, OIER reported 243 SSW undergraduate candidates and 363 SSW graduate candidates. The SOE graduate census is low due to undeclared candidates. According to these data, the SOE budgets approximately $3,300 per candidates in salaries, $95 per candidate in supplies and expenses, and $40 per candidate in travel. The SSW budgets approximately $2,000 per candidate in salaries, $165 in supplies and expenses, and $20 in travel.

[For details refer to SSW & SOE Budgets 6b.1.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2525)

**6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY09** | **FY10** | **FY11** | **FY12** |
| **School of Education** |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | 2,065,453.00 | 2,093,469.00 | 2,092,703.00 | 2,095,942.00 |
| Fringe Benefits | 601,832.00 | 595,165.00 | 565,069.40 | 567,656.00 |
| Supplies & Expenses | 58,369.00 | 59,369.00 | 57,710.00 | 59,866.00 |
| Travel | 30,000.00 | 29,000.00 | 26,493.00 | 26,500.00 |
| **Total Budget** | 2,755,654.00 | 2,777,003.00 | 2,741,975.40 | 2,749,964.00 |

NOTE: [In 2009-2010 budgets for LV/Main Campus were held in Dean's Office in Las Vegas](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540). At each site, the SOE budget was a portion of the entire site's budget.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **UNIT/LOCATION** | **FY 10 – 11** | **(NO BREAKDOWN)**  **SOE INCLUDED IN**  **SITE TOTAL BUDGET** |
| SOE - Office of the Dean | $164,545.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE - Main Campus | $339,795.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE - Counseling | $484,405.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE - Curriculum & Instruction | $310,841.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE - Educational Leadership | $214,325.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE -Special Education | $332,420.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| SOE - Teacher Education | $789,342.00 | Main Campus – LV |
| **TOTAL** | **$2,635,673.00** |  |

NOTE: [In FY 2010-2011 budgets were centralized in Las Vegas but disaggregated by department](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540) for departmental control.

The cuts to higher education have been extensive. Since Fall 2008, NMHU has experienced a decrease of 19% in our state appropriations. At the same time, due to the economic situation more students are staying in school or pursuing a degree. Over the last year, all institutions in New Mexico faced enrollment increases at a time when state funding declined. Administrators have found ways to increase the availability of programs to more people.

**6c. Personnel**

**6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty?**

The [Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001348-CollectiveB-130200952439.pdf) (Article 12) addresses workload policies for those who are part of the bargaining unit. Article 12.1 describes the normal teaching load. Article 12.2 lists the non-teaching duties. The full-time faculty contractual days are described in Article 12.6. Article 12.12 outlines the compensation for department chair duties. [*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf) (Section 2) fully describes the department chair duties.

[*The Faculty Handbook*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/000747-nmhu_faculty-12192007125832.pdf) applies to all faculty, including those not covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Section 3 and Section 6 address workload policies and expectations.

**6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?**

At the initial licensure level, candidate supervision during ECME and Special Education practica, Field Base 1 and Field Base 2 experiences are compensated with faculty teaching load assignment. Field Base 1 is observational and requires no direct candidate supervision from SOE faculty. Primarily, candidates attend classes in three different levels of schools (e.g. elementary, middle and high school). Experiences are shared in the Introduction to Teaching course. Organizational activities, such as the facilitation of candidate background checks, necessitate a faculty workload assignment. Field Base 3 coordinators are assigned the course load for GNED 451 (student teaching) because of the need for SOE professors of record for candidate grades. In Spring 2011, the Dean and another faculty member supervised student teachers pro-bono.

At the advanced level, in Educational Leadership and Counseling internships, faculty are assigned to specific practica and internship courses. They are compensated as part of a teaching load.

**6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?**

The faculty workloads compare to any comprehensive university. The 12-credit full-time workload requirement results in most faculty teaching four courses per semester. Department chairs cap most initial licensure level courses at 24 students. The professor and administrators both must approve course capacity overloads. Graduate-level course capacities are generally less with most advanced courses capped at 12 students. In Spring 2011, undergraduate SOE classes averaged 7.5 candidates. SOE graduate mean class size was 5.8 candidates.

The VPAA approves faculty release time. For their responsibilities, all department chairs received 0.25 FTE release. The Department of Teacher Education Chair receives 0.5 FTE release because the size of her department. The Field Base Coordinator receives 0.25 release time during the semester and a 10-month contract. The [Vistas Sin Limites](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/programs/vistassinlimites/index.aspx) Director receives 0.5 FTE release. A grant supplements 0.25 FTE of a vocational counseling faculty’s contract. The main-campus Associate Dean receives 0.5 FTE release from faculty workload as NCATE coordinator who wrote the *Institutional Report* and gateway reviewer who monitors student progress through the gateways. In Spring 2011, the Chalk & Wire coordinator received 1.00 FTE release for accreditation and assessment-related activities.

Candidate ratings of advising criteria range from 2.44 to 3.20 (of 4.00). They rated advising lower than other criterion. Rio Rancho Center candidates differ from those who attend main campus, the sites or other centers. The majority are graduate candidates who more frequently drop-in for advising. Main campus candidates tend to be traditional undergraduate candidates. Main campus candidates tend to be traditional undergraduate candidates. To improve advising and student-support services, the VPAA recently reorganized the Rio Rancho staff. The implementation of [Degree Works](http://www.sungardhe.com/Solutions/DegreeWorks/), an online advising program, will help candidates answer basic advising questions.

[Supplementary Assessment Data for 6c.3](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2539)

**6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity,**

**coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?**

Part-time and full-time faculty decide programmatic issues. Those who teach graduate candidates, with few exceptions, hold terminal degrees. Many part-time faculty either are active or retired public school teachers, counselors and administrators. Some adjunct faculty participate at the state-level of educational policy formation. The main-campus Associate Dean, who serves as NCATE coordinator, is a part-time faculty member. Also, he serves as an elected non-voting faculty senator representing the Department of Curriculum & Instruction.

All SOE meetings are open and part-time faculty are invited to participate. From the centers and sites, adjuncts may participate through ITV. They are invited to and receive the minutes of the general SOE faculty meetings. However, schedule conflicts limit participation. By design, there is a part-time faculty member on the SOE Assessment Team. Adjunct faculty attend and receive minutes from the SOE RR/center meetings. Part-time faculty participated in the [November 2008 retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2507), thus assisting with the crafting the [SOE Conceptual Framework](#Conceptual_Framework). Again, during the [November 2010 data retreat](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2533), they interpreted field-base data reports from their perspective as adjunct faculty and university supervisors of student teachers. Adjunct faculty members participated in the Summer Data Discussion series through email correspondence. The August 2011 data retreat reunited adjunct and full-time faculty members who reviewed the *Institutional Report*.

To ensure the quality of the program, candidates evaluate part-time faculty members. When questions of quality arise, department chairs and the Dean review the complaint and the data. If required, they change personnel. During the Fall 2011 Data Retreat, all new faculty received a CD with SOE policies and forms. Some departments have written their own [policy handbooks](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2535) that they disseminate to part-time faculty members.

**6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an**

**adequate number of support personnel?**

In Las Vegas, there are three SOE administrative assistants (two full-time and one 0.5 FTE). There is a faculty secretary assigned to field experiences in Las Vegas. There is one 0.8 FTE SOE administrative assistant in Rio Rancho. At the centers and sites, there are support personnel who are not specifically assigned to the SOE, but help NMHU candidates in general. At Las Vegas, there are four SOE graduate assistants who help faculty and / or administrative assistants. One graduate assistant staffed the Teacher Education Center Curriculum Library. At Rio Rancho, there were two graduate candidates. One was assigned to the field base coordinator and the other was assigned to a faculty member who worked on NCATE and Chalk & Wire. In Summer 2010, during a SOE staff restructuring, the Associate Dean and new staff met formally.

As the center population has grown, the SOE has had to analyze how to allocate resources. The administration and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Association recently addressed a faculty grievance with regard to allocation of resources. For the process used to resolve this grievance refer to [grievance description.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2526)

[Key Assessment Data for 6c.5](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)

**6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?**

During 2009-2010, each faculty member was allocated $550 for professional development. With the downturn in the economy, NMHU administrators eliminated the line item support for faculty travel and other costly professional development activities. However, there are free professional development opportunities on campus. There is faculty development support for presentation of papers and conducting research through the Research Committee. Special funds were secured for NCATE professional development.

The [Genovevo Dominguez Pino Memorial Endowment for Faculty Development](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2527) provides faculty at NMHU an opportunity to further their development in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service to the University and Community.

“Faculty Development” is defined as: Any activity undertaken by an NMHU faculty member that enhances their teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service to the university and community.

“Faculty Member” is defined as: Any faculty that works at NMHU or existing NMHU Centers who is tenured, tenure track, librarian or a visiting professor who has worked full time for at least three years.

The intent of the Pino Endowment Award is to provide all qualifying faculty members the opportunity to further their development in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service to the University and Community. Funds can be utilized for travel and registration for activities that enhance faculty development. Funds are not used to pay for travel and registration for presentation at conferences, to support sabbaticals, and emeritus faculty. Therefore, eligible faculty members receiving the award are not allowed to reapply for faculty development funds for a period of two years.

When the academic year starts, faculty participate in [Faculty Development Week](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultydevelopment.aspx). Daily activities orientate new faculty and increase faculty development capacity with all faculty. On 18 August 2011, during Faculty Development Week, the SOE held a data retreat to review the *Institutional Report*.

**6d. Unit facilities**

**6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning?**

In Las Vegas, the SOE occupies the Victoria D. de Sanchez Teacher Education Center [TEC], a three-story building. The first floor houses the SOE office, two wings of faculty offices, [NREC](http://www.rec4.com/) and [Vistas Sin Limites](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/programs/vistassinlimites/index.aspx) offices, two early childhood classrooms, a computer lab, Vocational Rehabilitation Center and the Curriculum Library. The second floor accommodates the [CESDP](http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/youth-programs/enlace/index.html) office. The top two floors have classrooms and the NREC on the third floor.

The SOE occupies most of the two-story [Rio Rancho center](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/riorancho/index.aspx). A few Business and one Social Work faculty maintain offices in Rio Rancho. Faculty and staff offices occupy both floors. There are 15 dedicated classrooms with a total capacity of 246 students. The SOE suite is located on the second floor. The first floor has a small library. There are two computer labs with 49 student-available computers.

An alumnus donated a former two-story bank building for the [Raton site](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/raton/index.aspx). During Summer 2011, the Raton site was totally renovated to better support faculty and candidates. Offices and classrooms occupy the first floor. The second floor has classrooms. Raton maintains seven classrooms with two more that will be added shortly. Students may access 22 computers. Santa Fe Community College [SFCC] rents rooms to NMHU in the basement of their West Wing. SFCC gives access to five classrooms for the NMHU [SF site](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/santafe/index.aspx). The SF site added three additional ITV rooms in Summer 2011. New construction of a Learning Center at SFCC will provide additional space for NMHU.

One [Española site](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/espanola/index.aspx) is in a former strip mall and the other is at the [CESDP](http://www.nmhu.edu/FacultyStaff/facultydevelopment.aspx) offices. Currently, no SOE faculty have offices in SF, Española, or Raton. The Center staff service student needs. San Juan Community College [SJC] rents the [Farmington center](http://www.nmhu.edu/statewidecenters/farmington/index.aspx) five rooms for classes and two faculty offices. Students may borrow laptops from the Farmington staff for course work. They may use SJC computers also. SJC and SFCC provide the internet infrastructure for the distance education programs delivered there.

On 10 June 2009, StudioInsite presented [*The New Mexico Highlands University Campus Master Plan*](http://its.nmhu.edu/IntranetUploads/001784-NMHUMaster-825200982504.pdf)*.* They studied the goal to increase enrollments without adding space, classes or faculty. The architects concluded that enrollments could expand 25% in the Victoria D. de Sanchez Teacher Education Center [TEC] in Las Vegas. Likewise, enrollments could expand 25% in Donnelly Library in Las Vegas (p. 14). Also, they researched the goal of increase enrollments by scheduling more classes in rooms that are under-utilized. They concluded that the TEC is only 48.3% utilized. Donnelly Library is 74.2% utilized (p. 17).

TEC houses the Instructional Materials Evaluation Center that contains publisher-supplied samples of state-approved PK-12 texts and materials. The Center functions as a regional [curriculum library](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=462), providing selected samples of resources for short-term loan. Through the Curriculum Library, selected SOE programs make course textbooks and reference materials available to candidates for checkout. In the Curriculum Library, the [Literacy Council](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=462) has space. In 2010, NMHU facilities remodeled the TEC Curriculum Library and the SOE office. [Refer to Technology 6d.1.](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2528)

**6e. Unit resources including technology**

**6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?**

The allocation of resources starts with the faculty in departments. [During 2011, the unitary SOE budget was separated into five departmental budgets](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2540). Department chairs request budget allocations. At the departmental level, chairs prioritize faculty requests. In Spring, all chairs together meet with the SOE administrative assistant and the Associate Dean. The SOE administrative assistant responsible for budgets, produces the previous year’s budgets. Adjustments are made based on need.

The administrative assistant produces a formal budget request that is taken to a budget hearing. The Institutional Budget Director, Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President of Financial Affairs convene a budget hearing in the Teacher Education Center. Each department chair advocates for the department’s request and inquiries are answered. About two months after the budget hearing, in early July, the new budgets are uploaded into the budgeting system software.

Department chairs manage their budgets and coordinate with the SOE administrative assistant. The administrative assistant advises chairs when budget amounts are low or when spending deadlines approach.

**6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?**

The SOE equips each faculty office with a PC computer. All Las Vegas faculty offices have printers. At other sites, faculty print to a common printer.

Two years ago, misplaced paperwork between main campus, centers and sites was problematic. The improvement of the paperwork process became a major focus of staff and faculty. Last year, the SOE offices in Rio Rancho and Las Vegas bought copier/scanners. The scanners create digital files that attach to emails. All centers, sites and the main campus office digitized all candidate files in January 2011. The digitized files remain in the Associate Dean’s office. Rio Rancho, the largest SOE site, maintains contemporaneous digitized candidate records. All candidate paperwork is given to the SOE administrative assistant for processing, copying and scanning to Las Vegas and filing Rio Rancho in the common file room. The scans greatly reduced the misplacement of candidate records between sites and main campus. Centers and sites maintain redundant records until the documents leave the center for the main office in Las Vegas.

In addition to formal education and evaluation of the use of technology, the administration equipped SOE classrooms, at all sites, to be “smart classrooms.” Faculty use white boards, projectors, computer-assisted presentations and in turn, require candidates to utilize a variety of means to present assignments and projects. Candidates participate in Interactive Video Conferencing [IVC], BlackBoard, and Elluminate for the delivery, or enhancement, of some coursework. Faculty use document cameras, instructor work stations, LCD projectors, microphones and speakers, remote controls and cameras, and Smartboard Technologies. Unit faculty integrate PowerPoint presentations, web pages, wikis, blogs, online discussion forums, podcasts, and videos into their instruction.

In Fall 2009, SOE faculty adopted [Chalk & Wire](http://www.chalkandwire.com) [C&W] as a platform to create candidate electronic portfolios. C&W tracks candidates’ progress as they address the [New Mexico competencies](#PED_Competencies_All) of licensure areas. In December 2010, Associate Dean received the first C&W SOE admission application. Nine months later, 78 candidates submitted their C&W SOE admission applications. In July 2010, 229 candidates registered with C&W. Thirteen months later, 731 candidates registered with C&W. Currently, 21 instructor-created rubrics are used. These contain 156 assessment criteria each linked to NMPED Competencies. There are 2912 total data points.

These are the most current data for library usage.

**Electronic Usage**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **2009-2010** |
| **General Databases** | 14 |
| Total Searches | 84,014 |
| Full-Text Used | 37,757 |
| **Education** | 2 |
| Total Searches | 3,883 |
| Full-Text Used | N/A |

**6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?**

Various sources support the development and the implementation of SOE’s assessment system. The administration supports professional development activities related to the NCATE accreditation process. In Fall 2008, the SOE Dean attended the NCATE conference in Virginia. During the next two years, the Associate Dean attended NCATE with two different faculty members. Vice President of Academic Affairs [VPAA] special budget paid for the conferences. The Dean, the Associate Dean and other faculty members participate in free NCATE webinars.

In Summer 2009, the SOE purchased the Chalk & Wire electronic portfolio and assessment system. Chalk & Wire [C&W] provided an on-site trainer who conducted a two-day introductory workshop with the faculty. For the last two years, the VPAA’s budget paid for the SOE C&W Coordinator and later the Associate Dean to attend the national C&W conference. A private non-profit organization paid the expenses for the NCATE archivist, who is the Rio Rancho SOE administrative assistant. [Land of Enchantment Teacher Quality Partnership](https://www.educatorsupportcenter.com/grants/letqp/) paid for staff member who is a SOE partner. The SOE provides C&W peer trainers, who help others learn, with a free two-year account. In Spring 2011, the C&W coordinator received 1.0 FTE release time for assessment activities. A full-time graduate assistant constructed NCATE electronic exhibits.

Other faculty received release time dedicated for assessment and accreditation. For two semesters, a [SOE A&S faculty liaison](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2493) receives 0.25 FTE release. The Field Base and Assessment Coordinator receives 0.25 release time during the semester and a 10-month contract. The main campus Associate Dean receives 0.5 FTE release from faculty workload as NCATE coordinator, C&W consultant and SOE admissions officer. The 0.8 FTE Rio Rancho SOE administrative assistant is the NCATE archivist. Two other faculty members received monetary compensation to prepare the assessment data and NCATE exhibits in the Summer.

**6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?**

Library resources abound at NMHU. Donnelly Library is the principle main campus library that serves all sites including Raton. A new Rio Rancho librarian administers the holdings at the center. Currently, he is reviewing the relevancy of the corpus. The Teacher Education Center in Las Vegas houses a regional Instructional Materials Evaluation Center staffed with a graduate assistant. The Farmington center candidates access the San Juan Community College library. Likewise, the Santa Fe / Española center candidates access the Santa Fe Community College library.

Electronic resources have vastly increased the immediate availability of research materials. National reviewers vet and package the online catalog and subscription electronic databases offered to patrons both on-campus and remotely through Donnelly’s web page. Donnelly library staff query patrons and faculty about additions and deletions to the offerings. Services include several full text and bibliographic databases. Subscriptions to electronic resources improved access to research material, especially important to our distance education candidates and to remote external academic sites. Patrons may access 40,593 full-text journals and 42,418 electronic that complement the 170,154 print holdings.

Multiple times a year, publisher-supplied samples of state-approved PK-12 texts and materials arrive at the Instructional Materials Evaluation Center. The SOE welcomes school district administrators, teachers, parents, unit faculty and students to review texts and curricular materials for adoption. The Instructional Materials Evaluation Center functions as a unit [curriculum library](http://www.nmhu.edu/news.aspx?recid=462), providing selected samples of resources for short-term loan. Through the curriculum library, selected SOE programs lend candidates course textbooks and reference materials.

A transition to Follett, an online merchant, will extend the availability of the NMHU Bookstore. The NMHU portal directly links to the online bookstore. In compliance with federal regulations, all students may view the required textbooks for each course during the online scheduling of classes. Currently, faculty are considering the implementation of e-books, both for traditional and distance education courses.

**6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?**

Donnelly Library responds to faculty and candidates changing needs, through an extensive, continuous investment in online resources. Patrons access electronic resources through the Donnelly Library portal. In 2007-2008, patrons accessed 92,000 web pages. Two years later, 2009-2010, they viewed 144,662 web pages–a 57% increase. The online catalog and subscription electronic databases are available to our clientele both on-campus and remotely through the library’s web page. Services include several full text and bibliographic databases. Subscriptions to electronic resources improved access to research material, especially important to SOE distance education students and to remote external academic sites. From 2007-2008 to 2009-2010, patrons showed a 112% increase in the number of full-text journals accessed and a two-year 11% increase in the number of electronic books accessed.

The librarians provide instruction in library resources and research at the request of departments and instructors. Librarians conduct informational seminars via ITV to allow the participation of center and distance education candidates. The library staff provides on-demand remote support.

[Key Assessment Data for 6e.5](http://its.nmhu.edu/includes/onlinedocs/display.html?quicklink=2542)