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OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 Summarize the institution’s mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).

University of Nevada, Reno Mission Statement (2016)
Inspired by its land-grant foundation, the University of Nevada, Reno provides outstanding learning, discovery, and engagement programs that serve the economic, social, environmental, and cultural needs of the citizens of Nevada, the nation, and the world. The University recognizes and embraces the critical importance of diversity in preparing students for global citizenship and is committed to a culture of excellence, inclusion, and accessibility. The University of Nevada, Reno Mission Statement was approved in its current form by the NSHE Board of Regents on December 4, 2014. It is consistent with the NSHE Mission Statement (Board of Regents Handbook Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 1.)

The University of Nevada, Reno was founded in 1874 and was originally located in Elko, Nevada. It was relocated to Reno, Nevada in 1885 to better serve the majority of Nevada's population at the time. In July 2017, the United States Bureau of the Census ranked the state of Nevada as the second fastest-growing state in the nation. The University population is keeping pace with this growth. Student enrollment has increased 20% from 2011 to 2017 (Fall 2011: 17,994; Fall 2017: 21,653). The University's Office of Institutional Analysis projects enrollment to reach 25,000 students by 2027.

The University of Nevada, Reno is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, and received reaffirmation of its accredited status in February of 2017. It offers over 145 degree programs across 12 colleges and schools, including the Graduate School.

The University of Nevada, Reno has a productive academic faculty of just over 1,000, with $90 million in total research funding.

I.2 Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.

The College of Education - University of Nevada, Reno Mission Statement
The College of Education...
1. Prepares well-qualified educators, human development specialists, counselors, administrators, and other professionals to address community needs;
2. Conducts original research and scholarship to improve the knowledge based in professional practice and policy;
3. Engages with the state, local school districts, and communities through outreach and reciprocal partnerships to strengthen social, educational, and economic well-being of all Nevada citizens, including children; and
4. Cultivates professionals who are culturally competent, locally relevant, and globally aware.

Values
In all of its activities, College of Education faculty and staff embrace the following values for our graduates and ourselves.
1. We value diversity, including but not limited to age, ethnicity, class, gender, indigeneity, language, disability, ability, race, sexual identity, religious status, gender expression, educational background, geographic context, nationality, immigration status, income, marital status, parental status, and work experiences.
2. We value ethical practice and abide by the ethical guidelines of each of our respective professional organizations.
3. We value integrity in all of our actions.
4. We value equity.
5. We value respect.
6. We value a culture of caring and relationship building.

I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.

The College of Education offers three undergraduate degree programs: 1) Bachelor of Arts in Education with teaching majors at the secondary level (7th-12th grades), 2) Bachelor of Science in Education with teaching majors at the secondary level and in Integrated Elementary Teaching, and 3) Bachelor of Science with a major in Human Development and Family Studies. The Integrated Elementary Teaching Bachelor of Science in Education degree focuses on elementary education licensure coursework (K-8th grade) with students selecting an additional emphasis in one of three areas: special education, early childhood education, and English language acquisition and development. In addition, the College of Education participates as a partner in NevadaTeach, which includes a number of undergraduate dual degree programs designed to prepare teachers to work as licensed secondary teachers in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics.

Master's degrees are offered with majors in counseling and educational psychology (accredited by CACREP), educational leadership, elementary education, secondary education, special education, literacy studies, equity
and diversity in educational settings, and human development and family studies. A Doctoral program is offered with 8 areas of emphasis.

Initial licensure programs include programs leading to a Bachelor of Arts/Science in Secondary Education, a Bachelor of Science in Integrated Elementary Teaching, and Master of Education degree programs in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education (initial licensure track).

Advanced programs, as defined by NCATE, include: the Elementary Education M.S. program, the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program, the Special Education M.Ed. program (advanced licensure track), and the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program. Each of these programs provides additional training to already licensed teachers.

All programs obtained state approval at the last state review (see Exhibit 1-3-a).
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I.4 Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework for initial and advanced professional preparation programs at the University of Nevada, Reno is organized around four themes: (1) A lifelong love of learning; (2) a strong fund of knowledge concerning all aspects of education; (3) reflection on educational practices; and (4) valuing democracy and multiculturalism. Although the term "conceptual framework" implies a fixed structure, we view this framework as being dynamic and one in which professional educators must immerse themselves.

Theme 1: Love of Learning. Knowledge is not a fixed set of truths that are handed down from expert to novice. Therefore, educators must be open to discovery and derive pleasure as the mind extends life themes into new realms of meaning. Learning is intrinsically rewarding, combining the cognitive with the affective. Mastery, curiosity, and the desire to know are animating forces in the intellectual life of a learner. Because of a love of learning and desire to meet the needs and desires of students, educators must seek to build a growing repertoire of knowledge, as well as professional skills, throughout their careers.

Theme 2: Strong Fund of Knowledge. Educators' intellectual resources and dispositions largely determine their capacity to engage students' minds and hearts in learning. Therefore, a strong fund of subject matter knowledge is essential in professional preparation. Educators must possess knowledge of, knowledge about, and a positive disposition toward subject matter. Educators must also possess a strong fund of pedagogical knowledge in order to adequately teach subject matter to students and to translate knowledge into appropriate curriculum. Pedagogical content knowledge represents a blending
or melding of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers. To maximize the use of pedagogical knowledge, educators must possess a rich knowledge base about learners; including knowledge about physical, cognitive, and affective development and the role of a student's background in the learning process. Educators must also possess a strong fund of curricular knowledge including different views of curriculum and ensuing consequences for the role of the educator; an understanding of curricular planning and the knowledge necessary to carry it out; and the realities of curricular decision-making. Educators must be able to link subject matter with pedagogy as they shape experiences that enable students to develop and learn.

Theme 3: Reflective Practice. Educators should be able to make sound judgments and choices in selecting particular approaches and adapting them in ways that are consistent with their goals and that serve the best interests of their students. Educators who become experts at their craft have learned how to reflect systematically and develop strategies for learning from their experiences. Such abilities will depend on the acquisition of a reflective attitude toward teaching. Reflective teaching should be thought of as a general professional disposition, regardless of the philosophical framework out of which one works. Reflective practice informs decision-making, which is a key element in the instructional process, and is essential to effective participation in an educational setting. We expect all students in initial and advanced programs to practice and develop their skills as a reflective practitioner.

Theme 4: Democracy and Multiculturalism. We live in a pluralistic society that reflects a rich and diverse mixture of races, cultures, and experiences. Consequently, schools must provide learning opportunities that give all students access to forms of social, political, and economic power. The purpose of educational institutions should be to give voice to the diversity of its people, and to recognize the truth that sometimes these voices have been suppressed (both historically and in modern day). Democracy and multiculturalism are taught within a critical framework that supports reflection on privilege, open forums for discussion and debate, and movement toward empowering forms of schooling that are firmly rooted in social justice and a sense of community. Representation of the diversity of thinking that is reflective of a multicultural society is mandatory within educational institutions that support multiculturalism. Open access to information is of critical importance within a multicultural democratic community.

The unit's conceptual framework is just that - the philosophical foundation for what we do. Operationalizing this framework requires specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Faculty began developing the conceptual framework by examining the InTASC standards, the domains of professional competence, and the standards of other professional specialty associations. The analysis revealed that the four themes of the conceptual framework are embedded
within the standards used across programs. In other words, as InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and other standards used by programs are met, the institutional standards of the conceptual framework are also met. Please see Exhibit 1-5-c for more information on the unit's Conceptual Framework and its relationship to the advanced programs' student learning outcomes.
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**I.5 Exhibits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.5.a</th>
<th>Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.5.b</td>
<td>Examples of syllabi for professional education courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.c</td>
<td>Conceptual framework(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.d</td>
<td>Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.e</td>
<td>Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-5-a Catalog Pages- Graduate School.pdf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-1 EL 700 Spring 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-2 EL703 Spring 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-3 EL 798 Summer 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-4 EL 798 Fall 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-5 EL 715 Fall 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-6 EL 746 Fall 2017 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-7 ElemEd EDS_750_Syll_Sp_17.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-8 ElemEd Syllabus-CTL 728.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-9 ElemEd Syllabus EDUC 624.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-9a ElemEd EDUC 625 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-9b ElemEd EDRS 700 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-10 LitStud EDRL700 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-11 LitStud edrl701 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-12 LitStud eds795 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-13 LitStud EDS 770 Spring 2011 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-14 SpEd EDSP 725B Fall 2017.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-15 SpEd EDSP 724 syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-16 SpEd EDSP 443.643 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-17 SpEd EDSP 713 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-18 SpEd EDSP 726 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-19 SpEd EDSP 467.667 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-20 SpEd EDSP 722 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-b-21 SpEd EDSP 721 Syllabus.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-d UNR_CACREP_Site_Visit_Report, 10-30-17.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-c Conceptual Framework.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See **Attachment** panel below.
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1.a Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

All advanced program candidates are assessed at entry with admissions data (Grade Point Average; GPA), mid-point course assessments, and at exit assessment. Specific program areas, like Literacy, have students complete an entry assessment that reveals their foundational knowledge about literacy knowledge and instruction. Other program areas require students to complete an application essay in which they identify current background knowledge and specific goals. A key indicator used to assess prerequisite content knowledge in candidates in the advanced programs is the cumulative undergraduate GPA, reviewed upon application into their respective programs. The cumulative GPA indicates that students have successfully completed undergraduate coursework for a Bachelor's degree with an average "B" grade or better in all coursework. Given that all four advanced programs require that students have an active teaching license, all advanced program applicants have successfully completed a 4-year degree program with specific content-area coursework required for licensure before applying to any of the advanced programs in the unit.

If an applicant is applying as a graduate degree-seeking student to any advanced program in the unit, an overall undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher is required for admission. Under special conditions and with provisions, advanced programs throughout the unit may accept students with undergraduate cumulative GPAs below 3.0. Students accepted under such provisional status require a special memo to the Graduate School for admission. Exhibit 1-3-d shows the mean GPA for candidates admitted into each advanced program for the past 3 application years.

After admission, all advanced candidates remain closely monitored by faculty advisors and program coordinators regarding the required program assessments and candidate dispositions. To remain in good academic standing throughout the unit's advanced programs, students must maintain a 3.0 GPA or better as prescribed by the University of Nevada, Reno Graduate School. Throughout each master's degree program, the performance of each candidate is assessed using program-specific tools designed to assess program-specific Student Learning Outcomes. A summative assessment of candidates' content knowledge concludes each M.S. and M.Ed. program. In addition, advanced candidates seeking a second teaching license or
endorsement must complete the appropriate state-mandated Praxis II exam to illustrate proficiency in that content.

Students complete either a project or professional paper during their final semester of an advanced program, which is guided by their committee chair and presented to their graduate committee. During this session, the student is asked questions that are intended to elicit reflection on his or her understanding of content and major themes/issues facing his/her respective field. The candidate's graduate advisory committee completes the final evaluation of professional competencies demonstrated by the culminating assessment.

Exit from all advanced programs requires (a) program-specific evaluations of content knowledge, and (b) completion of culminating activities. These culminating activities are written in nature (e.g., capstone papers, comprehensive examinations, projects, or theses), and seek to integrate content and professional knowledge. Faculty members review each candidate at the "exit" phase. This "exit" status is affirmed through the submission of a Notice of Completion to the Graduate School, which is signed by each graduate advisory committee member indicating that the student has successfully completed all program requirements, including the culminating activity.

Each advanced program has delineated at least one student learning outcome (SLO) reflecting students' content knowledge. These are as follows:

**Literacy Studies M.Ed.:** SLO 1: Graduates will be able to demonstrate foundational knowledge of literacy, literacy development, and multiple literacies.

**Elementary Education M.S.:** Each SLO in the Elementary M.S. program requires foundational content knowledge in order to be successfully completed. The Elementary SLOs are:
1. Teachers will be able to identify, analyze, synthesize, and produce meaningful research on educational issues and policy informing their classroom practice;
2. Teachers will demonstrate the effective use of research based planning for instruction that leads to improved (K-8) student achievement in math, science, and/or social studies; and
3. Teachers will demonstrate growth in leadership roles and opportunities in their grade level teams, schools, district, and state or beyond.

**Special Education M.Ed.:** SLO 1: Candidates will demonstrate foundational knowledge of characteristics of individuals with disabilities and their learning environments, and curriculum content to develop appropriate instruction to facilitate student learning.
Exhibit 1-3-d presents outcomes from key assessments demonstrating candidates' content knowledge.

1.1.b Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the pedagogical content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

The unit's candidates in advanced programs for teachers demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the pedagogical-specific methods of teaching content of their respective fields of study and of the theories related to pedagogy and learning. They are able to select and use a broad range of instructional strategies and technologies that promote student learning and are able to clearly explain the choices they make in their practice.

Candidates in advanced programs are able to select and use a broad range of instructional strategies and technologies that promote student learning and are able to clearly explain the choices they make in their practice. As advanced students progress through the program courses with specific pedagogical emphases, faculty members in those courses are able to assess candidates' mastery of pedagogical knowledge and skills through assessment of pedagogical-specific Student Learning Outcomes.

The course sequence for the M.S. in Elementary Education was deliberately built to not only build content knowledge but to learn the associated pedagogical content knowledge. Each of its courses align with current standards and the current pedagogical practices associated therein. An example from Mathematics would be that the four mathematical courses are arranged by the Common Core State Standards' Mathematical Practices as they apply to different areas of content instruction. In Science, although the courses are guided by the Next Generation Science Standards' Disciplinary Core Ideas (DCI), each course is taught utilizing the integration of the DCI along with the Science and Engineering Practices (SEP) and the Cross Cutting Concepts (CCC) for full integration of the three dimensional aspect of the NGSS. SLO #2 for Elementary Education specifically addresses pedagogical content knowledge: "Teachers will demonstrate the effective use of research based planning for instruction that leads to improved student achievement in math, science and or social studies". This SLO documents the use of both content knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge that is used to improve candidates' current practice. Specific courses now carry specific assignments for data collection in the revised Elementary program. Exhibit 1-3-d provides data and data plans for the Elementary Program.

The M.Ed. in Literacy Studies program is based on the Nevada state requirements for Reading Specialists as well as the Standards for Reading Professionals from the International Literacy Association (ILA; https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/standards/standards-for-reading-professionals). To measure graduate students' progress in
pedagogical content knowledge, SLO #2 states: Graduates will be able to demonstrate use of assessment, curricular, and instructional knowledge to determine and meet the literacy needs of diverse students. The Literacy Studies program employs two types of assessments, course-based assessments and program level assessments. The course-based assessments are course-specific and provide information on students' capacity with the SLOs at the time in which the course was taken. The program level assessments are submitted by all students at the beginning, middle, and end of the program and measure growth over time on the SLOs. Exhibit 1-3-d provides data for the Literacy Studies program.

In the new assessment system for the Special Education M.Ed. program, launched in the fall of 2016, "Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates" is addressed by SLO #1: Candidates will demonstrate foundational knowledge of characteristics of individuals with disabilities and their learning environments, and curriculum content to develop appropriate instruction to facilitate student learning. Students in the advanced program for Special Education are evaluated multiple times on the SLO using a rubric that is included in the response to Standard 2 of this report. Scores are reported on a 1-4 scale, with higher scores indicating greater proficiency. We have collected SLO #1 rubric data on currently active advanced program students. In an effort to demonstrate progress as students work through the program, we also retroactively applied the SLO #1 rubric to assignments from students who have completed the program, if those assignments were still available to score. As a result, we have early and late program SLO #1 scores for 42 students. We applied a paired-sample t-test to determine if the mean of the late program scores (M = 3.50, SD = .672) were significantly higher than the mean of the early program scores (M = 2.64, SD = 1.055). The t-test yielded a statistically significant difference (t = -5.180, p < .0005), with a large effect size (d = 1.00). These results support the argument that students are improving their pedagogical skills and knowledge as they progress through the Special Education program.

1.1.c Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Students in advanced programs consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences. They reflect on their practice. They know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning. They are able to analyze educational research findings and incorporate new information into their practice as appropriate. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers reflect on their practice and are able to identify their strengths and areas of needed improvement. They engage in professional activities. They are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching,
learning, and best practices. They are able to analyze educational research and policies and can explain the implications for their own practice and for the profession.

Candidates graduating from the unit's advanced teacher programs must demonstrate adequate understanding of the professional knowledge expected in their fields as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Common throughout all advanced programs is the expectation that candidates must (a) know their students, families and communities; (b) use current research to inform their practices; (c) use technology in their practices; and (d) support student learning through their professional services.

The Elementary Education program has three guiding Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). SLOs 1, 2, and 3 all, in part, address the propositions in 1c. SLO 1 speaks to graduate students' ability to use research and policies to systematically inform their teaching practices. SLO 2 speaks to graduate students' ability to effectively use research to plan instruction that will improve student learning. SLO 3 speaks to graduate students' ability to demonstrate active leadership and involvement in their learning communities. The data plan for Elementary Education is presented in Exhibit 1-3-d.

The data presented for Literacy Studies in Exhibit 1-3-d specifically address issues of diversity with students, families, and communities, as well as the graduate students' capacity for using data, current research, and technology in their practices. Included in the multiple literacies component of SLO 1 is a consideration of diversity. SLO 2 specifically addresses diversity in assessment and instruction, and assessment involves using data to make instructional decisions (a specific focus of EDRL 700 and EDRL 701). As evidenced by the program level assessment data, students make clear progress in SLOs 1 and 2 throughout the program. SLO 3 speaks to the scholarly habits of graduate students and their ability to synthesize and apply research findings. Again, as evidenced in Exhibit 1-3-d, students make clear progress in SLO 3 as they progress through the program.

In the new assessment system for the Special Education M.Ed. program, launched in the fall of 2016, the extent to which students "are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices. They are able to analyze educational research and policies and can explain the implications for their own practice and for the profession" is addressed by SLO #3: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to understand research related to special education and to synthesize that research with an application to applied practice. Students in the advanced program for Special Education are evaluated multiple times on the SLO using a rubric that is included in the response to Standard 2 of this report. Scores are reported on a 1-4 scale, with higher scores indicating greater proficiency. We have collected SLO #3 rubric data on currently active advanced program students.
In an effort to demonstrate progress as students work through the program, we also retroactively applied the SLO #3 rubric to assignments from students who have completed the program, if those assignments were still available to score. As a result, we have early and late program SLO #3 scores for 31 students. We applied a paired-sample t-test to determine if the mean of the late program scores (M = 3.15, SD = .958) were significantly higher than the mean of the early program scores (M = 2.21, SD = 1.038). The t-test yielded a statistically significant difference (t = -3.363, p = .002), with a large effect size (d = .94). These results support the argument that students are improving their research skills and knowledge as they progress through the Special Education program.

1.1.d Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Summary processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the knowledge, skills, and ability to affect student learning.

The unit's candidates in advanced programs for teachers have a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and regularly apply these in their practice. They analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn. They are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning.

Literacy Studies, M.Ed.
In the M.Ed. in Literacy Studies program, SLO 2 specifically speaks to assessment, curriculum, and instruction for diverse learners, and the course-based assessments for EDRL 700 and EDRL 701 (case study reports based on supervised practice) directly align with creating positive environments. The program level assessments also require evidence of knowledge in promoting the development of literacy in positive environments. Exhibit 1-3-d displays data demonstrating growth in graduate student knowledge throughout the program.

SLO 2 relates to assessment, curriculum and instruction for diverse learners. Course-based assessments in EDRL 701 Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction Literacy and EDRL 700 Literacy Assessment, case study reports based on supervised practice, are offered as measures. These courses both include an innovative "Virtual Reading Clinic", which allow for a supervised practicum experience in a fully-online program. M.Ed. students in EDRL 700 and EDRL 701 choose two K-12 practicum students from their school sites in need of literacy and language support. Following the acquisition of parental permission forms, the M.Ed. students work with the two practicum students approximately 15 times across the two courses. The tutoring sessions encompass both assessment and instructional goals. All tutoring sessions are video-recorded and uploaded to a password-protected website. The M.Ed. students reflect on their own sessions and watch and critique the sessions of
their colleagues, and the instructor in both courses views the sessions and provides coaching and feedback as well. In both courses, M.Ed. students write weekly reflections on their assessment and instructional decisions with their practicum students.

The SLO-aligned course-based assessments for these courses are the final case study reports on the practicum students. The final case study report for EDRL 700 captures the M.Ed. students' assessment choices for their practicum students, practicum students' performance on assessments, assessment interpretations, and instructional goals based on assessments. The final case study report for EDRL 701 captures the M.Ed. students' instructional goals for the practicum students and all instructional activities and resources crafted to meet those goals. Final assessment information, practicum students' gains, and revised instructional goals are also included in this second case study report.

With respect to data that shows gains across all courses, Exhibit 1-3-d provides data intended to demonstrate candidates' growth in the program.

Elementary Education, M.S.
The Elementary M.S. program is guided by two Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) that incorporate student learning for teacher candidates. The SLOs are assessed when student course artifacts are examined. The courses vary in which SLOs are assess dependent upon their emphasis areas. The first SLO examines whether teachers demonstrate the effective use of research-based planning for instruction that leads to improved student achievement in math, science, and/or social studies. The artifacts submitted are graded on a rubric specifically aligned with this SLO which assesses planning for instruction (learning objectives, sequences of learning, individual learners, and use of assessment), assessment (data alignment and engaging learnings), and student learning. The second SLO examines whether teachers demonstrate growth in leadership roles and opportunities in their grade level teams, schools, districts, and state. This SLO is self-assessed and specifically examined (1) if the teacher collaborates with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth and (2) if the teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility to student learning to advance the profession.

Students learn from the teachers in the MS for Elementary Education. The data presented in Exhibit 1-3-d display student learning in classes with teachers enrolled in the Elementary M.S. program.

The Special Education Advanced licensure program is guided by three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). The SLO2 addresses, in part, assessment and the use of outside resources. This SLO is assessed through course artifacts across a variety of courses. Specific courses and artifacts will depend on which of six emphasis areas the student is in. Every emphasis area requires that students
are assessed on SLO2 with a minimum of two, and as many as five, artifacts. These artifacts include lesson modifications, functional behavioral analyses, portfolios, implementation projects, transition plans, papers, curriculum & progress monitoring projects, and instructional plans. The tables in Exhibit 1-3-d outline the specific artifacts measuring knowledge in this area for each emphasis area in special education.

Please also refer to specific artifacts presented in Exhibit 1-3-g that demonstrate candidates' impact on student learning.

1.1.e Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals’ demonstration of the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Candidates for other professional school roles have an adequate understanding of the knowledge expected in their fields and delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They know their students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform their practices; use technology in their practices; and support student learning through their professional services. The advanced program considered in this section is the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program.

Although not required for the Administrator Endorsement in Nevada, all students in the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program take the Praxis exam, Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision. This exam is considered as the students' comprehensive examination for the degree program. Because it is not required for licensure, there is no state level cut-off score for passing this examination. However, 100% of candidates over the past 3 years of data collection have exceeded the national passing score on this exam.

As measured on the Praxis assessment, Educational Leadership students demonstrate a higher level of content knowledge as their mean score surpasses the national passing score of 145. 100% of students pass this test by national standards.

In addition to the Praxis II assessment, students in the M.Ed. program for Educational Leadership also are guided by a specific set of Student Learning Outcomes for this program. The learning outcomes are aligned to the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL). Specific SLOs for Educational Leadership are as follows:
SLO 1: Facilitating the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared supported by the school community (PSEL 1)
SLO 2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conductive to student learning and staff professional growth (PSEL 4, 5, 6, 7, 10)
SLO 3: Management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment (PSEL 9)
SLO 4: Collaborating with families and community responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources (PSEL 3, 8)
SLO 5: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner (PSEL 2)
SLO 6: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (PSEL 3).

Students in the redesigned Educational Leadership M.Ed. program (Nevada Leads) complete a series of assignments designed to capture their growth on each of these Student Learning Outcomes and standards. One particular assignment is their self-assessment on each of the 10 PSEL standards. This self-assessment was completed at the beginning of the newly redesigned program for the first cohort (January 2017, n = 19). Overall, students rated themselves as follows, on a scale of 1 to 5 (Pre-Novice to Distinguished).

Students at the beginning of the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program rate themselves as "Developing" for each of these standards. They rate themselves highest for Ethics and Professional Norms (PSEL 2) and lowest for Operations and Management (PSEL 9). See data in Exhibit 1-3-d.

Students complete the same self-assessment at three different times during their program: the beginning of the program (spring semester of year 1), approximately midway through the program (summer session of year 2), and at the end of the program (fall semester of year 2). In addition to student self-assessments, comparison assessments are collected as well. First, co-instructors rate each student according to the same PSEL 2015 assessment rubric at each iteration of the self-assessment (beginning, midway, and end). This provides an instructor viewpoint comparison of the students and the cohort as a whole. Second, mentor principals also provide a self-assessment of their own skills using the PSEL 2015 assessment rubric, which brings forth a comparison of the mentor-mentee viewpoints related to the PSEL 2015 standards. Ultimately, students can identify how they rate themselves, how instructors rate them, and how these ratings compare against their current mentor principals' self-ratings. Each iteration allows students and program leads to more accurately support students' needs and growth.

Candidates in Educational Leadership are assessed for their knowledge of students, families, communities, their use of current research to inform their practices, and use of technology in practice in their coursework throughout the program. For instance, EL advanced program students take and successfully complete EDRS 746, Data-Based Decision Making and EDRS 700, Introduction to Educational Research. In addition, these same students take Public Relations for Schools, which includes studies related to families and communities.
All candidates are assessed during coursework throughout the program, as well as with a culminating program project. One example is in EL 700, Basic Principles of Educational Administration (6 focus PSEL standards) and EL 703, Administration and Curriculum Improvement (4 focus PSEL standards), as students submit reflections of how they have understood, experienced, and view the standards in practice. This work brings together their personal reflections, course learnings and theory, along with their embedded internship experience. Other course examples include, EL 746, Data-based Decision-Making, which ask students to complete data analyses at various levels (scaffolding), such as at the student level, department/grade level, and the school level. Each analysis requires students to be attentive to all 10 standards in PSEL 2015 and allow for clear assessment of student learning and growth. In the embedded internship experience, students are able to interact with district-used technologies, data analyses tools, and evaluation rubrics.
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1.1.f Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals’ demonstration of abilities to create and maintain positive environments, as appropriate to their professional responsibilities, which support student learning in educational settings.

The unit’s candidates for other professional school roles critique and are able to reflect on their work within the context of student learning. They establish educational environments that support student learning, collect and analyze data related to student learning, and apply strategies for improving student learning within their own jobs and schools.

Candidates have demonstrated knowledge and skills through a variety of individual, small group, and classroom activities. Prior to the complete redesign of the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program and initiation of Nevada Leads (in January 2017), a portfolio developed during the internship included: (a) a philosophy statement as a building principal, (b) documentation of a major objective or problem situation, (c) completion of activities from a suggested list, (d) supporting materials for the practicum activities, (e) a diary or log of time working on the objective/problem situation, and (f) a summary reflection. Examples are available on site for this previously-existing process. In the redesigned program, students continue to work individually, in small groups, through multiple classroom activities, and with a two-year embedded internship experience. These learning experiences are designed to reflect specific aspects related to PSEL 2015 in order to combine theoretical and practical lenses to learning and leadership. In addition, courses are directly aligned with embedded internship experiences. Consequently, mentors are able to work one-on-one with mentees (candidates) in order to support and enhance student learning. Professors and co-instructors are able to reflect on student growth, adjust coursework (where needed) and support whole-group and individual learning. Professors and instructors also communicate with internship supervisor in order to support continuous student learning. For example, in one instance where a
student was struggling with course requirements and feeling anxious, the co-
instructors allotted extra time for the student to complete requirements. However, this was also communicated to the internship supervisor met one-
on-one with the individual to provide additional "tips" and other forms of support for student learning. While these are often more in the form of formative assessments on candidates, various examples support student learning.

To some extent, each of the SLOs for the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program involve support of student learning. However, the most applicable would be SLO 1: Facilitating the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared supported by the school community (PSEL 1), SLO 2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth (PSEL 4, 5, 6, 7, 10), and SLO 3: Management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment (PSEL 9). Assignments and assessment of these three SLOs, thus most inform student learning for other school professionals. Data are presented in Exhibit 1-3-d.

1.1.g Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of professional dispositions expected by the unit.

The University of Nevada, Reno is strongly committed to developing and supporting appropriate dispositions among all advanced program candidates. Candidates are familiar with the professional dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities reflects these professional dispositions.

The unit's advanced programs have developed a set of professional behaviors and dispositions that all candidates are expected to demonstrate. These dispositions include: 1) reflective practitioner, 2) multiculturalism and democracy, 3) love of learning and strong fund of knowledge, and 4) research and scholarship. The tracking of these dispositions begins at admission for advanced programs (see Exhibit 1-3-e).

All professional educators are expected to adhere to a professional code of conduct. Any educator pursuing graduate studies serves as a model for others. The faculty of the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno have adopted a set of professional behaviors or dispositions that are crucial for graduate level students. These dispositions apply to the university setting, courses, and field experiences. Failure to demonstrate one or more of the dispositions may lead to an individualized plan for improvement and, in
extreme cases, could lead to removal from the program. The list of
dispositions is not exhaustive. Depending on the situation, there could be
behaviors that do not appear on the list, but which could be considered in an
evaluation of readiness to continue in graduate study.

Literacy Studies, M.Ed.
Graduate students in the M.Ed. in Literacy Studies program are held to the
highest level of professional dispositions, and this expectation is explicit in
SLOs 2 and 3. SLO 2 requires that students can craft and implement
assessment, curriculum, and instruction in literacy for diverse students, and
SLO 3 requires evidence of scholarly habits and integrity. Without adhering to
the dispositions stated in the college-wide dispositions form, students cannot
successfully meet SLOs 2 and 3. Tables 1.5 and 1.6 provide evidence for
growth and competence in these SLOs as students progress through the
program.

Elementary Education, M.S.
Graduate students in the Elementary Education program are held to a
Graduate Student Professional Behaviors and Dispositions contract. This
dispositional contract is signed at application and dispositions are monitored
throughout the program. Students who do not meet one or more of the
dispositional areas are either placed on a remediation plan or in extreme
cases removed from the program. SLO 3 within the Elementary Education
program specifically addresses graduate students' ability to become active
leaders within their professional communities.

Upon application to the MS in Elementary Education, candidates fill out a
Professional Dispositions form that outlines the professional behaviors and
dispositions of students in our program. Students then filled out the
Professional Dispositions form again at the end of the last semester as part of
the comprehensive exam / defense. The program has collected these two
data points in an excel spreadsheet for each cohort. With that said, just filling
out a dispositions form as a checklist does not meet the new standard as
outlined by NCATE. Therefore, beginning in 2018 with Cohort 6, there will be
a self-evaluative Professional Dispositions Survey administered at the
beginning and end of the program. This survey can be analyzed for growth in
professional dispositions as a result of being in the program.

Special Education, M.Ed.
Professional dispositions are not subsumed under a specific SLO. Instead, the
professional dispositions, as listed above, are each included in one or more of
the three SLOs. The College of Education maintains a disposition process to
support students who do not meet at least minimum acceptable standards
across all the SLOs. When a student does not meet minimum acceptable
standards, this concern is documented in two ways. First, the rubrics for all of
the SLOs include criteria for these minimum acceptable standards, so
students are assessed on these standards as they apply to each artifact.
Second, faculty may choose to submit a dispositions report expressing concerns about the professional behavior and dispositions of a student. In either case, these documents trigger a dispositions process that includes an individualized plan for improvement for the student, and well as the possibility of removal from the program. In addition, every student completes a self-evaluation of their professional behaviors and dispositions prior to internship.

Educational Leadership, M.Ed.
Upon admission to the program, candidates sign the College of Education Professional Behaviors and Dispositions, which acknowledges their understanding of these behaviors and dispositions, as well as demonstrates an agreement to focus on these aspects throughout their program experience. In EL 700, for example, the course projects is a complete reflection of their experience. They submit a "draft" of their reflections at the start of the course, and then submit a final version at the end of the course. The growth and understanding as a Reflective Practitioner is clearly notable in their document (available upon request). In EL 703, Administration and Curriculum Improvement, students use the lens of Multiculturalism and Democracy in order to focus on curricular needs and improvement. Throughout students' internship experiences (EL 798) students continue to demonstrate their Love of Learning and Strong Fund of Knowledge; this growth is visible in student internship logs and experiences; furthermore, new students attend the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development conference.
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1.1. Follow Up Studies
Summarize results from follow-up studies of graduates and employers regarding your teacher education graduates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, ability to help all students learn, and professional dispositions.

Graduates' preparation in content areas for Advanced Programs is assessed, among other ways, in follow-up studies of graduates and their employers. In spring of 2017, a survey was sent out to employers and graduates of the advanced programs from the last 4 years (2013-2016). The surveys were administered by Skyfactor (formerly EBI).

The college provided the email addresses of all 168 graduates of advanced programs from 2013-2016. Three email addresses were unable to be verified or failed in delivery, and 6 participants opted out. A total of 65 graduates completed the survey (39.2%); following is the breakdown by advanced program:

- 20 graduates of Elementary M.S.
- 19 graduates of Special Education M.Ed.
- 8 graduates of Literacy Studies M.Ed.
- 4 graduates of Educational Leadership M.Ed. (specific data unreportable due to small sample size)
- 4 graduates indicated they were from "other" programs (Graduates of the 4 advanced programs in this report were specifically targeted for this survey;
however, it is possible that these respondents indicated "other" because they had graduated from more than one.)

The survey included questions on students' demographics, characteristics of their workplace, satisfaction with various aspects of their program, satisfaction with their preparation for the workplace, and open-ended questions on program improvement and professional achievements. In addition, the college added 10 questions that were specific to advanced program graduates, the target of this administration of the survey. The following questions were added:

1. From which program in the College of Education did you most recently graduate? [Forced choice]
2. To what extent do you feel that your graduate program gave you an in-depth knowledge of content for teaching or administration? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
3. To what extent do you feel that your graduate program improved your professional practice? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
4. To what extent do you feel that your graduate program used and helped you to understand current research and policies related to teaching, learning, and best practices? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
5. To what extent do you feel that your graduate program has had an impact on your use of student data to improve your instruction? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
6. To what extent did your graduate program help to develop your ability to apply research and research methods? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
7. To what extent do you believe that your graduate program has helped you to impact student learning (either directly or indirectly)? [1-7 scale; from not at all to extremely]
8. Have you pursued National Board Certification? [yes, working on, considering, no]
9. What are your long-term professional goals? [open-ended]
10. Please provide any additional feedback you may have about your graduate program at the College of Education. [open-ended]

Overall, the data presented in Exhibit 1-3-i indicate that most graduates believe that their advanced program provided in-depth content knowledge for teaching or administration. The distribution of responses was larger for Elementary Education and Special Education than for Literacy Studies, although only 3 total graduates responded below a 4 (moderately). Nonetheless, should this trend continue, these programs may consider reviewing and bolstering the level of content knowledge provided to their students, if warranted.

The response numbers on the employer survey were less robust than those of the advanced program graduate survey. Only 15 graduates submitted employer contact information. One employer opted out of the survey and 4
did not respond, leaving a total of 11 responses (73.3% response rate, of the employers with contact information available). Due to the low number of responses, it was not possible to disaggregate the data by program. Overall, the employers who responded were satisfied with the preparation of graduates from this college of education compared to others with similar levels of education and experience, as indicated in Exhibit 1-3-j. Notably, no employers indicated that graduates were "among the least prepared" or "less prepared than others".

The unit is currently piloting a new strategy for reaching graduates and employers and 2 new assessment instruments, as part of its participation with the Deans for Impact Common Indicators System. Advanced program faculty will be examining the instruments to ascertain their usefulness in assessing the graduates of advanced programs and employers of their candidates in the spring of 2018. (These instruments were originally developed for use with initial teacher preparation programs, so may need to be adapted.)

1.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

The 2014 NCATE accreditation report revealed two areas for improvement for advanced programs:
1. Data are incomplete for advanced programs and are insufficiently aggregated within programs or disaggregated by program.
2. Data are insufficient to measure candidate impact on P-12 student learning.

Immediately following our last NCATE visit, faculty in the advanced programs met monthly led by Diane Barone, Director of the PSS Division, and Melissa Burnham, Associate Dean. Each program area sent a representative from their faculty to work on assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The first task this group managed was creating a single dispositions document for all advanced program students. All students sign this document upon admittance to an advanced program. Another task was to explicitly identify the advanced programs in the unit, based on the NCATE definition and the size of the program. It was clear in the unit’s 2014 institutional report that there was some confusion regarding "advanced" versus "initial" programs, with some initial programs being mislabeled as advanced if they were at the graduate level. After achieving clarity on the definition of an advanced program as that which prepares existing teachers with advanced levels of knowledge, an additional license added to an existing license, or with preparation as an "other school professional", the unit was able to identify the four programs of focus in the current report. Although the unit has other programs at the graduate level, these do not uniformly prepare existing teachers.
The group then tackled the development of program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Previously, all courses had SLOs, but there were no program outcomes explicitly identified. Once the program SLOs were clearly labeled, faculty determined when the SLO was assessed and how it was assessed. In each program there is a blend with some SLOs assessed within courses and others outside of courses. At this time, some programs have entered data into TaskStream while others are maintaining spreadsheets with this data. While data may be stored in different formats, faculty review student data within their monthly meetings and changes happen within programs based on this data.

The process since the 2014 site visit has been rigorous, and has resulted in much clearer learning outcomes and better assessments of candidate learning for each advanced program. As noted above, the previous AFI for Standard 1 indicated that:
1. Data are incomplete for advanced programs and are insufficiently aggregated within programs or disaggregated by program.
2. Data are insufficient to measure candidate impact on P-12 student learning.

Each advanced program is now actively collecting data on their candidates, storing these data in Excel or in Taskstream, and regularly examining the data. Data are also clearly collected on candidate impact on student learning, as the Exhibits illustrate (e.g., Exhibit 1-3-g).

1.3 Exhibits for Standard 1

| 1.3.a | State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.) |
| 1.3.b | Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years |
| 1.3.c | Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.) |
| 1.3.d | Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.) |
| 1.3.e | Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn |
| 1.3.f | Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.) |
| 1.3.g | Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning |
1.3.h Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit

1.3.i Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates

1.3.j Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates

1.3.k Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3-b-1 Title II 2015.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-b-3 Title II 2017.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-a State documentation.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-b-2 Title II Nevada Data_2016.xls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-c Key Assessments Summary.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-c-1 Course-based Assessments Literacy.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-c-2 Assessments Elementary.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-c-3 Assessments Special Ed.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-c-4 Assessments Ed Leadership.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-d Aggregate Data.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-e Dispositions Assessment.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-f Dispositions Data.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g ElemEd-1 3rd Grade Student Analysis Work.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g ElemEd-2 Annotated-Lesson-Analysis.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g ElemEd-3 Lesson Implementation and Analysis.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g-LIT-1 EDRL 700 Case Study A1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g-LIT-2 EDRL 700 Case Study A2.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g-LIT-3 EDRL 700 Case Study B1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-g-LIT-4 EDRL 700 Case Study B2.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-1 EL 700 Pre Student 1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-2 EL 700 Post Student 1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-3 EL 715 First Observation Pre.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-4 EL 715 Third Observation Student Post.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-5 EL 746 Student Profile Data Beginning.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-EL-6 EL 746 Data Analysis Student End.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-LIT-1 Rivera - Entry Essay.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-LIT-2 Rivera, S. mid essay 1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h-LIT-3 Rivera, S. mid essay 2.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-h Elemed-1 CTL 728 Video Analysis.docx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-i-1 Grad Survey x InTASC.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-i-2 Grad Survey_All Qs.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-i-3 Grad Survey_By Program.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-j-1 Employer Survey_All Qs.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See Attachment panel below.
Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
2.1.a Assessment System

Summarize content, construct, process, and evaluation of the unit assessment system, its key assessments in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards, and its use in monitoring candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Following our last NCATE visit, assessment of our students and our advanced programs became our foremost priority. We immediately established monthly meetings with faculty in the advanced programs that were led by Diane Barone, Director of the PSS Division, and Melissa Burnham, Associate Dean. Each advanced program area sent a representative from their faculty to work on assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The first task this group managed was creating a single dispositions document for all advanced program students. All students sign this document upon admittance to an advanced program. The group then tackled program-specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Previously, all courses had SLOs, but there were no program outcomes explicitly identified. Once the program SLOs were clearly labeled, faculty determined when the SLO was assessed and how it was assessed. In each program there is a blend with some SLOs assessed within courses and others outside of courses. At this time, some programs have entered data into TaskStream while others are maintaining spreadsheets with this data as they prepare for Taskstream. While data may be stored in different formats, faculty review student data within their monthly meetings and changes happen within programs based on this data.

The assessment system is currently in the process of being transitioned to a digital platform (Taskstream) to aid in administration, collection, storage, analysis, and consistency of assessments of program SLOs across all advanced programs. As each advanced program has recently updated its assessment plans and developed SLOs, and while the Taskstream templates are being constructed for each program, advanced program data coordinators are holding student data in Excel databases. Within the next year, all programs will be converted to Taskstream to facilitate ease of data collection and analyses both within and across programs.

The unit at the University of Nevada, Reno collects a variety of data that collectively comprise the unit's assessment base. All course syllabi and student learning outcomes are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework. Performance indicators, assignments and assessments are aligned with the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards or other national professional standards, and best practices
supported by research. Programs that lead to an additional endorsement on a teaching license (Literacy, Special Education, and Educational Leadership) are aligned with State of Nevada requirements for these endorsements. Courses in all advanced programs are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, and these are evidenced in every syllabus. (Syllabi are available on-site; samples are provided in Exhibit I.5.)

The unit's assessment system includes a variety of integrated and comprehensive assessment and evaluation measures that individually and cumulatively monitor important candidate performance dimensions consistent with the unit's conceptual framework. The measures and instruments in the unit's assessment system are designed to be broad in scope, and to serve as effective predictors of subsequent candidate success in the schools. To this end the unit's assessment system seeks measures that are consistent, accurate, fair, valid, and reliable, as critical decisions about the progress of candidates rests upon these measures at important transition points in advanced programs.

The Standards Matrix (as illustrated in Exhibit 2-3-a-1) illustrates the fidelity of the relationship between the unit's assessment system and NCATE Standards 1, 3, and 4. Exhibit I-5-c also has tables depicting the Alignment of Conceptual Framework to InTASC Standards and Advanced Programs' standards.

The unit's conceptual framework (Exhibit I-5-c) identifies anticipated candidate performance outcomes (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) at the initial and advanced levels. The Educator Preparation and Curriculum Coordinating Council (EPC3) is responsible for the continuous monitoring, evaluation, and subsequent revision of the unit's assessment system. The EPC3 committee includes representatives from all of programs throughout the unit, including those engaged in preparing candidates at the advanced level. The unit regularly reviews assessment data from employer and graduate surveys (e.g. SkyFactor data).

At the advanced level, the unit is committed to documenting that candidates demonstrate specific sets of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions prior to program completion. Assessments used to document this include evaluations of candidates by faculty at a minimum of three points: (a) initial entry, (b) mid-point, and (c) program completion. These candidate evaluations are supplemented by evaluations of the unit's graduates by employers and by evaluations of programs by alumni. These interconnected evaluations are summarized by program in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 (see Exhibit 2-3-a). The responsibility for the continuing evaluation and modification of the Advanced programs' assessment system lies with the Associate Dean, and the EPC3.

The unit uses a variety of integrated and comprehensive assessment and
evaluation measures that individually and cumulatively monitor important candidate performance dimensions consistent with the unit's conceptual framework. Exhibit 2-3-a-1 shows the transition points and criteria for advanced programs.

The unit's assessment system is based on a series of expectations at critical transition points in each program. Multiple assessment procedures inform a variety of decisions, including determinations about (a) candidate progress and (b) the continuous improvement of programs throughout the unit.

The EPC3 is responsible for addressing issues with students who have been identified by faculty as not meeting the dispositions established by the college. In these cases, the course instructor meets with the candidate to discuss the area(s) of concern. Additionally, the instructor completes a Dispositions Referral Form that is filed with appropriate division Director and copied to the Associate Dean. The form includes an improvement plan for the student. Should a candidate have two Dispositions Referral Forms filed, and/or does not follow through with the improvement plan, his/her progress in the program is immediately frozen until the concerns are addressed to the satisfaction of the program area and EPC3. Should the concerns be severe or unresolved, the student may be recommended for removal from the program by Program Area faculty. See Exhibit 2-3-e for governance of the EPC3 and the dispositions process.
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2.1.b Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Summarize processes, timelines, and outcomes of data collection, analysis, and evaluation of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

In MyNevada, the university's student data management system, candidates have access to their personal demographic data, grades and enrollment.

One of the most critical functions of the unit's ongoing commitment to careful data collection and analysis is the systematic and comprehensive monitoring of the evolution and development of professional knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates.

The Advanced programs have three primary and clearly identified transition points where candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions are evaluated. Results of these evaluations inform decisions concerning candidates' continued progress. Candidates who fail to meet the minimum expectations identified at each of these three transition points may be (a) delayed in subsequent advancement through the program, (b) asked to participate in remediation activities, or (c) dismissed from the program. The three primary assessment points common to all Advanced programs throughout the unit include the following.

1. Initial entry into the program. Candidates who seek admission into the
unit's advanced programs must meet established minimum entrance requirements. (See Exhibit 2-3-b)

2. Mid-point of the program. The primary continuation decision at the mid-point of each advanced candidate's program is provided by the Graduate School, which continually monitors the ongoing grades of each candidate as he/she moves through the advanced program. If a candidate does not achieve a semester GPA of 3.0 in a given semester, he/she is then placed on academic notice by the Graduate School, with both the candidate and the Director notified in writing. If a candidate is on academic notice and fails to meet the semester GPA requirement a second time, the candidate is then administratively withdrawn from the program.

3. Completion of the program. Every candidate in the unit's advanced programs completes a culminating activity or project which is then evaluated by the candidate's Graduate Committee (three faculty members with Graduate Faculty status). The assessment of the culminating activity is on a "Pass/Fail" basis, with a "Pass" score required for graduation.

In addition, a final audit of the candidate's application to graduate is carried out by the registrar and involves a careful check of the application against the candidate's transcript and the degree requirements. If the degree requirements are not met, the overall GPA computed for the courses listed on the candidacy application is below 3.0, or if the candidate has applied one or more courses with grades lower than C, then the application is considered unacceptable and is returned to the candidate. Candidates with unacceptable candidacy applications must resolve the problem by substituting alternate course work that is approved for this purpose by the faculty advisor, the graduate program coordinator, and the graduate dean. If no such approval is granted, the candidate cannot graduate and is withdrawn from the program.

In addition, alumni and employer surveys are distributed, collected, and analyzed each year (Skyfactor) to assure continuous quality of candidates completing the advanced programs.

The unit has consistently strengthened its assessment system to more comprehensively collect data from all constituencies invested in teacher education. The unit seeks to obtain evidence from a variety of sources at the advanced level at a variety of stages of progress through the programs.

At the beginning of each semester, the unit compiles information on candidate demographics, current semester enrollment, and admission status. Faculty advisors meet every semester with candidates in the advanced programs.

The unit is committed to the continual enhancement of the data collected on candidates and programs, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed. The unit is steadfast in its belief that reliance on these data offers the greatest promise
for continuous improvement of candidate performance, program quality, and overall unit operations. This includes follow-up surveys. Hence, upon program completion, candidates complete one survey: the Skyfactor survey of alumni. Data from these surveys provide the unit and programs with valuable information about the candidate's level of satisfaction regarding their advanced program. The survey looks at the overall program and the candidate's perceptions about such things as being prepared for teaching students with disabilities, planning, technology, classroom management, assessment, teaching English language learners, and more.

The unit does not have alternative route, off-campus, or distance learning programs at the advanced level, although the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program can be completed online, in person, or a mixture of both.

The unit has a formal process for dealing with candidate complaints (see Exhibit 2-3-e).

Grade Appeals: This is a sequential process that begins with the candidate and the course instructor, to the program coordinator, and then to the director for that program. The university has a grade appeal process in place if this cannot be resolved within the unit.

Student/Faculty Conflicts are resolved on an individual basis. When resolution is not reached, the next levels involve the program chair or Associate Dean. Notations are made by the Associate Dean and kept in a locked drawer.

Professional Behaviors and Dispositions Referral: these issues are handled through the Professional Dispositions Referral Form. This referral sets a timeline for resolution, a plan of action, consequences for not reaching resolution and the appeal process. For coursework, this referral is handled first by the course instructor and program coordinator. If the candidate is not satisfied with the determinations made at this level, he or she may appeal to the Education Appeals Committee of the EPC3.

Program Dismissal: The unit follows the university program dismissal policy. The Associate Dean oversees this process and ensures the issue is dealt with and resolved in a timely manner. Evidence, notes and meeting minutes are scanned and kept for 5 years by the Associate Dean. No candidates have been dismissed from an advanced program to date.

The unit uses a variety of technologies to collect data and analyze data. Currently, data for each advanced program are housed in Excel worksheets. However, programs are in the process of transitioning to a central data collection site (Taskstream). The unit uses PowerBI and Oracle Dashboards available from the University's Institutional Assessment Office for census headcounts in programs per semester, demographic data on students, and graduation data.
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2.1.c Use of Data for Program Improvement

Summarize processes, timelines, activities, and outcomes derived from use of data for program improvement of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

The unit works with the Office of Institutional Analysis and Office of University Assessment to systematically solicit, analyze, and summarize data. The unit takes action as a result of data gathered. Regularly gathered data include course evaluations, SLO assessments, alumni surveys, and employer surveys. The data from all these sources are provided to program coordinators, to faculty members, and to other stakeholders in the unit's mission, functionally serving to inform and guide subsequent and ongoing programmatic and curricular decisions (see Exhibit 2-3-g and Exhibit 2-3-g-1).

The unit regularly reviews data at the program and unit levels and makes changes based on the data. The data includes and is not limited to advanced program enrollment, Student Full Time Equivalent (sFTE) and completer numbers. Faculty routinely collect and analyze a variety of data for the purpose of evaluating candidates' student learning outcomes (see Exhibit 2-3-a-1). At the program level, these data influence decisions about course content, sequence, and programs of study.

In short, the unit is systematically collecting a variety of data regarding its ongoing operations, sharing that information with significant stakeholders, and implementing suggestions based on that data analysis into its programmatic and procedural functions. The unit has monthly meetings with its most significant stakeholder (the Washoe County School District), during which data are shared and with whom the unit has a bi-directional data-sharing agreement.

The ways in which the unit uses data to inform program and other changes continues to evolve over time as the unit develops increasing sophistication, efficiency, and comprehensiveness in data analysis and dissemination. The unit's Associate Dean and Director of Assessment and Clinical Experiences coordinate the collecting, compiling, analyzing, aggregating, summarizing, and disseminating of data designed to facilitate candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The EPC3 also participates in the design, interpretation and implementation of recommended improvements. Data are regularly shared at the Executive Council monthly meetings. As appropriate, assessment data are returned to faculty members and to candidates to enable each to better analyze and improve their performance.

Data from The Annual Report of Graduates and Their Employers and The Annual Advanced Program Data Report generated and disseminated to the PSS and TEHD Directors in summer are reviewed and given to program coordinators. The annual reports serve as feedback to programs who use the data as one guide for continuous improvement. Each Director submits a report relaying the status of program review and appropriate changes that addressed the issues.
Faculty members receive assessment data through a variety of channels. Administrative assistants keep active databases of students: Admissions data, scores on artifact assessments, and progress in each program. These databases are accessible by faculty as well as the unit. Staff currently export candidate assessment data to Directors, Program Coordinators, and program faculty upon request. Program Coordinators and Directors use the data for program recommendations and decisions, and faculty use these data primarily for advisement. After each semester's grades have been submitted, faculty members have access to their course evaluation data. These data (quantitative and qualitative results) assist faculty members in self-assessments of their teaching. Faculty members also submit all course evaluations with their annual evaluation materials.

The Associate Dean, in conjunction with the Director of Assessment and Clinical Experiences, generates annual reports of student data each summer for dissemination to the Dean, Division Directors, and Program Coordinators.

Faculty and other shareholders in the unit receive data and analyses through regular (monthly) Executive Council meetings, as well as through their representatives on the unit's various advisory and governance committees as described in Standard 6, Governance. From the initial sharing of candidate assessment data at these meetings, representatives from the various stakeholders in the unit are able to take back to their respective constituencies the specific data that are of greatest significance to their functions within the unit. This is a key channel for informing and engaging faculty as new information becomes available. Program Coordinators and program faculty members who sit on a variety of programmatic, administrative, and/or advisory committees throughout the unit (e.g. EPC3) also share the most recent candidate assessment information made available to those groups at monthly program faculty meetings. At these meetings the data are discussed, policy and programmatic implications are identified, and responsive improvements are identified, agreed upon, and implemented.

All candidates have access to all relevant and applicable assessment data on themselves. Candidates in the advanced programs also meet every semester with their academic advisors to review their individual assessment data and progress in the program.

The decision-making structure of the unit continually seeks to enhance the efficient and timely flow of information within and between all the various components and constituencies that collectively make up the unit. Dissemination of candidate assessment data is conducted through several complementary channels. These data are presented and discussed at regular meetings of the advisory and administrative groups of the unit. This helps to assure that critical information for unit planning, governance, and continuous improvement is presented, discussed, and subsequently acted upon. The
minutes from these meetings also are systematically disseminated via email, and most are stored in a central file sharing location. Thus all parties have access to the data they need. Minutes of meetings will be available onsite.

The 2014-15 academic year was the first year after substantial unit reorganization. The necessity for the unit to better coordinate data collection and analyses prompted our move to the use of Taskstream. We are in the initial stages of implementation of Taskstream, and programs are currently creating their templates to use in the system.

--The newly appointed division directors started July 1, 2014. They reviewed the NCATE Accreditation Report, the 2014 NCTQ review, the Institutional Report, the Title II report, the U.S. News statistical survey and school rankings, the Skyfactor survey results, and the employer satisfaction survey results.

--In fall 2014, these documents were reviewed with faculty. Each program continues to align and scaffold candidate performance indicators within programs.

--In fall 2014 and each semester thereafter, candidate performance data on these indicators were collected. However, given that the advanced programs recently worked to create new Student Learning Outcomes and assessment rubrics, databases needed to be revised. Data collection using the new system is now underway in each advanced program.

--At the conclusion of the spring 2018 semester and every spring thereafter, programs will analyze candidates' student learning outcomes within programs and the division directors examine these data across programs. They will use these data to inform programmatic decisions.

2.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

During the fall 2014 NCATE visit, the site visit team recommended that Standard 2 was Not Met for Advanced Programs. The specific Area for Improvement noted in the 2014 report is as follows:

There is limited evidence that advanced programs aggregate, disaggregate, analyze, interpret, and disseminate data systematically for program improvement.

The lack of data for advanced programs prevents the unit from making evidence based decisions for continuous improvement. Moreover, the lack of direct data means that the unit relies on qualitative information only (often candidate self-perception) and thus prevents the unit from determining comprehensive trends among findings.
As you will see in this section of the report, the College of Education Advanced Programs have been working diligently to continuously improve the unit's assessment system. These efforts have included but are not limited to:

. Formalizing a regular and systematic schedule of data collection, dissemination and documentation of the subsequent use of that data for each Advanced Program; and

. Re-conceptualizing and reorganizing the unit governance process with a focus on program evaluation at all levels.

Results presented in Standard 1 clearly illustrate the substantial progress of the assessment functions. There is little question that the unit's overall program assessment process has become more efficient, useful, and effective as a direct result of the feedback received from the 2014 NCATE visit and report.

The College of Education faculty members welcome this opportunity to present evidence of the College of Education's rapid and substantial progress in improving the unit's advanced programs assessment system. As evidenced throughout this report, faculty throughout the unit responded to the 2014 NCATE feedback on the unit's assessment system with professionalism and enthusiasm, resulting in a coordinated response of dynamic improvements. These efforts to improve the unit's assessment procedures have united the unit's faculty and staff in ways that will be substantial and long-lived.

Following our last NCATE visit, assessment of our students and our advanced programs became our foremost priority. We immediately established monthly meetings with faculty in the advanced programs that were led by Diane Barone, Director of the PSS Division, and Melissa Burnham, Associate Dean. Each program area sent a representative from their faculty to work on assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The first task this group managed was creating a single dispositions document for all advanced program students. All students sign this document upon admittance to an advanced program. The group then tackled program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Previously, all courses had SLOs, but there were no program outcomes explicitly identified. Once the program SLOs were clearly labeled, faculty determined when the SLO was assessed and how it was assessed. In each program there is a blend with some SLOs assessed within courses and others outside of courses. At this time, some programs have entered data into TaskStream while others are maintaining spreadsheets with this data. While data may be stored in different formats, faculty review student data within their monthly meetings and changes happen within programs based on this data.

Each advanced program has undergone a substantial process of review and revision of its program-level assessment plans. Each program now has
specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and assignments that correlate with these SLOs. Thus, rather than a single summative assessment of student work at the end of the program, students are monitored throughout each program, and faculty are provided with regular data on each of their SLOs. Outcome data from each program's SLOs will provide faculty with the means to make changes to enhance student performance.

Data Collection and Management
After the 2014 NCATE Site Visit, advanced program faculty members were brought together to relate the need for major revisions to their program assessment plans, data collection, and organization of these data. Faculty representatives from each advanced program met with college leadership on a regular (at least monthly) basis throughout the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years to review the purpose of program-level assessment and revise assessment plans, including the assessment of clinical and field experiences. All advanced programs developed new program-level Student Learning Outcomes and plans for assessing these from admission through program completion.

As of Fall 2017, most advanced programs are in the beginning stages of implementing these new assessment plans. Although most advanced programs are currently using Excel spreadsheets to collect and manage assessment data, each advanced program is in the process of moving to use of Taskstream as the central data collection and storage system. Thus far, the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program has fully converted to the use of Taskstream for the collection of student self-assessments and instructor assessments of students' growing competence with regard to the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Each advanced program's data collection templates will be created in Taskstream by the summer of 2018 for full implementation in the Fall semester of 2018.

### 2.3 Exhibits for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.a</td>
<td>Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.b</td>
<td>Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.c</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.d</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.e</td>
<td>Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.f</td>
<td>File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.g Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

| 2-3-a Assessment System Standards Matrix.docx |
| 2-3-a-1 Description of Assessment System.docx |
| 2-3-b Admission Criteria and Data.docx |
| 2-3-c Practices- Fairness Accuracy Consistency.docx |
| 2-3-d Data Collected Compiled Etc.docx |
| 2-3-e Candidate Complaints.docx |
| 2-3-g Use of Data (all).docx |
| 2-3-c-1 Literacy artifacts for eval of cross program essays.pdf |
| 2-3-g-1 ElemEd Changes Lemelson.docx |

See **Attachment** panel below.
Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.1.a Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

Summarize processes and outcomes of collaboration between unit and school partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences, and in sharing of responsibilities, resources, and expertise.

Clinical experience is a central feature of all of our advanced programs. Our faculty are committed to providing students with experiences that connect theory and research to practice. As you read this report, you will notice how faculty continue to reflect on clinical experiences to increase their value to university students and the P-12 students they encounter. Notable among the recent changes in field experience are the internship experiences of students in Nevada Leads (the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program). Rather than having one internship experience at the end of their program of study (as was the case for the previous iteration of this M.Ed. program), students are involved in internships each semester of their program. This major program change resulted from a collaborative redesign of the program completed in conjunction with the unit's local school district. Additionally, literacy faculty have conceptualized how to incorporate clinical experiences within a fully online program of study. Candidates work with P-12 students at their school sites and video record their tutoring experiences. These videos are reviewed and reflected upon by each candidate, other candidates, and the instructor to provide constructive feedback.

The advanced programs in the College of Education design, implement, and evaluate field experience and clinical practice within their programs. Each advanced program has a clinical experience expectation.

Strong partnerships with P-12 schools exist for advanced programs in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Special Education, and Literacy Studies. All programs work closely with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) and other nearby school districts (e.g., Carson City School District). Select P-12 district leaders who meet university qualifications teach some of the courses as part-time instructors and collaborate in designing, implementing, and evaluating program coursework and artifacts. For example, not only was the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program fully redesigned in collaboration with WCSD administration partners, but each course is co-taught with an acting district building administrator, each candidate has a district administrator as a mentor, and each candidate completes internship hours in their district mentor's school building during each semester of the program. This advanced program clearly illustrates the
unit's commitment to working collaboratively with district partners.

Candidates in the MS for Elementary Education Program are all fully licensed K-8 teachers who are currently working in one of the local school districts or who are employed in related teaching positions. Funded candidates come from both the Washoe County School District and Lyon County School District. The other students paying their own way in the program also come from the local school districts, but may also come from charter schools, private schools, or even non-profit organizations where their primary job is teaching children. In a cooperative arrangement between the local school district and the university, a data sharing agreement exists. It is from this partnership that the MS program can collect P-8 student MAP data from candidates' classrooms, collect digitally recorded lessons, and complete observations in the classrooms. It should be noted that IRB protocols from UNR as well as the local school districts are followed when required. As a requirement for the Elementary M.S. program, candidates are given multiple assignments in many of their courses where they develop and teach standards-based units and lessons that relate to the content in the courses being taught.

In the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program, candidates participate in an online practicum where they tutor a student with instructor supervision. The graduate student submits videos that demonstrate their tutoring work. In EDRL 701, students tutor a struggling student. Each tutee is tutored eight times during a semester. The tutor videos his or her tutoring session. Following the session, the tutor evaluates his or her tutoring. This video and analysis is then shared with the instructor, a full-time faculty member. The faculty member provides weekly feedback to the tutor about his/her instruction.

As noted above, in the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program, an internship experience is embedded across the course of the two years of study. Specifically, aspiring school leaders enroll in a 1-credit internship experience each semester (including summers), which is tied to course learnings, leadership practices, and the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. This results in 45 hours of clinical experience, which is primarily attained through full-day leadership opportunities alongside a current Washoe County School District mentor-principal. The mentor-principal is at a school different from the aspiring school leader, which exposes students to experiences outside of their own school setting.

In Special Education, students participate in field-based practicum experiences that are supervised by faculty.

The unit's formal agreements with the local school district can be found in Exhibits 3-3-a-1 and 3-3-a-2.
An important goal of each of the advanced programs is to integrate clinical experiences throughout candidates' programs of study. We believe that students in advanced programs need guided experiences to further develop their knowledge and skill levels. As most of our students in advanced programs are also teachers, the clinical experience may happen at their place of employment. Candidates are able to interact with students who represent diversity regarding ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, and/or sexual orientation (as diversity is defined by NCATE) regardless of the geographical area to which their employment ties them. At least some of these differences exist in every school, and program coursework and artifacts assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions regarding diversity competencies. Moreover, the College of Education houses several clinics for advanced candidates to complete required practical experiences such as a reading clinic and a counseling clinic. While students in the Literacy M.Ed. program complete their field experience in their own schools, masters level students also support the teaching faculty in the E.L. Cord Foundation Center for Learning and Literacy.

Candidates in the MS for Elementary Education Program are all fully licensed K-8 teachers who are currently working in one of the local school districts or who are employed in related teaching positions (e.g., charter or private schools). As a requirement for this program, candidates are given multiple assignments in many of their courses where they develop and teach standards-based units and lessons that relate to the content in the courses being taught. An example from mathematics would be that in the very first semester, teachers digitally record themselves teaching a lesson in math. This video is then used for a self-analysis that can be compared with a recording taken towards the end of the program. Scoring rubrics are used to compare these recorded lessons to show improved teaching from candidates. (An example appears in Exhibit 1-3-g.) In science, teachers in the same grade levels construct a three-dimensional NGSS unit of study that they then teach in their classrooms. Several reflections are collected from this teaching experience, recording failures and successes of teaching in this integrated fashion. Students then make plans on how to improve their instruction based on the information collected. With these examples, candidates in the Elementary M.S. program are regularly implementing strategies and lessons into their classrooms while taking courses in the program.

A specific example of evaluation of clinical experiences in the Elementary M.S. program can be seen with EDUC 625: Curriculum and Development in Science. Assessments in this course have changed over time to reflect the three-dimensional nature of the Next Generation Science Standards. Information from teacher feedback in class, teacher reflections, course
evaluations and informal conversations have led to the improvement of not only developing and using a better 3D approach to designing and teaching lessons, but the development of formative assessments that assess all three dimensions of the NGSS and most recently the use of "phenomena" to introduce concepts and lead investigations. Technology is used in this course by using the internet to access the NGSS web site and NGSS app for teaching resources, the Achieve website for EQuIP rubrics and training, the use of the NSTA Learning Center for online resources and learning, and finally using digital probes and software for data collection in class.

In the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program, students participate in an online practicum where they tutor a student with instructor supervision. The graduate student submits videos that demonstrate their tutoring work. In EDRL 701, students tutor a struggling student. Each tutee is tutored eight times during a semester. The tutor videos his or her tutoring session. Following the session, the tutor evaluates his or her tutoring. This video and analysis is then shared with the instructor, a full-time faculty member. The faculty member provides weekly feedback to the tutor about his/her instruction.

An internship experience is embedded across the course of the two years for the principal preparation program in Educational Leadership. Specifically, aspiring school leaders enroll in a 1-credit internship experience each semester (including summers), which is tied to course learnings, leadership practices, and the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. This results in 45 hours of clinical experience, which is primarily attained through full-day leadership opportunities alongside a current Washoe County School District mentor-principal. The mentor-principal is at a school different from the aspiring school leader, which exposes students to experiences outside of their own school setting.

In Special Education, students participate in field-based practicum experiences that are supervised by faculty.

Exhibit 3-3-b contains specific and detailed information on the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences in all four advanced programs. Exhibit 3-3-f contains the rubrics designed to evaluate candidate performance in clinical experiences across programs.

---

3.1.c Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Summarize proficiency expectations and processes for development during field experiences and clinical practices; and outcomes based on demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn.

Each clinical experience has assignments and rubrics to determine the quality of the candidate's experience and his/her impact on student learning.
Following are sample related student learning outcomes and assignments. Rubrics used to evaluation candidate performance in clinical experiences can be found in Exhibit 3-3-f.

Elementary Education M.S.
SLO #2: Teachers will demonstrate the effective use of research based planning for instruction that leads to improved student achievement in math, science and/or social studies (InTASC Standards 6 & 7).
Rationale: The purpose of this outcome is to have teachers demonstrate that students do learn from their teaching. According to InTASC, teachers should be able to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals (standard 7) and that teachers will use multiple assessments to engage their learners in their own growth (standard 6). Therefore, this program will not only have teachers utilize the most current research regarding content, methodology, and pedagogy in their instruction, but teachers will demonstrate that the students in their classrooms are indeed learning from their instruction.
Data: The Measure of student learning in participating teachers' classrooms will take place at three times in the program. The first will be a sample lesson plan submitted at application, the second at the end of year one and at the end of year 2 as a product of EDUC 624 & EDUC 625. Teachers in the local school districts currently are required to conduct a SLO each quarter of instruction that demonstrates student learning. Teachers will have the opportunity to submit the SLO conducted in their classroom with the content areas of math, science, and/or social studies to show that students are learning from their instruction. Additionally, in place of an SLO, teachers may use MAP testing scores from the three administrations that are required in order to show student learning in mathematics. The hope here is that teachers will show that students learning is improved from the knowledge of content and pedagogy gained as a part of this program.

Educational Leadership M.Ed.
SLO #2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conductive to student learning and staff professional growth.
Assessed in courses: EL 715: Supervision & Evaluation (Rubric Standard 2; Summative Teacher Evaluation) and EL 798: Internship (Internship Culminating Experience)
In the internship completed during each term of the program, students in the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program complete a number of assignments during their required hours. Students review the standards of focus for the term alongside the 2 courses being taken during that term, and devise a plan for the internship hours alongside their mentor principal. These plans are reviewed and approved by the internship coordinator prior to the plans being implemented.
An example internship-specific assignment is as follows (for the fall 2017 semester):
In a one- to two-page paper, describe what was learned about leading the professional growth cycle of support, supervision, and evaluation. Consider the following questions:

. How does the Mentor Principal's approach support supervision and evaluation?
. What was learned as a result of these experiences?
. What are the implications for future site leaders?

In a one- to two-page paper, describe what was learned about leading the SLO process. Consider the following questions:

. How does the Mentor Principal lead the SLO process?
. What was learned as a result of these experiences?
. What are the implications for future site leaders?

In addition, mentor principals regularly assess their mentees on the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders using the same assessment rubric that candidates use to assess themselves on these standards.

Literacy Studies M.Ed.
SLO #2: Demonstrate use of assessment, curricular, and instructional knowledge to determine and meet the literacy needs of diverse students.
Assessed in courses: EDRL 700: Literacy Assessment (Final Case Study Report on Practicum Students) and EDRL 701: Field Work and Clinical Practice in Reading (Final Case Study Report on Practicum Students). Example case study reports can be found in Exhibit 1-3-g-LIT-1 through 4. Specific assignment descriptions and rubrics can be found in Exhibit 1-3-c-1.

Special Education M.Ed.
SLO #2: Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate assessment strategies, planning for, and delivery and management of instruction of individuals with disabilities to facilitate student learning.
Assessed in coursework throughout program and in course: EDSP 725. Candidates submit signature artifacts from coursework completed during the first semester (entry), during the semester they complete 15 credits (mid-point), and during the semester of graduation (final point).
Candidates will also demonstrate knowledge and competence for this SLO in semester during which supervised field experience is completed (EDSP 725).

Sample assessment rubrics of candidates during the Special Education field experience can be found in Exhibit 3-3-f, and clearly display the need for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions for student learning.

3.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Acton Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

No AFIs were identified for Standard 3 in the 2014 NCATE Accreditation Report. However, several activities have occurred to strengthen clinical
practice since 2014, and these are highlighted in this section to illustrate the unit's ongoing commitment to continuous improvement.

Educational Leadership (EL) M.Ed.: The EL faculty, in collaboration with college and Washoe County School District leadership, created a new program based on focused interviews with alums and current students as well as current standards and national recommendations for principal preparation programs. The new principal preparation program (called Nevada Leads): (a) integrates the internship with each semester's coursework, (b) provides mentor principals to each student, (c) has revised all courses to reflect the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, and (d) has implemented a co-teaching model, wherein each course is co-taught by an EL faculty member and a practicing principal.

Literacy Studies M.Ed.: The Literacy faculty review program outcome data regularly and make changes as needed. Because the Literacy Studies program is offered both online and in-person, clinical experiences are more challenging to facilitate and supervise. However, faculty have initiated mandatory video recording of master's students working with their P-12 students as a means of providing specific feedback to their candidates.

Elementary Education M.S.: The Elementary faculty have increased the rigor of STEM projects based on evaluation reports.

Special Education M.Ed.: The Special Education faculty have a proven model of supervising practicum students in field experiences. Faculty supervise master's students each semester, outside of their teaching load. As part of this supervision, faculty visit their master's candidates in schools to provide specific feedback.

Each advanced program has undergone a substantial process of review and revision of its program-level assessment plans. Each program now has specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and assignments that correlate with these SLOs. Thus, rather than a single summative assessment of student work at the end of the program, students are monitored throughout each program, and faculty are provided with regular data on each of their SLOs. Outcome data from each program's SLOs will provide faculty with the means to make changes to enhance student performance.

Data Collection and Management
After the 2014 NCATE Site Visit, advanced program faculty members were brought together to relate the need for major revisions to their program assessment plans, data collection, and organization of these data. Faculty representatives from each advanced program met with college leadership on a regular (at least monthly) basis throughout the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years to review the purpose of program-level assessment and revise assessment plans, including the assessment of clinical and field
experiences. All advanced programs developed new program-level Student Learning Outcomes and plans for assessing these from admission through program completion.

As of Fall 2017, most advanced programs are in the beginning stages of implementing these new assessment plans. Although most advanced programs are currently using Excel spreadsheets to collect and manage assessment data, each advanced program is in the process of moving to use of Taskstream as the central data collection and storage system. Thus far, the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program has fully converted to the use of Taskstream for the collection of student self-assessments and instructor assessments of students' growing competence with regard to the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Each advanced program's data collection templates will be created in Taskstream by the summer of 2018 for full implementation in the Fall semester of 2018.

Summary
All advanced programs include carefully supervised field experiences to support students in connecting theory and research with practice. The fundamental goal is that all students in advanced programs can support and extend student learning in PreK-12 school settings. For example:

In Literacy Studies - Students tutor struggling PreK-12 students and share videos of this instruction with the faculty member teaching the course. Students move from assessment data to support and document student learning.

In Elementary Education - Students work with PreK-6 students in small groups and whole class settings to teach science, mathematics, technology, or engineering. In CTL 728d, they video and analyze lessons with the guidance of a faculty mentor.

In Special Education - Students in each licensure area participate in supervision of fieldwork course. These courses have low enrollment so that the faculty member can carefully analyze the advanced student's teaching.

In Educational Leadership - Students participate in internship each semester of their advanced program. They are supervised by faculty members and their mentor principals. Each semester the internship includes 3 full days (24 hours) plus 26 additional hours.

Student dispositions are explicitly shared with students at the beginning of their advanced programs. During monthly advanced program meetings, faculty discuss students demonstrating any dispositional concerns. If necessary, a remedial plan is created and shared with the student so that she or he can continue and be successful in the advanced program.
3.3 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.3.a Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding.

3.3.b Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery).

3.3.c Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty.

3.3.d Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs.

3.3.e Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection.

3.3.f Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

3.3.g Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

---

3-3-a-1 UNR-WCSD MOU 2013.pdf
3-3-a-2 UNR-WCSD MOU Addendum 2017.pdf
3-3-b Candidate Field Experiences.docx
3-3-c Selection of Clinical Faculty.docx
3-3-d Support and Evaluation of Clinical Faculty.docx
3-3-e Guidelines on Field Experiences.docx
3-3-e-1 NL.WCSD Confidentiality Agreement.pdf
3-3-f Clinical Assessment Instruments.docx
3-3-g Clinical Practice Entry-Exit.docx

See Attachment panel below.
Standard 4. Diversity

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

4.1 Diversity
4.1.a Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Summarize the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences; descriptions of and processes for development of diversity proficiencies; and the outcomes based on key assessments.

The unit's conceptual framework states, "We live in a pluralistic society that reflects a rich and diverse mixture of cultures and experiences. Consequently, schools should provide learning opportunities that give all students access to forms of social, political, and economic power. The purpose of educational institutions should be to give voice to the diversity of its people, as well as represent dominant values and positions. This must be done within a critical framework that supports open forums for discussion and debate, as well as moving toward forms of schooling that are empowering in intent and are rooted in forms of social justice and community. Representation of the diversity of thinking that is reflective of a multicultural society is mandatory within educational institutions that support multiculturalism. Open access to information is of critical importance within a multicultural democratic community."

The unit's students and faculty are guided by the reality of changing student demographics across the nation. However, the teaching force across the nation remains predominantly white, female, and monolingual. It is critical that the unit recruits a diverse faculty and diverse candidates and then prepares these candidates to develop culturally responsive teaching practices. These practices focus on multicultural perspectives with candidates who support cultural competencies that ameliorate the structural inequalities related to power and ideology. As can be seen in the unit's conceptual framework, these practices must be done within a critical framework that supports open forums for discussion and debate, as well as moving toward forms of schooling that are empowering in intent and are rooted in forms of social justice and community. In addition, the framework states that it is mandatory within educational institutions that support multiculturalism to have representation of the diversity of thinking that is reflective of a multicultural society.

In the unit's advanced programs, we work with practicing teachers. Our goal is to help them understand the importance of supporting all learners. We accomplish this goal by helping students in our advanced programs understand how to respect and support the diverse learning needs of their students.
The Elementary Education M.S. program’s emphasis on diversity includes embedding cultural relevant and diverse topics explicitly and implicitly in all coursework. The focus of the program is to support learning for all candidates in issues related to race, gender, language, cultural differences, and socioeconomic status. Candidates are taught to assess the individual learner and adapt teaching to meet individual student needs within the context of whole group instruction. Process standards are emphasized as they relate to Next Generation Science Standards and Common Core Standards for Mathematics Practice. EDS 749 and 750 explicitly addresses gender, social class, race/ethnicity, linguistic background, nationality and disability in lecture materials, readings, and class discussion. The Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards were developed in a way to encourage diversity and equity as a part of teaching each and every standard. Dr. Okhee Lee led a team of science educators from diverse backgrounds to edit every performance expectation (standard) so that cultural sensitivity was addressed and the connection to diversity and equity issues became an explicit connection, not only to the practices of science and engineering, but also to the disciplinary core ideas and cross cutting concepts. Once this review was completed, Appendix D "All Standards for ALL Students" was written with explicit connections to improve equity and diversity. This appendix contains eight case studies demonstrating to teachers how these standards work to equal the playing field for all students and highlight specific ways to help economically disadvantaged children, race and equity issues in the standards, working with students with disabilities, working with English Learners, working with girls and women in science, working with alternative education in non-traditional settings, and working with students who are gifted and talented. So, if the instructors of the courses understand the standards and teach them with fidelity, they will also be working with equity and diversity issues as part of their instruction.

The Literacy Studies M.Ed. program's emphasis on diversity includes a particular focus on diverse and developmentally different learning needs. The two courses with embedded practica, EDRL 700 and EDRL 701, require that the M.Ed. students identify P-12 students with exceptionalities who are reading well below, or well above, grade level. In addition to working with students with diverse learning needs, there is emphasis in most of the literacy courses on supporting linguistically and economically diverse students, since literacy achievement typically correlates with those demographic factors. EDRL 607 facilitates teachers' knowledge about children's books that represent the cultures and diversity of their students.

The Special Education M.Ed. program’s emphasis on diversity is inherently embedded in all of its area of concentration courses. Specific emphasis on race and culture occurs in EDUC 741B (Issues in Teaching in Diverse Educational Settings: Multicultural Education). Further, disability status itself is a type of diversity. The Special Education advanced program infuses issues of inclusion, accessibility, assessment bias, and related diversity concerns
throughout every course and field experience.

The Educational Leadership M.Ed. program emphasizes diversity throughout the course of the program in various ways. For example, in Basic Principles of Educational Administration, EL 700, leadership is explored through a diversity lens that includes diversity of staff, students, and partnerships as the foundation to basic principles of educational administration. Administration and Curriculum Improvement, EL 703, includes an emphasis on culturally responsive practices in curriculum and school improvement. Similarly, in Data-based Decision Making, EL 746, candidates are encouraged to explore data and discussions related to diversity. Supervision and Evaluation of Teaching, EL 715, includes a guest speaker that brings forth the focus of diversity in enhance teacher and student experiences through equitable teaching practices. All of these experiences occur early on in the courses (and in the program itself) to serve as an ongoing lens and foundation to all efforts that follow through students' program experiences. In addition, students' ability to serve at the mentor principal's school site, rather than their own site, allows for an increased perspective the commitment to diversity. Students also attend the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development conference on leadership, in order to further augment the curriculum and experiences. Students are asked to write and reflect on their experiences and share in class, which is then used toward evaluation purposes. While these experiences occur for all students in the program, the conference attendance is supported by a grant an available to all students but some do experience schedule conflicts. In 2017, 20/25 students attended and reported increased understandings in culturally responsive practices, social emotional learning, and/or parental engagement to reach diverse individuals and communities.

Specific diversity proficiencies and the advanced programs' methods of supporting them are discussed in detail in Exhibit 4-3-b.

4.1.b Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse faculty; qualifications and expertise of faculty in supporting candidates in their development of expected proficiencies; and the unit’s affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity.

Candidates in conventional and distance learning advanced programs at the University of Nevada, Reno interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, both male and female and from at least two ethnic/racial groups. The composition of full-time faculty teaching core courses in each advanced program appears in Exhibit 4-3-d.

Although not all programs include a great deal of faculty diversity, students take courses from outside of each advanced program as well, and these courses are often taught by faculty members of color. For reference, the College of Education currently contains 47 full-time academic faculty
members, 12 of whom identify as faculty of color (25.5%).

Faculty with whom candidates work in advanced program classes and clinical practice have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts of the unit to increase faculty diversity. This effort is illustrated in the unit's most recent hires. Of the 13 full-time academic faculty members hired since fall of 2016, 5 are faculty of color (38%) and 1 is a Caucasian faculty member who is a member of the deaf community.

The unit includes many faculty members with extensive knowledge and experience related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and students with exceptionalities. The unit believes that to prepare candidates to become multicultural educators we must model the importance of leading multicultural lives. Faculty backgrounds include (a) proficiency in a language other than English, (b) research in educational issues of diversity, (c), teaching courses targeting educational diversity, and (d) international educational travel.

As noted above, the current percentage of full-time academic faculty who identify as people of color (non-Caucasian) is 25.5% in the College of Education. However, only 3 faculty of 47 identify as Hispanic or Latino/a, which clearly does not mirror the state's population. The unit is committed to hiring diverse faculty members at every opportunity, however, as indicated by its percentage of diverse faculty hires over the past 2 years (38% of the most recent 13 full-time faculty hired).

Efforts are made to recruit a diverse application field for open faculty positions through advertising on a number of websites representing underrepresented candidates. The unit's faculty also reach out to their professional organizations and colleagues to advertise searches widely. The university is committed to the recruitment of underrepresented groups as well. Current efforts include:

- Diversity statement as part of every application
- A diversity advocate on every search committee
- Implicit bias training for all search committee members (implemented in 2017)
- Requiring diversity-targeted advertising on every faculty search
- HR requires diversity among search committee members
- HR Recruitment Coordinators available to meet with search committee at outset to promote diversity and are available for consultation on ways to incorporate diversity focus in process (including job description, interview process, selection criteria, etc.
- HR reviews and approves candidates at each level of the interview process;
a candidate pool will not be acceptable if sufficient diversity is not present

The unit also hosts an AACTE Holmes Scholars program, which is designed to support doctoral seeking students from traditionally underrepresented groups. Our membership as a Holmes institution also provides us with access to the Holmes Alumni Network, which offers postings for job searches. Being a part of this networked community further displays our commitment to hiring a diverse faculty.

The College of Education currently has 43 full-time academic and administrative faculty members who are 100% state-funded. The racial/ethnic distribution of these faculty is presented in Exhibit 4-3-d. Of the 7 new, tenure-track faculty hired into the College of Education in 2017, 4 (57%) were Faculty of Color. Given our attention to diversity in faculty hiring procedures, we expect the proportion of Faculty of Color (currently 28%) to continue to increase in the coming years.

In 2016, a College of Education plan was developed to both (1) underscore our commitment to hiring and retaining diverse faculty and (2) to consider specific strategies in order to fulfill this commitment. Specific strategies developed as part of this plan include the following:

● Intentional recruitment of diverse applicants for open positions through targeted advertising (e.g., using the AACTE Holmes Scholars tools for posting open positions)
● Use of special hiring strategies when qualified diverse faculty are identified (e.g., cluster hiring practices, promotion into tenure-track positions, and creating opportunities for qualified spouses)
● Promoting accurate knowledge and challenging myths related to hiring of diverse faculty (e.g., by assuring that all search committee members engage in training and conversations related to diversity during the search process, and keeping in mind the benefits of diversity in each search)
● Inclusion of a faculty statement on diversity as part of the application packet required of candidates for open searches.

Twenty percent of the faculty in the College of Education is comprised of males, while eighty percent of the faculty are women. The university as a whole prioritizes opportunities for historically under-presented groups, including women. The College of Education is actively seeking to increase faculty diversity, including a more equitable gender balance, and actively recruiting African American and American Indian faculty members.

The College of Education’s efforts to hire and maintain a diverse faculty are far more successful than those of the school districts in the counties surrounding the university. According to the Northern Nevada Teacher Workforce Assessment 2017, Lyon County has the most racially/ethnically diverse faculty with 90.02% of the faculty identifying as white/Caucasian, while 98.33% of Churchill County’s faculty identifying as white/Caucasian. In
Washoe County, approximately 90% of the faculty identified as white/Caucasian, while only about 50% of the students identified as white/Caucasian, approximately 30% of the students identified as Hispanic/Latino, and 20% identified as other races or ethnicities.

The College of Education holds executive council meetings as well as meetings for all faculty and staff. According to the meeting minutes for the College of Education Executive Council Meetings, diversity was discussed nineteen times. According to the meeting minutes for the College of Education All Faculty and Staff Meetings, diversity was discussed five times. Specific themes that emerged in these meetings included the need for recruiting more diverse faculty as well as recruiting more diverse students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

4.1.c Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse peers; and the unit’s affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain candidate diversity.

The unit and its host institution are both committed to enhancing diversity throughout the campus, including diversity in the student body. The university believes it is important to have a student body that is diverse. Thus, it actively seeks students from a broad range of diverse groups. The demographic characteristics of students in our 4 advanced programs appear in Exhibit 4-3-e.

As the tables in Exhibit 4-3-e make clear, advanced program students have exposure to student diversity with regard to both race/ethnicity and gender in their respective programs. Literacy Studies has notably few male students. These data will be reviewed by faculty to consider possible approaches to increase the gender diversity in this program. The majority of students in all advanced programs are Caucasian; however, all advanced programs have a small proportion of students of color, with Hispanic students being the most represented group after White students. Advanced programs will continue their efforts to improve the diversity of students in each of their programs.

Students in advanced programs work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas. All advanced programs integrate experiences that require students to work together in collaborative groups for assignments. For example, in the Special Education M.Ed. program, students engage in collaborative educational activities throughout the program. The required EDSP 652 course includes a large (5-6 members) activity to develop an assessment for reading comprehension, administer the assessment, score the responses, examine the reliability and validity of the assessment and results, and present their findings to others. The course also requires several small group activities (2-3 members), including developing, an observation, collecting data, and reporting on results as well as reliability and validity of the observation. Other examples of small group activities in
that course include searching for scholarly sources for specific topics and synthesizing the findings. EDSP 611 also includes a large group project and presentation, this time related to design and implementation of instruction. EDSP 724 includes several small group activities that require identifying scholarly literature on specific topics, and sharing findings with the larger class. Students in EDSP 653 form small groups on the first day of class and work collaboratively in these groups each week to complete an activity around either a case study or an activity that requires the group to go out on campus and observe naturalistic behaviors to practice the behavioral concept covered that day in the class lecture. Students in both EDSP 722 and 726 often work in small groups or pairs to present material in class, and in those classes and EDSP 713, a good portion of the classes require the students to participate collaboratively in online course discussion, as the courses are hybrid in delivery.

Nevada Leads students (Educational Leadership M.Ed.) attend a national conference (ASCD) as a cohort, they provide peer-to-peer mentoring of incoming cohort students, and are tasked with group problem-solving for internship needs. Nevada Leads students are asked to work in groups to develop a webinar (examples available on site) focused on theoretical and practice implications of leadership styles/approaches. In multiple Nevada Leads courses, they participate in online course discussions in groups, as well as working in many types of in-class assignments (case study problem solving, data reviews and analysis, group decision-making, alternative solutions through decision models, etc.).

Recruitment of students into the advanced programs has traditionally occurred through word of mouth and local teachers finding the programs after searching for opportunities for professional growth past the Bachelor's degree. However, beginning in the 2016-2017 academic year, the unit hired a new Marketing and Communications position and began a more ambitious recruitment campaign for advanced programs.

. Most of the advanced programs now include a "Request Information" section, where prospective students can add their contact information and be directly contacted by the program's coordinator.
. Several advanced programs began holding open in-person information sessions designed to recruit candidates into their programs.
. New program manuals and flyers were created to advertise the advanced programs to broad audiences of potential applicants.
. Advanced program faculty attend the University's graduate school fairs to advertise their programs to potential applicants.
These efforts have resulted in a larger pool of applicants for each advanced program.

The recent redesign of the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program has resulted in a healthy increase in applicants to the program. In Fall of 2016, the first cohort of Nevada Leads students was recruited to begin in January of 2017.
Recruitment efforts included several in-person information sessions in schools throughout the district, flyers distributed to all building administrators, a highlight piece in the local newspaper, and email blasts to district teachers. As a result, Nevada Leads received 37 applications for 25 spaces in the program. In the past, students applied at various points in the academic year and were accepted into the program on a rolling basis. However, this model resulted in only 4 to 6 applicants per year, all of whom were accepted into the program if they met the minimum criteria for admission. Increasing the applicant pool to 37 increased the quality and diversity of admitted candidates. In Fall of 2017, Nevada Leads is recruiting its second cohort of students, with a specific goal of attracting candidates of color and those who represent other forms of diversity. Recruitment strategies included the following: (1) Information sessions were scheduled in schools with a relatively large population of diverse teachers, (2) building administrators were asked to identify potential leaders who come from diverse backgrounds and encourage them to apply, and (3) an email blast advertising the program went out specifically to teachers who identified as non-White. Applications for Cohort II were due on November 1, 2017. Thirty-four students entered at least the first stage of the application process, 22 complete applications were reviewed, and 20 students were admitted into the program and will begin in Spring 2018.

The Literacy Studies M.Ed. program is fully online, which allows for a much broader audience of potential applicants. Prospective students who might otherwise have difficulty in getting to campus due to dependent care, physical disability, finances, transportation, or location (e.g., rural), have access to this program. Additionally, Literacy Studies does not require GRE scores, which have the potential to exclude students from diverse backgrounds. Other efforts to increase the pools of candidates for each advanced program come from initiatives at the college level.

The Educational Leadership program has a scholarship award that is given annually to a Hispanic/minority graduate student pursuing a master’s degree in Educational Leadership. Recipients must have been a teacher or administrator in the Washoe County School District for at least three years. The scholarship is set up to award $1,500 during the fall, spring and summer semesters up to $4,500 per year. Specific scholarships such as this one help to support efforts to increase the diversity of students in our advanced programs.

The percentage of students from traditionally underrepresented groups is increasing or remaining steady in the College of Education. Our attempts at increasing the diversity of students are clearly paying off, with a 60.8% increase in diverse undergraduate student enrollment from 2011 to 2017 and a 55% increase in diverse graduate student enrollment from 2011 to 2017.
Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse students in P-12 schools; processes for the development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity; and outcomes based on key assessments during field experiences and clinical practice.

The unit makes every effort to ensure that candidates have field experiences with P-12 students from racial and ethnic groups different from their own, students with exceptionalities, students from different socioeconomic groups, and male and female students. Candidates work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.

Advanced program candidates enroll in different classes that required experiences in Washoe County School District or their home district (see Standard 3). Exhibit 4-3-f shows the field placements for candidates that have specific experience components. The courses below are specific to the advanced programs in Literacy Studies, Elementary Education, Special Education, and Educational Leadership. While we cannot assure that all students in advanced programs have experiences with diverse P-12 students because most are completing field work in their own classrooms, the diversity present in our local school district makes such exposure extremely likely.

Most students complete required field experiences in schools within the Washoe County School District (WCSD; with the possible exception of students taking the online version of the Literacy Studies program). WCSD is the second largest school district in the state of Nevada and the 60th largest school district in the country. In the Fall of 2017, WCSD had a total of 64,192 K-12 students in 104 schools (62 elementary, 14 middle, and 14 comprehensive high schools, plus 14 alternative schools) serving an area that is 6,342 square miles in size. A total of 38 schools in WCSD are categorized as Title I. The demographic characteristics across WCSD are presented in Exhibit 4-3-f.

In the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program, the Virtual Reading Clinic is a space for peers and faculty to provide feedback to the M.Ed. students on their assessment plans, instruction videos, reflection, and case study reports. In addition, M.Ed. students read each other's letters home to parents to collaborate on tone and messaging for diverse audiences.

In the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program, each student has a mentor that serves as an acting principal at a school. The mentor principals supervise each student's internship experience that is embedded across 6 terms (spring, summer, and fall across 2 years). Students spend at least 3 full days with their mentor principals during each term, shadowing, completing assigned tasks, and meeting for reflection. Mentor principals provide specific feedback to their mentees on their progress toward becoming a school
administrator. In addition, students receive regular feedback from their course instructors on their progress toward meeting each of the 2015 PSEL Standards.

In the application process, candidates in the MS for Elementary Education are given a weighted score for working in a school that is in the lower socio-economic status, is a Title I designated school, and schools that have high diversity. Although we will accept students from any school setting, we understand that schools with high diversity are given priority. For candidates in our program that work in higher SES settings or less diverse populations, they benefit from the in-class conversations about the challenges posed in all classrooms. Additionally, research interests for all of our faculty deal with diverse issues ranging from gender studies, working with English Language Learners, and working with students in poverty. These research foci work themselves into classroom instruction, assignments and student generated research projects throughout our program.

In the Special Education M.Ed. program, all students complete fieldwork under the supervision of their faculty advisor. The advisor visits the student in their classroom at least three times (for students who live a great distance from Reno, these observations may be conducted via webcam). Students submit lesson plans prior to observations, faculty observe students teaching, and complete an observation rubric. They then use this rubric to conduct a debriefing with the student and provide feedback at the conclusion of the observation period. Faculty also provide observation forms to the students to share with their site principal and during the field experience semester, the student must also be observed by their principal and submit those observations to their faculty advisor.

4.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

N/A

4.3 Exhibits for Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3.a</th>
<th>Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.b</td>
<td>Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.c</td>
<td>Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3.d</th>
<th>Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.e</td>
<td>Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.f</td>
<td>Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.g</td>
<td>Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.h</td>
<td>Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.i</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4-3-a Aggregate data on diversity proficiencies.docx |
| 4-3-b Curriculum Components and Experiences Related to Diversity Proficiencies.docx |
| 4-3-c Assessment Instruments and Scoring Guides.docx |
| 4-3-d Faculty Demographics.docx |
| 4-3-e Candidate Demographics.docx |
| 4-3-f P12 Student Demographics.docx |
| 4-3-g Recruiting & Retaining Diverse Faculty.docx |
| 4-3-h Recruiting & Retaining Diverse Candidates.docx |
| 4-3-i Supporting Candidates Work with Diverse P-12 Students.docx |

See **Attachment** panel below.
Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
5.1.a Qualified Faculty

Summarize unit’s expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty, school-based faculty, and university clinical faculty regarding faculty qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The unit is comprised of faculty whose credentials reflect distinguished professors, journal editors, board members, state and national professional organization officers, grant-writers, award winners, well-known authors, and excellent teachers, researchers, and providers of service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To begin, nearly all faculty members have substantial backgrounds working with public school students in P-12 settings (see Exhibit 5-3-a). This extensive practical experience gives faculty members significant professional legitimacy to speak from, and provides faculty with a rich tapestry and field-based perspectives that are invaluable in educator preparation programs. They are able to provide links between theory, research, and practice. Through close connections with faculty and orientations, adjunct faculty or Letters of Appointment (LOAs) and graduate teaching assistants also work through this dynamic lens and receive faculty support and mentoring. In addition to faculty qualifications, conceptual consistency is enhanced by requiring adjuncts and LOAs to submit a vita or resume, which is evaluated for qualifications by members of the appropriate program. All graduate assistant (GA) applications are reviewed for qualifications by the program area faculty. The Faculty Qualifications table (Exhibit 5-3-a) shows that 100% of advanced program faculty members have doctorates in their fields and most have experience teaching and/or other professional experience (e.g., Educational Leadership).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty (LOAs) without terminal degrees are selected for their recognition at the local and regional level as being professionally accomplished and respected. Their strong backgrounds in practical classroom settings or leadership positions are invaluable complementary additions to the advanced programs. LOA faculty members support the professional education unit by teaching a variety of courses. All LOAs have or had licensure in their respective areas, and they have been identified by unit faculty as being qualified to take on teacher preparation and/or supervision responsibilities. The unit maintains a rigorous approval process for all adjuncts who teach in the program. All of the LOA faculty members are teachers, administrators, retired educators, or retired superintendents who have worked or are currently working in the local school districts. The relationships established with these practitioners are vital in providing students with productive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunities to learn from a practical viewpoint.

The College of Education has 3 field-based faculty positions in 3 program areas (Special Education, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education). These positions are collaborative with the Washoe County School District (WCSD); the College of Education pays their salary while WCSD pays their benefits. Field-based faculty are 3-year appointments, wherein highly effective teachers in WCSD are loaned to the unit to support relevant, contemporary, field-based knowledge in our teaching programs. The field-based faculty do not teach coursework in the advanced programs; however, they provide support to the initial licensure programs that frees up time for faculty to teach graduate-level courses. All field-based faculty are licensed in the area that they support and are selected on a competitive basis.

The Special Education, Literacy Studies, and Elementary Education advanced programs' coursework is all taught by full-time academic faculty members with doctorates. In Educational Leadership, each course is co-taught by a faculty member or LOA with a doctorate and a practicing school administrator. The practicing school administrators who are chosen to co-teach courses have proven themselves to be highly effective practitioners. All hold master's degrees and a current school administrator endorsement; at least one holds a doctorate as well. Advanced programs' clinical experiences are supervised by full-time academic faculty members in that program. There are no clinical faculty that support the advanced programs.

In the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program, students are directly supervised by their mentor principals in their school placements. The mentor principals have contemporary professional experiences as they are all practicing principals. The internship experience is additionally overseen by a Nevada Leads coordinator, who visits each intern at his/her placement at least once per semester. The coordinator of the internship course is either a central office administrator or a recently retired school principal with years of supervisory experience.

In the Elementary Education M.S. program, students are supervised by full-time academic faculty members. Elementary Education faculty have K-8 teaching experience and are also actively engaged in the community and schools. Teruni Lamberg runs the Nevada Mathematics Project, a statewide initiative for professional learning related to mathematics pedagogy for practicing teachers. David Crowther is currently the President of the National Science Teachers Association and is involved in several community partnership grants. Lynda Wiest coordinates the Girls Math and Technology Program and works directly with the local community and teachers.

In the Special Education M.Ed. program, students are supervised by full-time academic faculty members. Special Education faculty have Early Childhood-12 teaching experience in special education, and are also actively engaged in the
community and schools. Special Education faculty supervise advanced program field experiences in schools. All of this work takes place in special education classrooms.

Faculty in the Literacy Studies M.Ed. program supervise the practicum experiences for the M.Ed. students. LOA faculty members have been used for elective courses, but all of the required courses in the program, including the two that have practicum components, are taught by program area faculty.

5.1.b Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in teaching.

Advanced program faculty work within their respective professional standards to instill in candidates the proficiencies outlined in these standards. Professional standards are used to guide the development and updating of each program's coursework. Standards used to guide our advanced programs are as follows:

Literacy: Standards for Reading Professionals- Revised 2010
Special Ed: CEC Special Educator Preparation Standards

Some of our faculty have been involved in updating the professional standards for their organizations (e.g., Dr. Diane Barone has worked on the 2017 revision of the ILA standards; Dr. David Crowther has worked on the latest revision to the NGSS standards).

Based upon course evaluations completed by students at the end of each course, advanced program faculty members are most successful in their ability to teach and adapt instruction to the needs of each student. In addition to providing data about their teaching, these course evaluations help determine the faculty members’ evaluation ratings in the area of teaching. Faculty have access to their course evaluation data online after grades have been submitted each semester. Faculty are mandated to include course evaluation data (quantitative and qualitative) in their annual evaluation materials. Exhibit 5-3-f displays a summary of faculty evaluations in the area of teaching from 2014 to 2016.

Advanced program faculty value their students' learning. Courses in each advanced program have student learning outcomes (SLOs), published in the University Catalog. Each SLO is assessed through course assignments completed by students so that faculty can evaluate the degree to which students learned the desired content. In addition, each advanced program has program-level SLOs. These are also assessed regularly so that faculty can monitor the progress of students in gaining the essential knowledge determined by the faculty for their respective programs.
A College of Education faculty survey was conducted in 2014. This survey asked, "Which of the following instructional strategies do you use in your courses to address different learning styles?" Faculty members (n = 40) responded with high ratings of diverse strategies and assessments of student learning. Advanced program faculty members in the unit believe that they serve as models for students based on their teaching practices in the classroom. Faculty members were asked, "Which of the following strategies do you use to encourage in your students the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?" Faculty members reported using a variety of instructional strategies consistent with reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving. These include the following:

- Questions for Reflection (82.5%)
- Direct Questions (65%)
- Critical Questions (47.5%)
- Written Reflections for Discussion (57.5%)
- Discovery Methods (35%)
- Inquiry Methods (45%)
- Reflection Journals (45%)
- Socratic Approaches (32.5%)

Some of the strategies were not endorsed as much as others. For example, discovery methods and Socratic approaches are reportedly used 35% and 32.5% of the time by the faculty who responded. The data became available to faculty in late spring, 2014 and were distributed to programs for discussions. The unit is planning on surveying the faculty again to see what, if any, adjustments have been made. As our students progress through the program, it is our hope that they will experience a myriad of methods including Socratic approaches, discovery methods, web-based strategies, educational games, flipped classrooms, case studies, and other computer-based methods.

Faculty members throughout the unit were also asked which instructional strategies they use to help educate candidates about diversity. Faculty members responded as follows (n=40).

- Discussion (92.5%)
- Audio/Visual Materials (47.5%)
- Personal Experience (67.5%)
- Field Experiences (35%)
- Guest Speakers (47.5%)
- Web-based Strategies (22.5%)
- Educational Games (10%)

All faculty members used one or more of the preceding strategies. Some of these strategies were endorsed more than others. For example, web-based strategies and educational games were not often used to educate candidates
Faculty members were also asked "Which of the following strategies do you use to incorporate technology in your teaching?" The faculty member responses to this question were as follows (n=40).

- Multi-Media Presentations (80%)
- Web-Based Instruction (e.g., Canvas) (75%)
- Candidate Presentations/Reports using Technology (47.5%)
- Activities in Computer Lab (37.5%)
- Video Analysis (37.5%)

Advanced program faculty reflect upon their teaching. The annual evaluation of all academic faculty members requires faculty to reflect and write about pedagogical innovations that were introduced into courses, new teaching materials that were introduced, activities that enhanced student learning, and contact with the community, and to discuss their student evaluation data. These data are entered into the University's Digital Measures annual evaluation management system. As mentioned, faculty evaluations include reflections by faculty aimed to help them identify areas where they can improve or ways to enhance their teaching.

Starting in their third year, full time tenure track faculty have their teaching and research evaluated apart from their annual evaluation to provide feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion. This process, known as the "Third Year Review" is conducted by the faculty member's supervisor and involves writing up a summary of progress towards promotion and tenure. The supervisor then meets with the faculty member to go over the document and strategize on ways to continue or enhance progress toward tenure.

5.1.c Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in scholarship.

The Nevada System of Higher Education Code (Chapter 3) and the University Bylaws (3.3 and 3.4) govern the process of academic faculty promotion and tenure. The University Bylaws [3.4.5a(2)] states that for promotion and tenure, the faculty member must demonstrate "...continuing professional growth related to the academic faculty member's discipline or program area as shown by a record of scholarly research or creative activity resulting in publication or comparable productivity".

According to the College of Education's Promotion and Tenure Procedure Manual (2017), "The College of Education must attract, retain, and promote those faculty members who have demonstrated the potential for or who have attained a substantial record of scholarship that contributes to the realization of its mission...All faculty must establish their credentials as scholars".
As a Tier 1-ranked University, faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno are expected to engage in research, scholarly, and creative work. According to the College of Education’s Promotion and Tenure Procedure Manual: Research, scholarly, and creative work includes activities such as research, publications, and the delivery of papers and other invited presentations in professional settings. Research includes the discovery, interpretation, and critical evaluation of new knowledge and practice; program evaluation; and curriculum and product development including software, multimedia forms, and testing and evaluation instruments. The scholar shares his or her research findings and ideas individually or collaboratively with professional peers and in so doing subjects them to peer evaluation. Thus, the scholar extends both his or her own knowledge and the knowledge of others. The extension of knowledge is further enhanced through obtaining funding from federal, state, local, and/or private sources to conduct a variety of research, scholarly, and creative activities (p. 6).

Academic faculty submit annual evaluation materials. In order to be considered meritorious, faculty must receive a Commendable or Excellent rating on their overall evaluation. Priority scholarly activities that contribute toward this rating include publishing in scholarly journals, obtaining grant funding, and writing books or book chapters. Supporting scholarly activities include presentations at conferences, publishing in regional journals, submitting grant proposals, and developing scholarly or creative products (e.g., non-refereed articles, conference proceedings, curriculum materials). The expectation for an "Excellent" rating on the annual evaluation for Research is at least 3 quality priority products combined with other supporting activities. The expectation for a "Commendable" rating on the annual evaluation for Research is 2 priority products, likely combined with other supporting activities.

Exhibit 5-3-f provides data on the annual evaluations of faculty with regard to Research for the past 3 annual evaluation cycles. Faculty are provided feedback in their annual evaluation on their scholarly activity and ways to improve and/or move toward tenure/promotion.

According to the University, all academic faculty should be engaged in research. The goal of the university is to have 90% of all academic faculty actively engaged in scholarship. Faculty in the College of Education are active scholars in their respective disciplines, as indicated by the count of scholarly activities across the College (Exhibit 5-3-f).

Grant revenue in the College has increased due to more faculty receiving awards. A full 47% of advanced program faculty have active grant funding (including both state and federal awards).
Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in service.

The college prides itself on excellent service to the community, university, and state. In addition, the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws [3.4.5a(3)], note that service "...includes and is not limited to such things as membership in professional organizations, an ability to work with faculty and students in the best interests of the academic community and people it serves... service on university or System committees, recognition among colleagues for possessing integrity and the capacity for further significant intellectual and professional achievement, and recognition and respect outside the System community for service in community, state, or nationwide activity."

Service is an active part of each academic faculty member's role, typically making up 20% of the role statement. Professional service is considered to be "...an application of scholarship to policy or practice which will impact the profession or enhance the welfare of schools and society." Faculty members are evaluated on Service annually. Priority Service activities expected for each academic faculty member include "active participation on program, college, and university committees or serving in administrative roles" (COE Evaluation Procedures Manual, p. 27). As faculty increase in rank, the level of their service activity typically increases (e.g., more leadership roles in professional organizations, serving on editorial boards of journals, and the like). Exhibit 5-3-f displays the annual evaluation results for Service for the advanced program faculty in the College of Education over the past 3 years.

All advanced program faculty members are assigned to at least one college committee and many are members of more than one committee. The unit emphasizes university and community engagement as well. Faculty are encouraged to attend the local school district's "Door 2 Door" program where high school seniors in danger of not graduating are provided home visits to encourage high school completion and the Educational Alliance of Washoe County's "Run for Education." In addition, faculty members are expected to become involved in professional organizations through membership and participation. A guideline for faculty moving from Associate to Full Professor is to have them become involved in national service with professional organizations. In 2013, fifteen such offices were held by unit faculty members. Many faculty members are on national committees and others have hosted international conferences such as the International Association of Mathematics Educators.

It is noteworthy that the annual evaluation ratings for Service are lower for EL faculty members than for the other program areas. These ratings are somewhat skewed, given that there are 2 faculty members on phased-in retirement plans with reduced service expectations. The newer faculty members have mentorship to ensure that their service commitments remain steadfast. It is anticipated that, with the impending retirements and hiring of
an additional assistant professor in EL in fall of 2018, these annual evaluation rating averages will improve.

As noted above, unit advanced program faculty members are actively engaged in a variety of service activities in the university community as well as in national and international venues.

Faculty members also are active in service activities related to P-12 schools. Below is a list of service activities that advanced program faculty have performed over the past 3 years.

Literacy Studies
- Traner Middle School Academic English Project
- Northern Nevada Writing Project
- Striving Readers
- Reading Buddies (out of the Center for Learning and Literacy)
- Membership on various State of Nevada Task Forces such as Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) and Diversity Task Force
- Served on Writing Team for Nevada State Literacy Plan

Elementary Education
- Lemelson professional development for cohorts of teachers
- Working with WCSD and state of Nevada teachers on Common Core
- Technology for 21st Century Learner Project (Washoe County School District)
- Nevada Math Project Initiative
- Served on Federal Panel for Revisions to National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

Special Education
- Teacher Inquiry Groups
- Support for acting teachers to obtain licensure coursework through WCSD's Options Program

Educational Leadership
- Nevada State GEAR-UP
- Writing a text on Nevada School Law drawing on expertise for educators across the state.
- Participation in Principal for a Day at Washoe County Schools
- Nevada Connections Academy Board Member
- Washoe K12 Foundation Board Member
- Carson City Educational Leadership Project
- Motivational Speaking for Students from Underrepresented Groups

The Education Alliance of Washoe County has the College of Education Associate Dean as a member of the Board of Directors and the Executive Board. This organization compiles data from P-16 education in the local
community (district, community college, and university) and distributes this publically once a year (the Data Profile). In addition, it has a P-16 Advisory Council that was mainly responsible for the addition of courses in the local high school district curriculum for Advanced Diplomas_namely more math and science.

In addition, the Associate Dean serves as a member of the Commission on Professional Standards in Nevada, the entity responsible for setting and revising standards for educator licensure in the state. She also is actively involved as a board member of the Northwest Regional Professional Development Program, which is charged with providing professional service to teachers in the 5 northwestern Nevada school districts.
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5.1. e Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding faculty performance.

The institution and college require that all academic and administrative faculty members are evaluated once a year by the Associate Dean. Academic faculty are required to report activities related to teaching, research/scholarship, and service in Digital Measures and are required to submit their role statement for the evaluation year. Students evaluate all courses_including those taught by adjunct faculty, LOAs, and graduate teaching assistants. Course evaluations contribute to the evaluation of teaching for all academic faculty, and the results of course evaluations are used to determine if instructors on a semester contract should be rehired.

Both tenure-track and administrative faculty must submit an annual role statement, which delineates how faculty activities will help to achieve the unit's objectives. At a minimum, the role statement must be linked to the college/unit's strategic plan. The percentages attributed to each area (teaching, research/scholarly activities, and service) are used in the evaluation. The results of the annual evaluations are sent to the College of Education Personnel Committee who reviews the results for fairness and consistency. The dean of the college is the final reviewer. The Personnel Committee chair writes up the committee's impressions of the evaluation process and provides recommendations for the ensuing year.

For the annual evaluation, each faculty member is required to enter data representing his or her efforts in teaching, research, and service into the university's database: Digital Measures. Faculty receive training from supervisors and have support from the university on how to work with Digital Measures. The university sets up the basic template, and colleges can work individually with the Digital Measures administer to help focus the template to reflect particular college values. The evaluation period is January 1-December 31, and faculty are required to submit their materials in the beginning of January for the previous year's work. Evaluations of Field-based
faculty and Letter of Appointments (LOAs) is conducted by the respective program. Since these two faculty groups teach and are not required to conduct research or service, their evaluations are based on student course ratings and comments.

Exhibit 5-3-f illustrates the overall performance of advanced program faculty on the annual evaluation for the previous 3 years in addition to faculty performance on teaching, research, and service specifically for the past 3 years of annual evaluation cycles. Annual evaluations are given a qualitative rating of Excellent, Commendable, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. In order to quantify these ratings, the qualitative labels are associated with merit levels, as indicated in the footnote to each of these data tables. In the 2014-2016 evaluation cycles, no faculty member received an overall unsatisfactory rating.

The annual evaluation process involves the academic faculty member submitting the Digital Measures printout, along with supplemental supporting materials (e.g., course evaluations, publications, etc.). Within Digital Measures, faculty members reflect on their teaching, research, and service for the previous year. For teaching, faculty submit any pedagogical innovations, enhancements to the course, reflections on student feedback, and new materials or techniques infused into their coursework. They also submit a role statement for the following year, in which they set goals for teaching, research, and service.

In the written comments on the faculty member's work for the previous year completed by the Associate Dean, the Associate Dean provides feedback and suggestions for each area of the role statement: teaching, research, and service. This might include, for example, a suggestion to seek mentoring for teaching or research, to focus time on publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, or to balance service efforts across unit, University, local community, and organizational domains. After the evaluation is finalized, academic faculty members have the opportunity to meet with the Associate Dean to discuss the evaluation. This meeting is mandatory for assistant professors, and optional for those at the associate or full professor rank. During the meeting, further suggestions are often made to help enhance the faculty member's work over the upcoming year.

5.1.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Summarize resources, opportunities, processes, and outcomes regarding unit facilitation of professional development.

The university, college, and advanced programs are deeply committed to initial and continuing professional development of all faculty members. At the university level, technology training has become a way of life for the university's faculty, with consistent attendance recorded at a broad range of training workshops. The university holds a new faculty orientation every fall.
The College of Education also holds a new faculty orientation that was added to our college in fall of 2016.

Each faculty member meets with his or her supervisor to discuss the annual evaluation, as mentioned above. At that time, each faculty member is encouraged to reflect upon comments made in the evaluation about areas to consider for professional development. For untenured faculty members, these comments are aimed at enhancing those activities affecting promotion and tenure. For tenured faculty, comments generally point out areas to consider for improvement.

Given that the college emphasizes, among other things, the acquisition of grants and the promotion of research in the field, the college has a Research and Grants Committee that promotes scholarship and conducts in-service trainings for faculty in grant writing. The unit has hosted a summer series of consultations for grant-interested faculty, offers statistical consulting for data analysis, and alerts faculty members to new training opportunities offered by the university's Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation.

The university offers several opportunities for professional learning with regard to teaching at the university level. These are advertised to all faculty in the unit, and may be specifically recommended for faculty members whose course evaluations are lower than average. In addition, the unit supports faculty teaching by recommending formal evaluations of syllabi, assignments, and/or classroom teaching. For example, faculty members may be told to seek a formal observation of their teaching by a more seasoned professor in the unit. Several senior faculty members, including the Associate Dean, who regularly attain excellence in teaching, have completed formal observations of teaching. Typically, this involves a course observation and analysis of course materials, followed by a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the results and make recommendations.

For new academic faculty members, a formalized mentoring program has been recently established. Assistant professors are required to submit a mentoring plan that outlines their strengths and goals, along with a plan of achieving those goals and who they may approach to serve as a mentor for each goal. This type of personalized plan helps assure that junior faculty members understand their own contributions to their success, and maintains that a typical faculty member will have multiple mentors rather than a single person to provide mentoring for each aspect of the faculty role. Mentoring plans are discussed in detail at the new faculty orientation, and draft plans are submitted to the Dean's Office within the first semester of the faculty member's appointment. Plans are reviewed and revised as living documents to support each faculty member's success in pursuing tenure and promotion. Within the College of Education, there are numerous opportunities to enhance faculty professional development. The unit has a standing committee on Research and Grant Support that meets regularly to explore grant
opportunities and to make suggestions on how to strengthen infrastructural support. We also have in-house training for faculty on technology by one of our Information Technology faculty, and in-house statistical support provided by one of our retired faculty with statistical expertise.

The University now requires all faculty members serving on search committees to complete Implicit Bias training. This training (implemented as a requirement in fall 2017) is designed to help faculty understand and become consciously aware of their own implicit biases so that they can work to combat them in the search process. In addition, the University offers Safe Zone training for faculty to better understand students who identify as LGBTQ+, and for their offices to be identified as a safe zone for those students. A number of other diversity trainings are available on campus as well, including Disruptions in the Classroom workshops, Micro-aggression workshops, UndocuAlly training, a course on Becoming Culturally Responsible Professionals, and a mandatory course on Sexual Harassment and Discrimination.

The College of Education provides each faculty member with travel support each year, to attend professional development conferences at which they are presenting original research, or simply to attend for professional learning. Each Division and Program Area often supplements this travel support for faculty to attend more than one conference each year, and/or to support travel to conferences that are more expensive than the amount provided by the college.

Each Division also provides research support for faculty working on collecting pilot data or getting a new research project started. This Scholarly Activities Pool money provides support for faculty in supplementing their skills and in work toward collection of pilot data to serve as the basis for larger grant funding proposals.

At the university level, there are numerous opportunities, including online opportunities, for professional learning offered through the office of Extended Studies. The university also has a state-of-the-art library and instructional design center, called the Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center that provides computer and instructional design in teaching support, media design and production, video-conferencing, networking, and audio-visual support for faculty. COE faculty members are apprised of various training webinars through announcements on the COE Faculty listserv.

5.2 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

N/A
### 5.3 Exhibits for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.a</td>
<td>Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.b</td>
<td>Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.c</td>
<td>Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.d</td>
<td>Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.e</td>
<td>Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.f</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.g</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See [Attachment panel below](#).
**Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources**

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

### 6.1 Unit Governance and Resources

#### 6.1.a Unit Leadership and Authority

Summarize unit's leadership and authority in the design, delivery, operations of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators and other school professionals.

The College of Education is organized in two divisions: (1) Teacher Education and Human Development and (2) Professional Specialized Studies. Each division includes multiple programs with program coordinators who support the program with organizational and financial responsibilities. Other committees that support the advanced programs are detailed within this section.

The Dean of the College of Education is the head of the unit and has responsibility for its administration. The Dean is responsible for all personnel and budgetary matters and oversees long-range planning and program development in the college. The Dean also has final authority over curriculum matters, student issues, and providing verification that candidates complete their programs. The Dean, appointed by the President and Provost of the University, is evaluated by and reports directly to the Provost.

A review of the College of Education Organizational Chart (Exhibit 6-3-b) shows that, after the Dean, there is one Associate Dean, a Director of the Teacher Education and Human Development (TEHD) Division and a Director of the Professional and Specialized Studies (PSS) Division. Within TEHD, there are 3 programs and associated Program Coordinators: Human Development and Family Studies; Elementary Education; and Secondary Education. Within PSS, there are 4 programs and associated Program Coordinators: Counseling and Educational Psychology; Language, Literacy, and Culture; Special Education; and Educational Leadership.

The four advanced programs under review are housed as follows:

**Professional Specialized Studies**
- Literacy Studies M.Ed. (Program: Language, Literacy, & Culture)
- Educational Leadership M.Ed. (Program: Educational Leadership)
- Special Education M.Ed. (Program: Special Education)

**Teacher Education and Human Development**
- Elementary Education M.S. (Program: Elementary Education)

The unit is governed by the Nevada System of Higher Education Code, the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws, and the College of Education (COE).
Bylaws. The COE closely follows the COE Bylaws (see Exhibit 6-3-a), which have been approved by the COE faculty through the Faculty Senate. These bylaws provide the organization and administrative structure and personnel, policies, and procedures for the faculty of the COE and are consistent with the UNR bylaws and the Nevada System of Higher Education Code.

The COE has a structure of distributed leadership, which underscores its commitment to a collaborative mindset. Because there are no departments in the current college structure, several standing committees exist to make important decisions and to make recommendations to the college's leadership. These are detailed in the COE Bylaws and summarized below.

The Executive Council of the College of Education is comprised of the Dean, Associate Dean, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Center Directors, Director of Advising, Director of Assessment and Clinical Experiences, and a Staff representative. Executive Council (EC) meets on a monthly basis during the academic year to review new initiatives, adopt policies, and review program evaluation data. In addition, the Dean meets with Division Directors twice per month, with the Associate Dean once per week, and as a full leadership team once per month (Dean, Associate Dean, and Division Directors). The entire College meets at least twice per semester.

The College Faculty Senate is comprised of representatives of all academic programs and centers and ensures that a transparent, objective structure exists to fairly represent the voice of faculty in decisions and issues affecting the College.

The Educator Preparation and Curriculum Coordinating Council (EPC3) is made up of programs across the college and includes the Associate Dean, the Director of Teacher Education and Human Development, the Director of Professional and Specialized Studies, representatives from the initial and advanced licensure program areas, the Advisement Center Coordinator, and the Director of Assessment and Clinical Experiences. The EPC3 acts as the college's curriculum committee, and all curriculum changes go through the EPC3 for approval.

The Education Appeals Committee (EAC) is an affiliate group of the EPC3 and meets as needed to address and rule on all curricular and student appeals, with the exception of grade appeals, which are handled through a process dictated by the University's Administrative Code. Appeals concerning admission to one of the initial or advanced educator preparation programs are heard by the EAC, if necessary.

The Doctoral Committee is made up of representatives from the 8 doctoral program strands of the unit's doctoral degree program: Educational Leadership; Equity and Diversity; Special Education and Disability Studies; Literacy Studies; Counseling Education and Supervision; Information
Technology in Education; Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education; and English Language Learners/Emergent Bilinguals. This group of representatives deals with policies, procedures, and admissions to the program.

The Personnel Committee is made up of representatives (3-year terms) from all of the academic programs as well as centers located in the unit. This committee meets to review the annual evaluation recommendations prior to the dean's signature as well as meeting for all promotion and tenure considerations. The Chair of the Personnel Committee provides regular updates to the Executive Council.

The Research and Grants Committee works to increase the culture of research in the college through activities for faculty and students. Specific responsibilities include but are not limited to recommending on the distribution of college research funds and other incentives to increase grant and research quantity and quality within the college.

The Diversity Committee promotes and support an inclusive and equitable climate in the College of Education for faculty, staff, and students. Specific objectives include: (1) Identifying areas of need through structured and ongoing inquiries; (2) Making recommendations about policy/practice, as they relate to the creation of an equitable and inclusive climate; (3) Providing venues that address identified needs; and (4) Serving as a resource for students and faculty.

In addition to the standing committees discussed above, the College convened an ad hoc committee of advanced program representatives after the last NCATE review to address the issues that the 2014 site visit exposed. This group has met consistently for the past 3 years to work on program evaluation plans, developing student learning outcomes for the program level, modifying curricula where needed, and developing clear assessment plans. Developing program-level SLOs was essential in creating cohesive assessment plans for each advanced program. Their work together on the committee assured that each program would have a cohesive system that aligned within the overall college framework.

Each advanced program's admissions policies are published in the University's General Catalog (https://catalog.unr.edu), on the College of Education's website, and in each program's handbook. Information for advanced programs is consistently kept up-to-date on the college website. The college's Marketing and Communications specialist has received training and updates the college website regularly (e.g., uploading updated program handbooks).

The unit houses the Downing Counseling Clinic, staffed by counseling student interns who are supervised by counseling faculty, where students, their spouses, and families can be seen for free. In addition, the university has a
Counseling Center that provides psychological, behavioral, social, and/or academic performance services for candidates.

Program faculty members participate fully in their respective programs' design, implementation, and evaluation.

6.1.b Unit Budget

**Summarize budget allocation and its sufficiency in supporting both campus and clinical work that are essential to the preparation of educators and other school professionals.**

Exhibits 6-3-f and 6-3-g provide a sample of the College of Education's and three other University of Nevada, Reno Colleges' state-funded operating budgets for fiscal year 2017. The College of Education's financial support is equivalent if not heartier than the other academic units, given the overall enrollment levels. The College of Engineering typically has more state monies, although they do provide internships. The undergraduates graduating in the College of Engineering are comprised of chemical, civil, mechanical, electrical, and environmental engineering as well as computer science, computer science and engineering, and material science and engineering. The College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources undergraduates major in biochemistry and molecular biology, environmental science, forest management and ecology, nutrition, wildlife ecology and conservation, and veterinary medicine. Undergraduates who graduated from the Division of Health Sciences came from community health sciences, speech pathology, nursing, and social work.

Exhibit 6-3-f shows the College of Education state-funded budget from 2015 to 2017. The differences in salaries between 2015 and 2017 reflect a growth rate of 11% in faculty from 2015 to 2017.

6.1.c Personnel

**Summarize policies, procedures, and practices of faculty workload; unit's use of faculty and personnel in ensuring coherency and integrity of programs and operations; and resources and opportunities for professional development.**

The university and college workload policies allow for a flexible distribution of effort among teaching, scholarship, and service that balances the teaching, scholarly and service interests of individual faculty members. The variation in distribution of faculty effort allows optimization of faculty contributions to professional and institutional goals. In addition, the College of Education has policies for large and small class size and the impact upon teaching loads (i.e., faculty teaching courses with over 80 students enrolled count that course as "2" in their load).

A prototypical semester teacher workload for the College of Education faculty is teaching 5 courses per year (2-3 or 3-2 in the fall and spring semesters), devoting two days per week to research and one day per week to service.
There are numerous examples of the flexibility built into workloads. For examples, a faculty member may have received a grant and exercised a course buyout. A faculty member may be assigned to an additional service assignment if the course did not meet minimum enrollment. As reviewed in Standard 5 of this report, the high levels of scholarly productivity that have been generated by the unit faculty concomitant with equitable levels of service contributions reflect that faculty workloads are at appropriate levels.

The unit's workload policy is the University's Workload Policy. As stated in the Nevada System of Higher Education's Faculty Workload Policy, all academic faculty members are required to file a Role Statement. For academic faculty the normal workload is spread across efforts in teaching, research/scholarly activities, and service. Effort is measured by percentage totaling 100% effort so that a typical FTE faculty member's Role Statement would reflect 40% Teaching, 40% Research/Scholarly Activities, and 20% Service. All teaching faculty are required to announce to students and maintain acceptable levels of availability for students outside of class time. As noted above, 40% teaching is a 3:2 or 2:3 teaching load across the 2 semesters. Thus, faculty members teach a maximum of 3 courses in any one semester (typically a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses) and do not exceed the recommended limits.

Clinical supervision in the advanced programs occurs by full-time academic faculty. Because the number of students in these clinical experiences tends to be low in any given semester, faculty members typically supervise advanced program students outside of their teaching load or as part of a course that requires the clinical experience. One exception occurs with Nevada Leads, the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program. In this program, the clinical experience is divided into 1 unit per semester for 6 semesters. The internship course is supervised by a single person with a current cohort size of 25 students. Although this ratio (1:25) is higher than recommended, the students are directly supervised for all of their hours each semester by their mentor principal, while the faculty member oversees the internship course and assignments.

Courses such as independent study, thesis, and dissertation are in addition to the regular fifteen-credit load per academic year. The college does have a policy for counting dissertation work as part of a teaching load.

Normally, full-time tenure-track faculty are expected to teach 15-credits across two semesters (3-2 load). Off-contract teaching (Summer School and Wintermester) is an option. Guidelines for assigning clinical faculty workloads are governed by equity, accreditation requirements, program needs, and appropriate supervisor to student ratios. Student FTEs (full-time equivalents) have increased across all advanced programs from 2015 to 2017, with 221 sFTEs in 2015, 222 in 2016, and 253 sFTEs in 2017.
Part-time faculty members contribute substantially to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit. However, few part-time faculty members are used to teach in the unit's advanced programs, with the exception of the Educational Leadership M.Ed. program. In Educational Leadership, adjunct faculty members (referred to as Letters of Appointment- LOAs) are hired to co-teach each course. These LOAs are acting full-time principals in the local school district. The Educational Leadership program currently has an active search occurring for a new faculty member that will teach in Nevada Leads starting in fall of 2018.

The university provides numerous resources and mandatory trainings for LOAs (e.g., Sexual Harassment; FERPA, etc.). The Program Coordinators and Division Directors provide active support to LOAs in their program areas and divisions. In addition, Administrative Assistants for each program area assist LOAs with managerial tasks when needed.

The unit has 23 graduate assistant positions that are distributed to program areas. Typically, graduate assistants provide assistance to full-time faculty in teaching courses and conducting research. Occasionally, graduate assistants are used to teach lower-division courses. All graduate assistants must complete the necessary FERPA and Sexual Harassment trainings as part of a new course and orientation for teaching assistants.

Administrative assistants are assigned as follows; each has a part-time student worker:
- Educational Leadership (& Nevada School Law): 1
- Special Education & Language, Literacy, and Culture: 1
- Human Development & Family Studies & Counseling & Educational Psych: 1
- Elementary Education & Secondary Education: 1

The dean's office has one Executive Assistant, one Administrative Assistant, one student worker, one Administrative Faculty member who handles budget and personnel, and a Graduate Assistant to assist with assessment and accreditation. This number of support personnel is deemed sufficient for the unit.

Full-time academic faculty members have financial support from the Dean's Office for travel support, and conference registrations or professional memberships.

---

**6.1.d Unit Facilities**

Summarize campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards, including support for use of technology in teaching and learning.

The unit is housed in the William Raggio Building (built in 1998) and physically houses faculty offices, lecture halls, "smart" classrooms, the Early Learning Center, two classrooms of the Child and Family Research Center, the
Raggio Center for STEM Education, the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities, the Downing Counseling Clinic, the Learning Resource Center, a computer lab, and the Center for Learning and Literacy. The William Raggio Building (approximately 240,000 sq. ft.) classrooms and conference rooms are always in high demand. Every advanced program faculty member has an office with a computer.

Students use most of the spaces in the building, in addition to the classrooms. They can obtain resources, meet with other students, and work on class projects in the Learning Resource Center. The computer lab provides a space for students to take classes requiring computer access and a number of computers for drop-in use. Students can obtain counseling in the Downing Counseling Clinic. They can check out science lab kits from the Raggio Research Center for STEM Education and can obtain accessibility resources from the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities. In addition, students often complete course assignments and practicum hours in the Early Learning Center, the Child and Family Research Center classrooms, and the Center for Learning and Literacy. Finally, the computer lab within the building also has SmartBoard technology so students can practice using instructional technology for lesson building.

The University provides a strong infrastructure of faculty support across all aspects of the faculty role, with state of the art technology support and resources, strengthening support for grant procurement and management, smart classrooms, and a brand new Wellness Center.

6.1.e Unit Resources including Technology

Summarize resource allocations to support candidates in meeting standards, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable.

The unit allocates resources to each division and program area based on a formula accounting for the number of faculty in the division/program. This funding is for instructional support for courses, operating expenses, and the like. As mentioned above, funds generated from winter and summer instruction are allocated to divisions and programs for use as they see fit.

The unit's Associate Dean coordinates assessment functions for the College. A full-time Graduate Assistant is provided to support these functions as well. The College has purchased a Qualtrics subscription to support assessment (follow-up surveys of graduates and employers, online surveys of students during programs, etc.). In addition, the College has purchased Taskstream for use in program assessment and organization of student artifacts.

Every faculty member has a computer. Many have laptops, notebooks, and iPads provided by the unit. The unit is equipped with technology, a computer lab, the math tutoring room, and five conference rooms. The math room is
equipped with 10 McIntosh computers. The science room has a smart cart with 16 PC-based netbooks that could be used throughout the room or on field trips. In addition, the college has purchased a cart containing 30 iPads and another with 32 PC-based netbooks. These carts can be used in any room in the building, allowing all (or most) students in the class to access technology during class sessions. The Center for Learning and Literacy has integrated technology into the reading clinic so that candidates can video record each of their tutoring sessions. Finally, new technology was integrated into the Elementary-Secondary conference room to assist with graduate student and faculty presentations.

The College of Education Computer Lab, located on the first floor of the William Raggio Building, has 60 computers that are used for classes and by faculty and students. The Learning Resource Center also has many technology resources available for students and faculty to borrow (e.g., still cameras, video cameras, laptops, netbooks, projectors). This inventory is regularly upgraded so that students and faculty have access to the latest technology.

The recently built Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center is the state of the art university library. All students, including those taking coursework through Extended Studies, have access to a number of cutting edge technologies, research and computing help, digital labs, small, smart meeting rooms, conference rooms, traditional stacks, and electronic communications. Students can access all services online, including live chats. The Knowledge Center provides online access to all major databases, and has other curricular materials (e.g., E-Journals, books) in adequate numbers that reflect UNR's ranking as a Tier 1 Research Institution.

In addition, students have access to software online, such as a free subscription to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a Dataworks lab, research software for quantitative and qualitative analyses, a lifelong email address, and access to web-based file storage via NevadaBox.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.c</th>
<th>Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.d</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.e</td>
<td>Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.f</td>
<td>Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.g</td>
<td>Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.h</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.i</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.j</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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