

Seattle Pacific University
April 22-26, 2006
Administrator Preparation Program

STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD (PEAB)

Operating Procedures, Membership, Meeting Times

Seattle Pacific University has separate PEABs for their Administrative programs: The Principal PEAB consists of eleven (voting and nonvoting) members and the Superintendent PEAB consists of fourteen (voting and nonvoting) members. Both PEABs have membership representing the appropriate organizations per the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Both PEABs hold the required four meetings per year. Both PEABs are guided by a set of operating procedures. The PEABs have a process in place for soliciting additional members, as needed.

Recommended rating: Met

Collaborative Function

Evidence of collaboration, the review of data, and PEAB-generated recommendations were found in written documents and confirmed in interviews, annual reports, results of the placement information, and follow-up surveys. PEAB members review all aspects of the program, and program faculty must respond in writing to any recommendations brought forward by the PEAB.

The minutes and interviews with PEAB members show many discussions/activities/recommendations made by the PEAB. Collaboration is evident through PEAB/program activities for the Principal PEAB that included seeking ways to inform principals regarding the Professional Certificate, suggestions about continuing to pilot the eFolio for interns, and discussion of performance based principal certification. The Superintendent PEAB recommendations/discussions included adding a new off-campus cohort, new emphasis of effective schools, importance of instructional leadership in the schools, and full implementation of the diversity scholarship program.

Documentation shows evidence of review of assessment data for program improvement. Data collected is reported in an annual assessment report for the Educational Leadership programs and is used to identify program strengths and weaknesses in terms of candidate outcomes. Based on assessment data from candidates, the PEAB, and from surveys of employers, program modifications have been made. Some of these modifications include (1) increasing the emphasis of the Principal's role in special education and 504 plans; increase and update the content of the Instructional Supervision course to reflect actual practice in the field; add content on school improvement plans; connect assignments and

the internship logs to the electronic portfolio process, and modifications of the alignment and content and assignments to reflect the ISLLC standards and the mission of the School of Education.

Evidence is present that program approval standards were reviewed last year and continue to be reviewed every five years.

Recommended rating: Met

STANDARD 2: ACCOUNTABILITY

Learner Expectations

Learner expectations for candidates in educational leadership programs are aligned with the school of education conceptual framework, which emphasizes the themes of competence, character, service and leadership. Administrator candidates interviewed by the visiting team were able to articulate these themes and relate them to their work in the program. Candidate performance expectations are also aligned with the ISLLC standards, which are spelled out clearly in the intern manual. Candidates are asked to plan internship activities related to each standard, and they are assessed on each standard.

Recommended rating: Met

Positive impact

Because administrators are typically not engaged in face-to-face instruction of students, the program defines positive impact indirectly in terms of the candidate's ability to create conditions in the school that facilitate student learning. This is most directly assessed during the internship. Candidates interviewed by the team were able to articulate their responsibility to be stewards of learning and to describe ways they could assess their impact.

Recommended rating: Met

Assessment System

In collaboration with the School of Education, the Educational Leadership program at SPU has developed and is now implementing an assessment framework aligned with its conceptual framework and state/national standards. PEAB minutes and interviews with PEAB members confirm that this system has been developed with the advice and participation of the university's K-12 partners.

The plan identifies five major assessment points for the principal certification program:

- Admission to the program
- Continuation: Mid-point checks
- Internship
- Exit/program completion
- Graduate follow-up

The system includes e-folio entries from required program assignments, including the common performance indicators currently being piloted by principal preparation programs across the state. The assessment director indicated that the system is not yet

completely implemented; in particular, the “mid-point” assessments based on the developmental portfolio are not completely integrated into the system.

The superintendent program identifies four major assessment points:

- Admission to the program
- Continuation: Mid-point checks
- Internship and program completion
- Graduate follow-up

As with the principal program, the superintendent assessment system includes e-folio entries from required program assignments, although these are not yet integrated into the system.

The assessment director aggregates data collected through the assessment system and provides an annual report in September to each program. These reports are used to generate discussion about possible program changes.

As yet, the school of education has not formally reviewed components of its assessment system to ensure fair and unbiased assessments. Additionally, the common performance indicators used in the principal program are still being piloted and have yet to be evaluated for reliability and validity (as these are being used statewide, they are not solely an SPU responsibility).

Recommended rating: Met

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

As noted in the previous section, the program’s assessment system includes data from a variety of sources at different points in the program, ensuring that monitoring of candidate progress and improvement of the program will be informed by multiple assessments reflecting faculty judgments, GPA, candidate work samples, internship performance evaluations, and the candidates themselves. Collectively, these assessments systematically provide adequate information to guide decisions on candidate proficiency and program effectiveness.

The university uses a combination of Chalk and Wire and Banner to support the collection and aggregation of data. Although the assessment director reported the usual challenges in learning to work with a new system, he felt that it provides a solid technological framework to support the unit’s assessment efforts. Examples of reports viewed by the site visit team appeared to provide data in a straightforward and understandable way. The educational leadership programs had been “early adopters” of another system that did not work out, and are now converting to Chalk and Wire.

Recommended rating: Met

Use of data

The unit's assessment system annually provides the administrator programs with data that allows it to assess program effectiveness on a variety of measures. The institutional report identified a number of recent changes that had been made in the program, although it was not clear that in every case the changes had resulted from a review of assessment data. However, PEAB minutes and interviews with PEAB members made clear that data was shared with that group, sometimes resulting in recommendations for change.

Although the programs are beginning to make use of the data system for guiding their decisions, it is not yet clear that data are being used systematically and comprehensively. Interviews with faculty members indicated they believed that the implementation of the assessment system had affected their work, and there is little question that conversations resulting from data sometimes occur informally, as frequently happens in small programs. However, institutionalizing discussion and analysis of assessment data would strengthen its use for improving the program.

Recommended rating: Met

STANDARD 3: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

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

Unit Leadership and Authority

The School of Education (SOE) provides the leadership for effectively coordinating all programs at the institution designed to prepare education professionals to work in P-12 schools. The SOE and other faculty collaborate with P-12 practitioners in program design, delivery, and evaluation of the SOE and its programs. Colleagues in other schools at SPU are involved in the preparation of professional educators, and school personnel, and other organizations recognize the SOE as a leader. The SOE provides professional development on effective teaching for faculty in other schools in the institution.

The School of Education is the academic unit authorized to prepare education professionals to work in P-12 schools. The dean has oversight of all unit operations and personnel in the unit. An Associate Dean for Teacher Education, an Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies and Assessment, and a Director of Continuing Education assist the dean in providing programmatic oversight of teacher education, graduate, and continuing education programs, respectively. Each reports to the dean. There are three programs leading to Residency (Initial) Certification: the Undergraduate/Post-Baccalaureate Program, the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), and the Alternative Routes to Certification Program. Advanced programs include the School Counseling Program, the Educational Leadership Program, the Executive Leadership/Superintendent and Executive Leadership Program, the Curriculum & Instruction Program, and the Doctoral Program. The Continuing Education Unit is an integral part of the unit, and it delivers all continuing education courses, Distance Learning, the Professional Certification Program, the second level certification program for teachers, and secondary endorsements.

The SOE's Administrative Team is composed of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education, the Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies and Assessment, the Director of Continuing Education, the Budget Manager and the Administrative Assistant/Office Manager. Program chairs in programs leading to initial teacher education report to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education, chairs in advanced programs report to the Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies, and continuing education staff report to the Director of Continuing Education. In the case of the chairs for the MAT and Alternative Routes to Certification programs, they report to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education on certification matters and to the Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies on issues related to the granting of a graduate degree. The Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, and program chairs are faculty members and they receive load credit for their administrative responsibilities. The Director of Continuing Education is a fulltime staff position.

The Administrative Team meets bi-weekly to discuss both programmatic and operational issues of the SOE. The meetings also serve to keep each administrator apprised of work in other areas that might impact the work in their own area as well as establishing agenda items for faculty meetings.

Recommendations for changes to undergraduate and graduate programs needing university approval are sent to the campus-wide Undergraduate Policy and Evaluation Committee and Graduate Policy and Evaluation committees, respectively. University wide issues are debated and approved in Faculty Senate.

Collaboration with P-12 colleagues is accomplished through state required Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEABs). Each certification program has formed a PEAB to review, evaluate, and recommend changes. These boards meet a minimum of four times each year, and at least half of the voting membership must come from school personnel currently serving in the role in which candidates are being prepared. Recommendations from a PEAB must be responded to in writing.

Accolades continuously flow from the President, Vice Presidents, Deans of Arts and Science and other schools who spoke very highly of the Dean and Associate Dean of Education as leaders within and outside of the university. Challenges are treated seriously as opportunities to increase the effectiveness of the SOE.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

School of Education Budget

SOE budgetary allocations permit faculty teaching, scholarship, and service that extend beyond the SOE to P-12 education and other programs in the institution. The budget for curriculum, instruction, faculty clinical work, scholarship, etc., supports high quality work within the SOE and its school partners. The unit's budget for regular programs in place at the last review has grown from just over \$2,000,000 in 1999-2000 to \$3,396,000 in 2005-2006. The budget for continuing education programs is \$2,036,082, resulting in a combined unit budget of \$5,432,000. The institution has supported the hiring of two additional faculty positions and three additional staff members since its last review.

Other than the College of Arts and Science (CAS) the SOE has grown the most in staff and financial support. Its collaboration and partnership with CAS has led to receiving a five-year grant (\$1,498,000) entitled "Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher Diagnostic Skills and Tools." Three grants: \$40,000 from Washington Mutual Savings and Loan to explore strategies for helping students at Chief Sealth High School in the Seattle School District who are at risk of failing the state mandated Washington Assessment of Student Learning; \$40,000 from Boeing Company to the School of Education and the Physics Department to provide inquiry-based training to improve the teaching of science in schools; \$9,000 from Washington Mutual for scholarships to students of color.

Recommended rating: Met

Personnel

Though there are 20 professional faculty positions in the unit, two are currently vacant. Of the remaining 18 full-time faculty members, all hold doctorates and teach in the undergraduate and graduate programs. All but one professional faculty member have taught in P-12 schools for three years or more.

Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty not only to be engaged in a wide range of professional activities, including teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, work in schools, and service, but also to professionally contribute on a community, state, regional, or national basis. Formal policies and procedures have been established to include online course delivery in determining faculty load. The unit's use of part-time faculty and of graduate teaching assistants is purposeful and employed to strengthen programs, including the preparation of teaching assistants. Clinical faculty are included in the SOE as valued colleagues in preparing educators. Unit provision of support personnel significantly enhances the effectiveness of faculty in their teaching and mentoring of candidates. The SOE supports professional development activities that engage faculty in dialogue and skill development related to emerging theories and practices.

Both regular and adjunct faculty supervise teacher interns for which they receive six quarter credits. Graduate faculty members are given load credit for advisement, mentoring, scholarship, and supervision. Faculty members carrying administrative responsibilities are assigned load credit as determined by the Dean. Many faculty teach in the summer on an additional contract.

There is an adequate number of support staff to assist in the implementation of all programs. The SOE has 7.5 FTE office support for regular education programs, 6.0 FTE office support and 3.0 FTE professional staff to support continuing education programs including the Professional (advanced) Certification Program.

The SOE hires four Graduate Assistants to assist faculty with various professional tasks 15 hours each week during autumn, winter, and spring quarters. Graduate Assistants are paid an amount equal to the tuition of two courses per quarter. An additional three student workers assist with clerical tasks in the SOE office. Their remuneration is part of their financial aid package.

Various institutional units provide staff support to the unit. The Library assigns a full time liaison to work with faculty and manage the selection and care of resource materials for the general and curriculum collections, to provide lessons on literacy to students in the classroom, to assist graduate students with research projects, and to manage the library's budget for education resources. A staff member in the Instructional Technology Services provides instructional technology workshops, helps faculty members develop technology components for classroom instruction, and manages the technological elements of the SOE's online master's degree program in Curriculum and Instruction.

Recommended rating: Met

Unit Facilities

Peterson Hall, one of two historic buildings, is more than 100 years old and well maintained. It serves as offices for the administrative staff, faculty, certification officers, continuing education department, as well as three classrooms. Computer laboratories for the students are found throughout the campus. Students with disabilities have full access to the SOE, faculty offices, and three classrooms located in the building.

Education courses are scheduled in Peterson Hall, Demaray Hall, Otto Miller Hall and the Bertona Classrooms. Three classrooms are located in Peterson Hall, with one dedicated for use by the SOE. In Otto Miller Hall, one of two science buildings on campus, there is a dedicated science education classroom and a second dedicated math education classroom. These classrooms have adequate storage space for resources and equipment needed to teach math and science education courses. All classrooms are furnished with a networked computer system and overhead projectors that allow for electronic presentations by instructors and access to the internet. Peterson Hall, Demaray Hall, and Otto Miller Hall have wireless access to the internet.

An office is assigned for use by emeriti faculty. The four Graduate Assistants have work stations on the fourth floor where most faculty offices are located. Every office has a computer that is upgraded on a three year cycle. Although most offices still have individual printers, the unit is moving to multiple-user printers located in convenient areas among faculty and staff.

The University library provides collections, services, technology, and space for study and research, with over 190,000 volumes. The collection grows by some 6,000 new titles each year, including more than 1,300 current print periodical titles and an ever-expanding micro-fiche collection numbering more than 500,000 items. The entire collection is accessible online in the library and through the campus computer network via its automated catalog. An interlibrary borrowing service is available to students, electronic information resources. An interlibrary borrowing service is available to students, faculty, and staff. As a member of the Online Computer Library Center, the Learning Resources Center Library can provide access to library holdings throughout the Northwest, across the nation, and beyond. Since autumn 2003, students also have access to 31 million items held in 26 Washington and Oregon academic libraries through the Orbis Cascade Alliance and Summit.

Recommended rating: Met

Unit Resources Including Technology

The SOE aggressively and successfully secures resources to support high quality and exemplary programs and projects to ensure that candidates meet standards. Faculty have a wide range of technology available in classrooms to enhance student learning and student computer labs are located in buildings throughout the campus, including the university library. All of the general purpose labs provide full access to the internet, color laser printers, and other local and remote networked resources. Network connectivity and access to the internet is available throughout the campus. All students, faculty and staff use email and other electronic communication tools. The internet provides access to libraries, databases and information resources throughout the world. All faculty are provided late model computers and high speed network connections. Students have access to the internet from student computer labs, from their residence hall rooms, or from wireless “hotspots” in major common/study areas. Off-campus students have access to email from campus-provided modem connections.

There are two computer labs in the library, an instructional classroom with 20 PC computers and an open lab with 22 PC computers and two Macintosh computers with digital-editing capabilities. The library also has computers for database searching, as well as a number of computers for special and assisted use. In addition, there are a number of network ports for students to use their own computers in the library and the building is a “hot spot” with wireless capability. The Computer and Information Systems unit provides technology assistance to students and faculty on campus.

The institution’s Computer and Information System (CIS) unit assigns a liaison to the SOE for planning, installing, and upgrading computer systems as well as addressing immediate computer problems in the classroom. CIS also services dysfunctional computers at the request of the faculty and staff. A majority of faculty members use Blackboard technology, either completely in the online C & I master’s programs or blended use with those who meet in face to face courses. Many locations on campus, including Peterson Hall, now have wireless access to the Seattle Pacific University campus network. Through its Instructional Technology Services, the institution funds training sessions to faculty and staff in the use of technology.

The SOE implemented the Chalk & Wire electronic portfolio system for assessment in 2004. Teacher candidates are charged a one-time fee for an individual electronic portfolio account. This system allows students to post key documents that demonstrate achievement of program competencies and allows faculty to evaluate documents and monitor student progress. The system also enables faculty to aggregate data for use in determining areas in need of improvement. Use of this electronic portfolio system is in the process of being continually refined as faculty and students learn to more effectively use it.

Recommended rating: Met

Qualified Faculty:

All professional education faculty at the institution have earned doctorates or have exceptional expertise, have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship. All clinical faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise and are master teachers or well recognized for their competence in their field. Though there are 20 professional faculty positions in the unit, two are currently vacant. Of the remaining 18 full-time faculty members, all hold doctorates and teach in the undergraduate and graduate programs. All but one professional faculty member have taught in P-12 schools for three years or more.

Eight tenured teacher educators have retired over the past several years and are emeritus faculty. Many remain active in the unit. New faculty members hired to replace these retirees are in tenure track positions. All professional education faculty have had experience in K-12 schools and are active in the various guilds appropriate to their assignments. The current and specialized expertise adjunct faculty bring to the unit enriches the educational experience of candidates.

The Faculty Employment Handbook requires faculty members to engage in teaching and advising, professional activity, and service to the University, church, and community. All tenure track and full time, non-tenure track professional education faculty have an earned doctoral degree with experience consistent with their assignments. They actively participate in state and national professional associations and often serve in leadership positions. Those recruited to serve on state committees are informed about educational issues and programmatic development in the field. All but one professional education faculty member teaching in the teacher education programs have taught in P-12 schools for three or more years. All have current experience in P-12 schools and those supervising interns are in schools on a weekly basis. Clinical faculty supervising interns are known for their competence and experience and are licensed in the fields in which they teach or supervise. Professional education faculty in the school administration and school counseling certification programs teach all core program courses and supervise all interns.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields and are teacher scholars who integrate what is known about their content fields, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice. They exhibit intellectual vitality in their sensitivity to critical issues. Teaching by the professional education faculty reflects the unit's conceptual framework(s), incorporates appropriate performance assessments, and integrates diversity and technology throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices. Faculty value candidates' learning and adjust instruction appropriately to enhance candidate

learning. They understand assessment technology, use multiple forms of assessments in determining their effectiveness, and use the data to improve their practice. Many of the unit faculty are recognized as outstanding teachers by candidates and peers across campus and in schools.

Faculty are thoroughly prepared to teach candidates preparing for careers in education. They hold doctoral degrees and keep abreast of current trends in their fields through ongoing professional development. Their teaching is based on current research and best practices in teaching, school administration, or school counseling. They understand that an important role as professors is to contribute to the field through presentations at state, national, and international professional conferences, research, and scholarly publications. The core SOE has developed an Assessment and Unit Evaluation Plan. A strong effort has been made to emphasize the importance of collecting, aggregating, reviewing, and using assessment data to assess student learning, improve teaching, and increase program quality. This has included the implementation of an electronic portfolio system to help manage assessment data for these purposes.

The SOE has assessment plans that allows for collecting and aggregating of assessment data from multiple sources at various transition points in order to assess student progress and improve programs. Students are assessed on content, skills, and dispositions. In undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs, key assignments are posted by students and evaluated by faculty on electronic portfolios. Candidates are required to reflect on how any posted assignment meets program competencies. Additionally, the WEST-E examination assesses content, and the Pedagogy Assessment instrument is used to assess pedagogical skills.

Faculty make extensive use of technology in their courses, e.g. PowerPoint, Blackboard. A number of core faculty members deliver courses completely online as well as others having half of their course online and half face to face.

The Conceptual Framework (**competence, character, service, leadership**) has given clear direction to all profession education programs since 1999, is well known throughout the faculty and students, and is fully integrated into the culture of the unit. It is communicated to professional education faculty, adjunct faculty, supervisors, staff, and students. It is posted on the walls of the SOE in Peterson Hall, found in every course syllabus, printed in program brochures and materials, and prominently displayed on the unit's website.

Candidates in all programs are required to post key assignments and other evidence indicating achievement of program competencies and to reflect on how the evidence meets one or more competencies. In addition to more traditional evaluation strategies, many assignments require candidates to reflect on what they are learning and how that will impact them in their roles in schools. All assignments posted to Chalk & Wire require a reflection.

The SOE has developed a Placement Office to monitor and ensure that residency certification candidates experience working with diverse students prior to recommendation for certification. Dearborn Park, an urban elementary public school and Zion Preparatory Academy, an urban private school with highly diverse students provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse populations. Partnership with America Latina School in Guatemala further provides a voluntary opportunity for teacher education candidates to experience teaching in a third world country.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Professional activity is one of several elements in the evaluation of faculty members. Professional activity includes having a research agenda, publishing in one's field, and presenting at professional conferences. The SOE is committed to encouraging and supporting faculty in their efforts to contribute to their disciplines. Evidence of the faculty being actively engaged in scholarship can be found in their vitae as well as twelve faculty members published works in 27 scholarly articles in 2003-2004, and fourteen published 43 articles in 2004-2005. Achievement of the expectation is evaluated systematically through professional development plans, and those who have not achieved have been gently guided out. Fifteen faculty members delivered forty-eight professional presentations in local, state, or international settings during 2004-2005.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Service to the School and University is evidenced by all faculty members in the SOE serving on one or more committees. All serve on the SOE's Curriculum Committee, which meets on the first Friday of each month. Teacher education faculty are members of the Teacher Education Curriculum Committee (TECC), and graduate faculty serve on the Graduate Committee. Some faculty members serve on other committees within the unit such as Diversity, Promotion and Tenure, Scholarship, Standards and Deviation, and Faculty Search committees. All faculty members review assessment data for the purpose of improving programs in the unit. The undergraduate Teacher Education Program in 2003-2004, the Doctoral Program in 2004-2005, and the Curriculum & Instruction program were reviewed and revised based on the work of the committees.

Service to the profession is evidence by faculty attendance and presentations at annual conferences of their guilds as well as serving in leadership positions in their professional associations. Examples can be found of faculty members being honored by Association of Educational Research (AERA) for lifetime research contributions to the profession of reading; to Editor of Counseling and Values (refereed journal of the American School Counselor Association). Eight faculty members are in similar state and national positions.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Collaboration

Faculty regularly collaborate informally and formally with each other, with colleagues in the arts and sciences, and with colleagues in P-12 schools. All core faculty members of the SOE are housed in Peterson Hall. Collaboration among faculty is spontaneous as well as intentional. All but one faculty member in the unit's undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, MAT, and Alternative Routes to Certification are assigned to offices in close proximity to one another. This includes the Field Placement Office. All but three faculty members are assigned offices on the same floor of the education building. In this arrangement faculty members informally address issues and share ideas before problems arise.

Committees are intentionally designed to include faculty, adjunct professors, university supervisors and other staff enabling them to serve on committees that address program issues, set policy, determine procedures, revise and develop curriculum, and assess program quality.

Collaboration occurs among the unit's core faculty and faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. This occurs due to the fact that education candidates do not major in education but major in an academic discipline. Furthermore, College of Arts and Sciences faculty teach key courses in the residency (initial) certification program. This necessitates a communication and interaction among all faculty members regardless of their academic unit assignment.

Several grants have been awarded jointly to the School of Education and other academic colleagues on campus during 2004-2005: Boeing seed grant awarded to the School of Education and Physics Department; National Science Foundation-School of Education and Physics Department; Brain Center for Applied learning and Research with other faculty in the University.

Faculty regularly collaborate with colleagues in P-12 schools. This occurs informally since most faculty in certification programs supervise interns and regularly communicate with supervising teachers, counselors, and school administrators in the schools. More formally, each certification program has a Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB). The work of these boards ensures that P-12 colleagues have significant input regarding the quality and delivery programs.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Evaluation of professional education faculty, including adjunct professors, is systematic in the unit and the university. All faculty are required to have students evaluate at least two courses each year. Professors who are not yet tenured are strongly encouraged to have students evaluate every course they teach. Beginning in the winter of 2005, students

evaluated courses on line. Instructors receive students' ratings and narrative feedback, which can be used to improve teaching. The dean also receives a copy of the instructor's course evaluation online. Many faculty members voluntarily invite evaluations from students at mid-quarter.

The Faculty Handbook outlines five areas for evaluating the performance of professors. These areas include teaching and advising, professional activity (e.g. presentations, publications, etc) service to the University, service to church and community, and personal qualities (e.g. collaborative, etc.).

All non-tenured faculty complete a Professional Development Plan each year. These plans include goals related to the areas of teaching, advising, professional activity, and service to the university, church, and community. The plans must include a self-evaluation of the previous year's goals. The Professional Development Plans are submitted to the Dean in the autumn, and each professor receives a written response from the Dean. Tenured faculty submit Professional Development Plans that cover more than one year.

All faculty, both non-tenure track and tenure track, are required to submit a Third Year Review file that includes evidence of their performance in the areas of teaching, advising, professional activity, and service to the University, church, and community. These files are reviewed by the unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee, the campus-wide Faculty Status Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A written response is provided to the professor by the Faculty Status Committee, suggesting areas to address prior to submitting a tenure file.

Professors submitting applications for promotion and tenure must submit files that demonstrate their performance in teaching, advising, professional activity, and service to the university, church, and community. Like the process with Third Year Review files, these files are submitted to the unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Faculty Status Committee, and the administration.

Tenured faculty are required to participate in a Post-Tenure Review as least once every five years. The current procedure is to have two peers with the unit and one peer from an academic unit outside of the unit serve as the Post Tenure Review Committee. A written report is produced following the review and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the professional education faculty. Evaluations of professional education faculty are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service of unit faculty.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

The university provides regular opportunities for professional development. These opportunities are primarily directed by the Center for Scholarship and Faculty Development. In 2002, the university initiated an annual Day of Common Learning when faculty, staff, and students explore an important topic. A major speaker presents at a plenary session, and faculty, students, and staff present individual sessions on the same topic in the afternoon. The Instructional Technology Services unit also provides opportunities for professional development in the area of technology. Each year the Office of Academic Affairs allots professional development funds to be used at the discretion of the faculty member with approval by the Dean. The 2005-2006 allocation is \$800. Most faculty use these funds to attend professional conferences, and those who are officers or committee members of professional organizations are provided additional funds by the unit to offset their expenses. The university also sponsors a number of annual faculty lectures that helps facilitate a vibrant intellectual community. The unit has policies and practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners. Experienced unit faculty mentor new faculty, providing encouragement and support for developing scholarly work around teaching, inquiry, and service.

Recommended rating: Exemplary

STANDARD 4: PROGRAM DESIGN

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Significant evidence exists to show clear proficiency expectations for all candidates. The curriculum was developed using both Washington State and national standards set forth in the ISLLC Standards. Both the curriculum and the field experiences are designed and implemented to ensure candidates value diversity. Candidate assessments provide them with timely feedback so they can improve their knowledge, skills and dispositions.

Recommended rating: Met

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Diversity of program faculty is limited, but the School of Education has made persistent efforts to increase diversity through its strategic planning process, establishment of a diversity committee, and support for faculty to enhance their cultural competence. Candidates regularly interact in classrooms, field experiences, with School of Education faculty, with faculty from other university units, and with other diverse, ethnic, racial and gender groups.

Recommended rating: Met

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

The university has made substantial efforts to increase campus diversity, although candidates in the School of Education are not as diverse as the campus at large; currently, about 10 percent of candidates in advanced programs are racially and ethnically diverse. However, the School of Education has made major efforts to establish a climate in which diversity is valued, including outreach to establish partnerships with urban schools. Of special note is the work of the Perkins Center to increase candidate involvement with diversity.

Recommended rating: Met

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Data provided by the unit indicated that about 50 percent of interns over the past three years were placed in schools with significant minority populations or with more than 50 percent of students eligible for free-and-reduced lunch. Consistent with the standards, candidates are expected to demonstrate competence in working with students and community members from all populations, and are specifically evaluated on these skills. The internship expectations include focused reflections and observations regarding

children with special needs. The intentional focus on developing practices, skills, knowledge and dispositions relating to diversity is significant. The feedback process is very strong.

Recommended rating: Met

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

The level of collaboration with the PEAB is very strong. PEAB minutes and interviews with PEAB members confirmed that the programs regularly solicited and responded to advice from the PEABs. The focus on professional community clearly enriches the clinical practice. The careful placement of interns along with strong support from the school partners and the faculty is robust and significant.

Recommended rating: Met

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The field experience is enriched by providing multiple opportunities for observations in schools and communities before the actual experience begins. Both the field and clinical practice are focused on the development of pedagogical knowledge, professional skills and dispositions. The clinical faculty members are very accomplished professionals and provide continuing support for candidates. The internship for administrators is carefully designed to ensure that candidates gain a full range of experiences, including activities that occur before or after the school year. The respective responsibilities of candidates, site supervisors, and university coordinators are clearly communicated through the internship manual.

Recommended rating: Met

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn

There is clear evidence of robust entry and exit criteria for the program. Of special note are the following elements:

- Multiple assessment of strategies are used to evaluate candidate competencies and performance
- Field experiences and clinical practice are enhanced through reflections, combined with multiple opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills to help all students learn

Performance expectations for the internship include considerable attention to the promotion of learning, and candidates are asked to demonstrate how they have had a positive impact.

Recommended rating: Met

STANDARD 5: KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

Seattle Pacific University offers programs for the preparation of school principals and school superintendents. The Educational Leadership/School Principal program can be taken with the M.Ed. degree (51 credits) or as a certification only program for people that already hold masters degrees (30 credits). A nine credit internship is included as part of the program. Applicants to the principal program must have three years of experience as classroom teachers. The curriculum for the program meets the required state standards and is based on the national standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC).

The Executive Leadership and Superintendent Certification program is a two year, 24 credit offering that can be taken as a certification only program or combined with the Doctor of Education degree. The program includes a six credit internship. Applicants need to have completed (1) a program for teacher certification, (2) three years of experience as a school administrator, and (3) a master's doctoral or other advanced degree. The superintendent program aligns with the state superintendent program standards and the ISLLC standards.

In both of these programs candidates are required to meet graduate admission standards. (Candidates that already hold advanced degrees are not required to take re-take the MAT or the GRE.) Candidates must maintain 3.0 GPA's or higher in their programs.

Both programs require candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in schools and complete program portfolios tied to the state standards for principals or superintendents. Principal preparation is guided by the ISLLC Standards. As such, candidates must demonstrate that they meet those standards during their internships. Candidates complete a daily log, a portfolio and professional growth plans. They also complete School Improvement Plans and School Action Plans. They are evaluated on the extent to which they meet each of the six ISLLC standards. Data from portfolios and surveys have been collected and aggregated. Required readings for principal candidates are further evidence of the professional knowledge required in the program. Superintendent candidates must complete a "meaningful district wide project" and a two year portfolio that covers each of the key components of the program. Data from the standards portfolio and from surveys of graduates have been collected and aggregated.

Recommended rating: Met

Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

A candidate's performance in the principal and superintendent programs is assessed against the ISLLC standards throughout their program. The unit has aggregated

summative evaluation data and graduate follow-up surveys for the principal and superintendent preparation programs. The data for principal candidates shows that all 13 indicators have aggregated mean scores between 2.0 and 3.0 or in the range of “competent for beginning administrator.” Graduate survey item means all fall between 3.71 and 4.86 on a five point scale. While still acceptable, the items “leadership for a diverse community” and “political advocacy” received the lowest scores; “moral and ethical leadership” and “visionary leadership” were rated highest.

Candidate self evaluations for the superintendent program also had means in the acceptable range for all candidates. Candidates scored highest in “student learning,” “leadership/vision,” and “values and ethics.” The same items were used in the graduate follow-up evaluation and again indicated strong preparation with no major weaknesses.

Technology is integrated throughout the curriculum in both programs and candidates must demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary and appropriate for school administrators. There was strong support from faculty for the work of the university to keep technology updated and for the outstanding support that the unit receives from the instructional technology department.

Both administrator preparation programs allow candidates to take some degree coursework “on-line.” The evidence that was reviewed and interviews with recent graduates indicated that these courses are rigorous and of high quality. Candidates indicated that on-line courses provided for self-assessment, used appropriate rubrics for assessment, required proctored examinations that were mailed directly to professors, and had extensive bulletin board response requirements.

There is also a strong emphasis on research in the master and doctoral programs.

Recommended rating: Met

Dispositions for all Candidates

SPU programs all address the issue of dispositions and do so in exemplary fashion. This is consistent with the purpose of the institution as stated in the college catalog describing that it is the intent to graduate people of “competence and character...who exhibit honesty and integrity, and who value serving others.” (Undergraduate Catalog, p. 2). All undergraduate candidates complete a common curriculum course entitled “Belief, Morality and the Modern World.” Master’s degree candidates complete EDU 6085, “Moral Issues in Education” which seeks to “help educators develop a theologically, philosophically, historically and politically informed framework for taking ethical leadership in both public and private schools.” (Graduate Catalog, p.76). The issue of dispositions is prevalent in the unit’s conceptual framework which emphasizes “service, leadership, competency, and character.” That framework is clearly the underpinning for all of the professional education programs in the unit.

The aggregated candidate data for the principal and superintendent preparation programs provide further evidence of the attention paid to dispositions. In all categories that related to dispositional issues, SPU candidates had high ratings. Interviews with faculty and candidates provided additional evidence that SPU is serious about holding candidates to high standards of professionalism, integrity and character. One recent graduate commented that the faculty “expect a lot but also give a lot.”

Recommended rating: Exemplary

Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

The principal preparation program and the superintendent preparation program emphasize the importance of student learning throughout their respective curricula. The principal program structures courses and experiences to focus on the teacher as the one who most impacts student learning and the principal as the one who can impact the teacher. Candidates in the superintendent program take a separate course on improving student learning (EDAD 7588: Improving Student Learning) in which they learn to “integrate teaching, learning, and assessment in an aligned curriculum model that supports successful student learning.” Candidates in both programs are assessed on their impact on student learning and both programs include student learning in program evaluations by candidates and in their follow-up studies of graduates.

Recommended rating: Exemplary