

**Central Washington University  
Professional Certificate Report  
October 21-22, 2006**

**STANDARD I: PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD**

*PEAB Involvement*

The PEAB established for the pre-service program serves as the advisory board for the Professional Certificate program. All PEAB meetings have a standing agenda item for a report/update on the activities and current status of the Professional Certificate program.

The PEAB worked collaboratively with program faculty in the development of the Professional Certificate program and reviewed and approved the proposal for presentation to the State Board of Education. The PEAB made a recommendation to CWU that an E-portfolio process be developed and made available to individuals interested in an electronic version of the Professional Certification program. The electronic version (in the form of LiveText) has been developed and is available to candidates. The PEAB has reviewed the annual summary on the status of all candidates in the program through an annual report presented by the program to the PEAB.

The PEAB has made recommendations for program changes to the Professional Certificate administrator. The administrator prepared an annual report regarding the number of candidates in the pre-assessment seminars, participation by site, status of candidates, and information regarding data collection for assessing program success/needed changes. Accessibility to the program has changed with recommendations by the PEAB and action by the university via the on-line program and through contact with 56 school districts in seven counties.

***Recommended rating: Target***

## **STANDARD II: ACCOUNTABILITY**

### Administration

The College of Education and Professional Studies has designated a Professional Certificate program administrator to exercise the responsibilities outlined in WAC 180-78A-525. The program administrator selects and trains facilitators and develops program materials. At Central, the program administrator is also Chair of the Teacher Education and works to keep the rest of the department informed about Professional Certificate requirements. The program administrator was selected because of K12 teaching and administration experience both at the building and superintendent level. In addition, the college of education reorganized to bring the position within the executive section.

Interviews with candidates and facilitator indicate the program administrator is very supportive of their work, available for questions and clarifications, and responsive to feedback.

The program administrator is also supported by the director and associate dean who were involved in developing the CWU program and facilitated the first cohorts.

***Recommended rating: Acceptable***

### Assessment

All candidate portfolios are compiled electronically using the LiveText software which is customized to the CWU and state Professional Certificate requirements. The program currently uses a met/not met rubric similar to the Pedagogy Assessment and compiles summary information about the number of met and not met in each seminar. Facilitators for each of the seminars assess the teacher portfolios, though the program is encountering some challenges in ensuring they are all assessing in the LiveText system. Their summary data is not complete at this time. The program administrator has been reviewing each portfolio to be sure it is complete and contains all the required components. Interviews indicate some confusion on the part of candidates about how and when they will be assessed. We encourage Central to include assessment information in any handbooks and other program materials and to continue efforts to develop a three-point rubric.

The program administrator, director, and associate dean sat in a session of all Culminating Seminars during the spring of 2005 to gather feedback for program improvement. In addition, the program uses course evaluations for program improvement.

***Recommended rating: Acceptable***

## **STANDARD III: RESOURCES**

### *Personnel*

Sufficient faculty has been assigned to work in the program. The majority of instructors are district-based personnel, many of whom are National Board Certified Teachers. National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) are the program's first choice for instructors. In addition to NBCTs, the program has one Professional Certificate completer facilitating the on-line cohort and other CWU faculty. According to interviews, program faculty feel, by in large, well supported and have a sense of autonomy. They expressed a desire for more up front and thorough training/preparation and we encourage the program to ensure facilitators are knowledgeable about state requirements and any changes or updates.

***Recommended rating: Acceptable***

### *Financial and other resources*

The Professional Certificate program is not yet self-sustaining but is well supported by the College of Education and Professional Studies. Funding mainly consists of fees from candidates and other budget considerations from the university. The dean selected a tenured faculty member for the program administrator to ensure a stable presence.

Instructional, technological, and other needed resources are sufficient to support the Professional Certificate. Both Live Text and Blackboard are programs used for converting paper portfolios to e-portfolios and for the on-line program. Teachers and facilitators have access to technical support for the work with the online portfolio. We suggest the program continue developing guidelines for the on-line portfolio to prevent a doubling up of the work when candidates develop a paper portfolio and then put it on-line. Their website is a good resource for program information and description of the process. The program is also clearly outlined in the CWU course catalogue. We strongly encourage the program to review materials including handbooks and materials including portfolio expectations to ensure they are current and accurate.

***Recommended rating: Acceptable***

## **STANDARD IV: PROGRAM DESIGN**

### *Admission criteria*

Admission criteria are clearly identified and communicated in program materials and are consistent with the state standards for admission. Candidate files provided evidence that the program had documentation to verify applicant qualifications.

### *Instructional design and delivery*

The Central Washington University program has a clear design that is communicated through all their literature including course catalogues and the website. The program includes the required sequence outlined in WAC. We applaud CWU for the design of their flexible Core which allows candidates to select professional growth activities that are offered in connection with an advanced degree or through continuing education or clock hours. CWU seminars are held in school districts, at the main campus, and at extension campuses. The program recently added an on-line offering of the Pre-Assessment Seminar which received praise from candidates enrolled.

The portfolio requirements are clear and facilitator and candidate comments indicate they understand what they need to do and when. Candidates were quite positive about the program and considered it very “doable.” The Professional Growth Plan is completed during the Pre-Assessment Seminar and is developed with input from the Professional Growth Team and a consideration of the teachers’ context, and an assessment of the standards. We encourage the program to strengthen the assessment of the standards for individual professional growth. In addition, the program may consider shifting the focus of portfolio completion more toward the culminating seminar and focus more on self-assessment and the professional growth plan in the Pre-Assessment Seminar. The portfolio appears to be primarily a “fill-in” component as determined through review of portfolios and interviews.

***Recommended rating: Acceptable***

## **STANDARD V: KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS**

CWU has a uniform portfolio for their candidates that are clear and straightforward. Available candidate work was thorough and the teachers demonstrated a wealth of strategies they use connected to the 12 Professional Certificate criteria.

The current LiveText portfolio has a structure that is aligned with the structure of the state Portfolio Guidelines. Some content components within the structure are missing, however. We saw little evidence of the actual impact on student learning or the outcome/result of the many strategies described. Candidates struggled to indicate how the Professional Certificate program had impacted or changed their teaching. Most evidence was teacher centered and generally did not include student voice. The evidence for Criterion 2(a) in the action research project did demonstrate positive impact on student learning and included data-driven decision making, specific strategies, and resulting outcome with students. We suggest the program review the action research project for ties to the rest of the portfolio as the component is strongest.

To ensure that not only the structure but also the content of the program and portfolio align with state expectations and focuses on impact on student learning, we make the following recommendations:

We recommend the program re-examine the state portfolio expectations to ensure teachers can demonstrate the planning, implementation, assessment, and development of next steps for instruction and other strategies. We particularly highlight the questions that ask “in what ways was the plan data driven, research-based, and appropriate to context,” “what does the evidence/data show,” and “what are your next steps?”

We recommend the program consider ways to use the evidence guidelines and resources to help teachers first collect evidence that is student-centered and then to use the evidence as data for their own analysis of impact on student learning and subsequent planning.

We recommend the program review the Descriptions of Practice for Criterion 1(e) to ensure candidate evidence is sufficient in depth and breadth.

***Recommended rating: Unacceptable***