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**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.

The College of Education is comprised of faculty whose credentials (Exhibit 5.3.a Qualifications) reflect Foundation Professors, journal editors, board members, state and national officers, grant-writers, award winners, well-known authors, and excellent teachers, researchers, and providers of service.

Nearly all faculty members have substantial backgrounds working with public school students in P-12 settings. This extensive practical background gives faculty members significant professional legitimacy to speak from, and provides them with a rich tapestry and field-based perspectives that are invaluable in teacher preparation programs.

Through close connections with faculty and orientations, adjunct faculty, Letters of Appointment (LOAs), and graduate teaching assistants also work through this dynamic lens and receive faculty support, evaluation, 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 GA applications and GA assignments are reviewed for qualifications by a committee chaired by an associate dean. Once assigned to the appropriate course, GAs are required to complete GRAD 701, a course about classroom teaching offered by the university's Graduate School prior to teaching. All internship supervisors (see Standard 3 Table 3.B.4) are licensed in the areas in which they supervise and our Field-based Faculty members are excellent teachers and supervisors. The table on Faculty Qualifications (Exhibit 5.3.a) shows that 100% of professional education faculty members have doctorates in their fields and have experience teaching or other professional experience as in the case of Educational Leadership and Counseling.

More typically, adjunct faculty without the terminal degrees are selected for their recognition at the local and regional level as being unusually professionally accomplished and respected. Their strong backgrounds in practical classroom settings are invaluable complementary additions to the teacher preparation programs. The Teacher Education Unit typically employs Letter of Appointment faculty (LOA) annually, including university supervisors who supervise student teaching interns. The field-based faculty (3) are recommended by the local school district, and their qualifications are vetted through the Integrated Elementary Teaching Program (IETP) and Secondary Education programs. The Field-Based faculty for 2012-13 all have at minimum a master's degree and are licensed by the state of Nevada. One faculty member is licensed to teach Secondary Biological Sciences, General Science, Health Education, and is a Reading Specialist; another has a master's degree and is licensed in Special Education; and, the third has a master's degree in Elementary Education, is a Master Teacher, and District Curriculum Leader who is also endorsed to teach ESL. The unit's three field-based clinical faculty members hold current licenses in the fields for which they are teaching and supervising. Each
field-based faculty member submits a vita and is interviewed by the program in which they will be affiliated. All field-based clinical faculty members are highly qualified and have a minimum of 10 years of classroom teaching experience (Exhibit 5.3.b Table 5.B.1 Clinical Faculty Qualifications)

The qualifications for being a lead teacher include the requirements that one must have taught for a minimum of three years, and have been in his or her current position for at least one year, personally desires to serve as the lead teacher for an intern and be recommended by his or her principal to serve as mentor and guide. The Director of Field Experiences and Assessment is responsible for ensuring that the lead teacher and university supervisors are or have been licensed in the areas in which they are teaching or supervising (see Table 3.B.4). Unless they meet the above qualifications, they are not allowed to supervise. The school district is responsible for the placement of student teaching interns with qualified lead/cooperating school teachers.

Letter of Appointment (LOA) faculty members support the professional education unit by (a) teaching a variety of courses, including methods courses, and (b) supervising teacher candidates in both field experiences and clinical practice placements. All LOA's have or had licensure in their respective areas, and have been identified by unit professionals 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 superintendents who have worked or are currently working in the local school districts. The relationships established with these practitioners are vital in providing teacher candidates with productive opportunities to practice their skills in off-campus placements.

---

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.

Faculty work within a conceptual framework (see Exhibit 1.5.c Conceptual Framework) that reflects practitioners who possess a lifelong love of learning; a strong fund of knowledge; reflect on educational practices; and value democracy and multiculturalism. All faculty members throughout the unit incorporate the unit's conceptual framework in course syllabi, and more importantly integrate that throughout course content and activities. In doing this, faculty seek to promote the conceptual framework through a demonstration of continuing education, reflecting upon practice, researching areas in education including diversity and practice, and through participation in the College of Education Faculty Senate. Faculty members also strive to model these concepts in the university classroom.

In fall, 2013, the unit conducted a pilot study of students' perceptions of their experience of the conceptual framework in their classes. We conducted a survey from 5 class sections that included secondary practicum, literacy, and Special Education (n=70). Data (see Exhibit 5.3.a Table 5.A.1 Faculty Teaching Conceptual Framework Survey Results) indicated that students "agreed" or "strongly agreed" 75% of the time that faculty were embedding the conceptual framework in these five classes.
Faculty were also surveyed concerning the extent to which they are using current research and developments in their fields in their courses. Results indicate that 100% of the faculty agree (N=3) or strongly (N=18) that they use current research in their classes. We are planning on expanding this survey to include more classes in fall 2014 in order to get a more representative sample and to increase response rates.

Faculty members are most successful in their ability to teach and adapt instruction to the needs of each candidate. In addition to providing data about their teaching, these course evaluations help determine the faculty members' evaluation ratings in the area of teaching. Table 5.A.2 shows a summary of faculty evaluations in the area of teaching from 2010-2013. The drop in Excellent ratings for 2012 and 2013 is due to the increased emphasis upon reflecting about one's teaching. During this change in culture process, the Associate Dean who conducted the faculty evaluations emailed faculty who did not populate the Digital Measures fields related to teaching and requested more information. This happened in 2012, and the increase in 2013 teaching evaluations reflected faculty entering more data into the appropriate fields in Digital Measures. In addition, teaching evaluation ratings are based among other things on advisement, teaching loads, doctoral student activity, and student evaluations. Evaluations of faculty include areas in need of attention and/or ways that faculty can enhance their ratings. For example, if a faculty member receives excellent student comments and yet fails to engage graduate students when such opportunities are available to them, they are encouraged to increase their participation with graduate students by sitting on more committees at the master's or doctoral levels.

In the Fall, 2013 all Faculty Survey [n= 40; response rate 66%] 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?" Response frequencies were: 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%); and, Socratic Approaches (32.5%). The unit is planning on surveying the faculty again in fall, 2014 to see what, if any, adjustments have been made.

In the aforementioned Fall, 2013 Faculty Survey, faculty members were asked, "Which of the following instructional strategies do you use in your courses to address different learning styles?" Faculty members responded in high numbers with diverse strategies and assessments as follows: Strategies: Group Projects (72.5%); Cooperative Learning (62.5%); Case Studies (57.5%); Direct Instruction (80%); Brainstorming (52.5%); Presentations (77.5%); and, Direct Observation (45%). Assessments: Group Projects (72.5%); Presentations (77.5%); and Direct Observation (45%).

In the 2013 survey, faculty members throughout the unit were asked which instructional strategies they use to help educate candidates about diversity. Faculty members responded as follows: Discussion (92.5%); Audio/Visual Materials (47.5%); Personal Experience (67.5%); Field Experiences (35%); Guest Speakers (47.5%); Web-based Strategies (22.5%); and, Educational Games (10%). 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: Multi-Media Presentations (80%); Web-Based Instruction (e.g., Blackboard) (75%); Candidate Presentations/Reports using Technology (47.5%); Activities in Computer Lab (37.5%); and Video Analysis (37.5%).

Faculty reflect upon their teaching regularly through the annual evaluation process. In the reporting of "Teaching Activities" faculty are asked to reflect and write about pedagogical innovations that were introduced into courses, new teaching materials that were introduced, activities that enhanced student learning and/or contact with the community, and to discuss student evaluation data. This data is entered into the university's Digital Measures management system. In addition, faculty members were asked in fall of 2014 about which strategies they employed to better monitor their effectiveness in the university classroom. Their responses were as follows: Course Evaluations (80%); Student Participation (92.5%);
Discussions with Colleagues (47.5%); Student Assessments (85%); Analysis of Blackboard Usage (25%); Conversations with Students (45%); and, Peer Observation (17.5%).

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.

As part of our Tier I university ranking, faculty are expected to engage in scholarly activities. According to page 7 of the Promotion and Tenure Manual (Exhibit 5.3.f Promotion and Tenure Manual), research and creative work includes 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."

With regards to promotion and tenure, the university bylaws, Standard Two 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 Promotion and Tenure Manual, "The mission of the College of Education is to use intellectual and creative energy to improve the condition of education and students as well as their families by developing outstanding educational professionals and by producing good scholarship aimed at improving professional practice...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 missions...All faculty must establish their credentials as scholars." (Exhibit 5.3.f Promotion and Tenure Manual, p. 3).

The Teacher Education Unit models, supports, and reinforces faculty scholarship through brown bags, the Research and Grants Committee, and other forms. For example, in fall 2013 the unit hosted Dave Bauer, a noted grant writer, to meet with small groups of COE and Washoe County School District personnel on November 4 and 6. As a result of that, one of our professors began to set up an informal writing group to support each other's writing.

The promotion and tenure manual outlines what is expected in terms of research, creative, and scholarly activities. We require Priority Activities evidenced by such things as publishing in scholarly journals, obtaining grant funding, writing books and Supporting Activities evidenced by such dimensions as co-authoring journal articles, and presentations at conferences with doctoral students. Publications are further refined by the methodology used by the author(s) such as it being data-based, qualitative, quasi-experimental, experimental, practice, and/or theoretical. When gathering letters from external reviewers, they are specifically asked to comment on the candidate's research and publication record.

Faculty are evaluated yearly regarding their research and scholarly activities (Exhibit 5.3.f Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures), Tables 5.B.1 (Faculty Research Types) and 5.B.2 (Faculty Evaluation Summary) show the type of productivity of unit faculty for 2011-2012 and the percentage of faculty receiving "Excellent" in Research and Scholarly Activity. Notably in 2012 and in the fall, 2013, even though the overall percentage dropped for research, there is a significant increase in grant activity by College of Education faculty. Grant revenue is up due to faculty receiving awards, and 14 faculty (33%) are currently receive extramural funding. At the same time, many faculty write grant applications that are not funded. There were 9 grant proposals that were not funded in 2013. In order to help increase the number of faculty writing and receiving grant funds, the college has instituted the Research and Grants
Group which meets on a regular basis to discuss ways to enhance funding and promote research productivity.

Faculty are engaged in a variety of scholarship, research, and creative activities (Exhibit 5.3.d for Partial Sample of Faculty Research Activities). NCATE Exhibit 5.3.a Table of Faculty Qualifications cited above also reflects the type of scholarship activities that faculty are engaged. That same Table reflects faculty's systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and education of other school professionals. As can be seen, faculty are actively engaged in the study of pedagogy and the application of current research in new settings. Exhibit 5.3.e UNR-WCSD Collaborations shows the number and type of partnerships that the unit has with the local school district. As seen in the chart, a number of collaborations involve research. Faculty publish and present at national conferences. According to the university, 90% of academic faculty should be engaged in research. The goal of the university is to have 90% of all faculty actively engaged in scholarship. Exhibit 5.3.d (p.7 outlines the College of Education research expectations. In 2013, all but 3 academic faculty actively were engaged in research. Exhibit 5.3.d also shows samples of faculty research contributions.

The drop in percentage of those faculty members receiving "Excellent" in 2012 is a result of heightening the university standards in the area of research/scholarly activities. In addition, the College of Education Personnel Committee adopted new standards in 2011 that were subsequently approved by the faculty (see Annual Evaluation and Merit Procedures). At the university level new emphasis was placed on higher quality research and the acquisition of grants. The percentage drops were due more to these increased standards to which faculty were held. It is important to note that COE faculty rate very competitively across the university with the new university rating system. Faculty are encouraged to collaborate interdisciplinary as well as among their College of Education colleagues.

Exhibit 5.3.d Faculty Research Contributions shows the scholarly efforts of tenure and tenure-track faculty for 2013.

5.1.d Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

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 (see Exhibit 5.3.e Table 5.C.1 Faculty Service Types). In addition, the institution bylaws, Standard Three: Service says 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." For the college, 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."

All 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 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 (15) such offices were held by unit faculty members (see Exhibit 5.3.e Faculty Service Matrix). Many faculty members are on national committees and others have put on international conferences such as the International Association of Mathematics Educators.

The Educational Alliance of Washoe County has the College of Education Dean and Associate Dean as members of the Board. This organization has compiled a Data Warehouse of district data and distributes this publicly once a year. 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 Advance Diplomas—namely more math and science. The organization has developed the Parents' University in conjunction with the district superintendent in which board members go out and promote career and college readiness to parents. An interpreter is paid to help parents understand the issues if they are ESL, and parents and their children are given a PowerPoint presentation and information on FAFSA, the admission to college process, and names of contacts.

Table 5.C.2 (Faculty Evaluation of Service) shows the ratings for service 2011-2013. Ratings for Service 2011-13 show interesting fluctuations. For example, 2011 had the highest % of faculty receiving an "Excellent" rating in Service (77%). Then, the percentage of "Excellent" ratings dropped significantly in 2012 (48%) only to rise again to 68% for 2013. The reason for this was due to the re-organization of the college during the 2010-2011 academic year. A great deal of service was performed by faculty to re-organize the college during 2010-11: We had to develop new policies for governance, personnel, evaluation criteria, and class size. We had committees to review academic programs, committee on recruitment and retention, Public Relations, and Diversity. In the 2011-2012 academic year, much of the work had been accomplished, and the evaluation ratings dropped based on new criteria that had been developed the previous year. Another reason for this drop was how the faculty reported or did not report activities. Faculty are instructed (see discussion below on Evaluation) to fill out service activities and indicate the Significance of the activity (Minor; Intermediate, Major) and their level of involvement. Some faculty did not enter their data for Service appropriately. The Associate Dean worked with faculty on how to enter service, and the 2013 data reflects the results of entering appropriate service requirements.

Exhibit 5.3.e Faculty P12 Service shows the activities of approximately 65% of tenure-track academic faculty. A review of the list shows that faculty are involved at the state level task forces related to teacher education and that one faculty member President of the Commission on Professional Standards in Education, a school/university partnership (SUPER) lab school, extensive involvement with the local school district working with teachers, principals, and students, and grant efforts to recruit and retain students from underprivileged populations.

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, administrative, and adjunct faculty, Letters of Appointment (LOAs), and graduate assistants are evaluated once a year by their supervisor(s). Tenure-track 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 teaching assistants, and the results of those evaluations are used to determine if the person should be rehired.
Both tenure-track and administrative faculty must submit an annual role statement which is intended to delineate 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. 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 (Exhibit 5.3.d Digital Measures). The results of the 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 regularly writes up their impressions of the evaluation process and provides recommendations for the ensuing year. In May 2014, the Associate Dean, and Dean of the College of Education met with the Personnel Committee to review the evaluation process. It was decided to have the Chair of Personnel, Associate Dean, and Dean meet with the university vice-provost for academic faculty to review the process and to get recommendations for the 2014 evaluation process. So, there is regular review of the evaluation process.

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.

Faculty are required to submit a self-evaluation along with their evaluation materials. The self-evaluation provides an opportunity for faculty members to review and reflect upon the work they have accomplished for the year. The self-evaluation addresses the faculty member's activities in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. In addition, each faculty member is required to reflect on four areas of their teaching in Digital Measures: pedagogical innovation, enhancements to the course, reflections on student feedback, and new materials they infused or introduced into their coursework. After the evaluation is completed for each faculty member, a meeting is arranged with his or her supervisor to discuss the evaluation. Role Statements are related to faculty evaluations, and these Role Statements are flexible so that faculty can adjust their efforts to accentuate their strengths and/or can be used to shore up areas of weakness. For example, a faculty member who does an outstanding job in the classroom might decrease effort in research in order to focus on the development of a new course or develop a new online course. Likewise, an nontenured Assistant Professor might be encouraged to adjust the Role Statement to reflect heavier emphasis on research.

NCATE Exhibit 5.3.d shows a summary of faculty evaluations in the area of teaching, research, and service from 2011-2013. The drop in "Excellent" ratings in Teaching for 2012 and 2013 is due to a change in the increased emphasis upon reflecting about one's teaching. During this change, the Associate Dean who conducted the faculty evaluations emailed faculty who did not populate the Digital Measures fields related to teaching and requested more information. This happened in 2012, and the increase in 2013 teaching evaluations reflected faculty entering more data into the appropriate fields in Digital Measures.

Each faculty member meets with his or her supervisor to discuss the evaluation. At that time, each faculty 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.
**5.1.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

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

At the university level, there are numerous opportunities, including online opportunities, for professional development offered through the office of Extended Studies. The university also has a state-of-the-art library and instructional design center, called the 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. Professional development for counseling faculty is ensured by the fact that all counseling faculty hold state licenses and are required to engage in a minimum of 40 hours of continuing education every two years. At least three of those continuing education credits must be in ethics.

Within the COE, 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. The unit also hosts monthly Research Roundtables and meetings on the Common Core Curriculum roll-out. In addition, the dean pays the dues for one professional association for every faculty member, and there are monies for research and travel through the Scholarly Activities Pool (SAP). The SAP has been operating for several years, and faculty are able to apply for in-house research grants up to $400 as well as for travel to present findings up to $400. In 2013, the COE dean made an additional $300 available for travel which can be added to the SAP award. In addition, funds can be requested for special consideration. In 2013 and 2014 the unit paid for faculty and local school district personnel to attend a national conference on Professional Development Schools. Full-Time Teacher Education Unit Faculty have financial support from the Dean's Office for travel support ($600), conference registration or professional organization membership ($200), and special requests.

Unit faculty including Graduate Teaching Assistants are actively engaged in professional development both on and off campus. Since 2011, virtually all tenure track faculty participated in one or more professional development activities. A table listing faculty Professional Development activities for 2012-2013 (Table 5.G.1 (Examples of Professional Development 2012-2013) shows the type and quantity of professional development activities. Moving across the excel screen shows there is a depth of activity that faculty engage in. A sample of activities shown below reflects faculty that are actively engaged in a variety of professional development activities both on and off-campus. Faculty professional development included diversity, technology, the Common Core, grant writing, blackboard learning, twitter in classrooms and evaluation. Graduate Teaching assistants are often included in faculty presentations at national conferences which allow them to attend these conferences for nominal fees. This is especially true in the Educational Leadership faculty presentations. Recently, doctoral students participated 20 times in professional presentations. For example, doctoral students presented with faculty members at the National Council for Professors of Education Administration, The American Evaluation Association, and The Society for the Study of Human Development.
Examples of Off-Campus Professional Development Include:
• Division for Early Childhood Conference
• NAETC Conference
• National Association of Professional Development Schools Conference
• Global Education Conference
• Digital Learning Day National Town Hall Meeting
• Nevada School Law Conference
• Service Learning Conference
• ELA in the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium (Common Core)
• Educating for a Democratic Society (Istanbul)
• Northern Nevada Diversity Summit
• Food for Thought (Institute for Brain Potential)
• Association for Educational Research Association
• National Conference on Science Education
• National Conference for Teachers of Math Education

Examples of On-Campus Professional Development Include:
• College of Education Research Roundtable Series
• Last Lecture Series (Living and Learning Center)
• Webinar on Early Bilingual Experiences
• 2-Day Grant Writing Workshop (UNR VP for Research)
• Monitoring Websites (Center for Learning and Literacy)
• Blackboard Learning
• Orientation to Knowledge Center and Website Tutorial
• New Faculty Orientation
• Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Training
• Using Twitter in Classrooms
• Faculty Brown Bags Lunch on Evaluation
• Faculty Senate Forum
• Monitoring RTI

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.

No AFIs were cited for this Standard.
Exhibit 5.3.a - Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled below from data submitted in the Manage Faculty section of AIMS or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit.
FacultyInfo_19384_9659_88418.xls
See Attachment panel below.

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>
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- Faculty Evaluation Service.pdf
- Faculty Annual Evaluation Ratings.pdf
- FY11_Grant_Activity.pdf
- FY12_Grant_Activity.pdf
- FY13_Grant_Activity.pdf
- FY14_Grant_Activity_Thru_Dec13.pdf
- P-12 Service Activities.pdf
- Types of Service Activities 2011-2013.pdf
- UNR_WCSD Collaborations.pdf
- Faculty Ratings 2011-2013.pdf
- Faculty Professional Development 2012-13.pdf
- Faculty Intellectual Contributions.pdf
- SUPER Minutes.pdf