Section 1 - Institutional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE ID: 11431</th>
<th>AACTE SID: 9060</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Hanover College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit: Department of Education</td>
<td>Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C: 01/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Accreditation Visit: S13</td>
<td>Last Accreditation Visit: S06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Head Name: Dr. Kay Williams</th>
<th>Unit Head Title: Director of Teacher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head Email: <a href="mailto:willkay@hanover.edu">willkay@hanover.edu</a></td>
<td>Unit Head Phone: (812) 866-2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Head Fax: (812) 866-2164</td>
<td>Institution Unit Phone: (812) 866-7390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st NCATE Coordinator: Judith Roberts</td>
<td>1st Coordinator Title: Assistant Director of Teacher Education and Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Coordinator Email: <a href="mailto:robertsj@hanover.edu">robertsj@hanover.edu</a></td>
<td>1st Coordinator Phone: (812) 866-7394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd NCATE Coordinator:</td>
<td>2nd Coordinator Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Phone:</td>
<td>2nd Coordinator Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Coordinator Fax:</td>
<td>2nd Coordinator Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Name: Dr. Sue DeWine</td>
<td>CEO Title: President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Phone: (812) 866-7056</td>
<td>CEO Email: <a href="mailto:dewine@hanover.edu">dewine@hanover.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Fax: (812) 866-6879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2006-2007 academic year?

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2006-2007 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. A change in the name of the unit or institution.
2. The status of the institution (e.g., campuses merged, campuses separated, etc.).
3. Changes in key personnel, particularly the unit head, NCATE coordinator, or university/college president.
4. The addition and/or removal of programs.
5. The addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., addition of a master's degree or doctoral program).
6. Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. (NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.)
7. Significant changes in physical facilities.
8. Significant changes resulting from unforeseen conditions such as natural disasters or health calamities.

Hanover College welcomes a new president, Dr. Sue DeWine, on July 1, 2007. Dr. Rob Graham continues as Dean of Academic Affairs.

Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)
The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit’s conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

We have scheduled a review of the conceptual framework for our December, 2007 retreat, according to our assessment schedule.

**Section 6. Candidate Performance**

**Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

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

For the 2006-2007 year (fall 2006-winter 2007-spring2007), eleven elementary and seven secondary teacher candidates passed the Decision Point 2 benchmark. The last NCATE review indicated that the Unit had very little evidence of candidate learning at Decision Point 2 (of 3). All teacher candidates are required to demonstrate in a formal interview a level 2 (of four levels) portfolio and level 2 (of four levels) teacher dispositions. One elementary candidate was unprepared for the interview and did not pass the interview on the first attempt. She was allowed another interview after a conference with her advisor. She was much more prepared and was able to clearly communicate her philosophy of teaching. This candidate continued to struggle with meeting grade point average expectations (2.67 for student teaching) and key teacher dispositions and was removed from the program in the Spring of 2007 by the unit's Teacher Education Committee. For the first time, field work feedback from cooperating teachers in the elementary methods classes was included in Decision Point 2 criteria. Weaknesses detected for all teacher candidates at Decision Point 2 seem to reflect the need for stronger coursework regarding the use of technology, the use of multicultural frameworks in planning for instruction and varied assessment techniques and how to use assessment in future lesson planning. With regard to dispositions, the teacher candidates also need to improve a teacher presence and voice.

The 2005-06 Title II report for Hanover documents 100% pass rate for all candidates who took PRAXIS I and II. This is the third consecutive cohort to have a 100% pass rate.

The current elementary certification program (K-6) is being evaluated, and the Education Department is formally proposing an elementary education major (K-6) with the help of the Teacher Education Committee and the College Curriculum Committee. Hanover has had a marked decrease in elementary teacher candidates and is actively seeking ways to increase the general College enrollment. The Unit realizes that elementary certification that requires a liberal arts major is the equivalent of a double major. In most cases, this unique program has not been self-explanatory or easy to navigate for prospective and current elementary candidates. The Education Department is hoping for College faculty approval before December, 2007.

All Hanover teacher candidates need to improve their ability to integrate technology appropriately (pedagogical content knowledge). During the 2006-07 school year the Education Department worked on improving two areas of our curriculum related to technology: technological literacy and instructional technology. Adam Howard, the department’s technology facilitator and instructor of the department's technology course (EDU 306: Integrating Technology in Instruction), led these efforts. Initially, we proposed to the College’s curriculum committee to change EDU 306 from a half credit course to a full credit course and make it a requirement for students in the teacher education program. This was not accepted by the College Curriculum Committee. After more discussion we decided to eliminate this course and integrate the content traditionally covered in this elective course throughout our curriculum. This allowed us to fulfill our initial goal to include these two areas related to technology in the program for all teacher candidates - not just the students who enrolled in the elective course. At the beginning of the 2007-08 school year we developed a plan for integrating different aspects of these two areas in all courses in elementary and secondary programs from entry level courses to student teaching. We will fully implement these curricular changes beginning in the 2008-09 school year.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).
**Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

Please describe the unit’s plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

1. As indicated in Standard 1 above, Decision Point 2 (Is the candidate ready for student teaching?) data was not systematically summarized, aggregated, and analyzed. The Education Department has built in an annual formal assessment of Decision Point 2 to be coordinated by Assistant Professor Deborah Hanson. Decision Point 2 data from elementary and secondary candidates includes: Feedback from junior methods mentors or cooperating teachers (signed forms per candidate), GPA requirement of 2.67 before student teaching, letters summarizing a formal interview focusing on teacher dispositions and portfolio development at a level 2 (of four levels). This particular data is in part qualitative and is easier to aggregate and analyze outside of the Unit’s database system. Candidates who do not meet Decision Point 2 criteria are required to meet with their Education advisor, and a record of intervention and/or plan for improvement is filed. The Teacher Education reviews intervention and can ask for a candidate interview. The annual results per cohort of candidates will be shared with the Teacher Education Committee and Education Advisory Board in each Winter term, under the direction of Debbie Hanson.

2. The Unit is confused about its responsibility regarding feedback from graduate employers. The Unit did previously have a fourth decision point that pursued, “Are teacher candidates ready for licensing and first years of teaching. The Indiana Division of Professional Standards (IDPS) review advised the Unit (before our last NCATE visit) that we did not need the fourth decision point; we did not need to account for graduate status. The IDPS does occasionally send to Hanover a pass/fail report of individual first/second year graduates in schools completed by their principals. In the 2006-07 academic year we have received reports for two graduates. Consequently the unit assessment system does not specifically look at employer feedback. Should Standard 1 include candidate performance after graduation? Should Standard 2 include State or campus efforts to gather feedback from employers? Is the focus on candidate success or their impact on student learning? The Education Department and the College Career Center do keep a current record of graduate school assignment, principal name, and other relevant contact information. We do invite graduates to serve on the Advisory Board, score final portfolios, present at the campus Indiana Student Education Association meetings, and write newsletter articles. Finally, the Education Department completes an annual survey of graduates regarding its conceptual framework and program effectiveness from the perspective of a first/second year teacher. Data from these surveys is compiled and examined by the Advisory Board and Education professors. Each year there are resulting recommendations for program improvement. The Advisory Board meets this month to review results from the Class of 2005.

Since the last NCATE report, the Education Department has been working with the College Director of Administrative Computing to design a more useful database that is also integrated with the College databases. The Education Department has successfully created a user-friendly data system that can be accessed by the Education program manager (Cheryl Torline) and by Kay Williams, Unit Head. The Director of Administrative Computing is the troubleshooter. General candidate status can be directly accessed from the campus-wide system so that the Education Department does not have to duplicate data entry into its ACCESS database. The Registrar’s office staff also update candidate data through the larger Jenzebar system. This new and highly supported system is a huge relief!

Part of conducting thorough study of candidate assessments is our annual review of the final portfolio results for each cohort of seniors, the scoring process, the scoring rubric, and supporting materials. The Education professors have spent the whole of 2006-07 reviewing the seven-page scoring guide indicators, which had not been edited by the department since 2005. As a consequence of 2006-07 final portfolio results and examination by scorers, the Teacher Education Committee, and the Advisory Board, the Department: 1) created a short list of required portfolio documents from student teaching, 2) added explicit directions for candidate use of a multicultural framework, 3) required candidates to write one rationale per INTASC principle that would synthesize multiple documents in order to minimize redundancy, and 4) specifically encourage male candidates who did not find portfolio construction as appealing. All Class of 2006 candidates met the minimum portfolio requirements for the first time since 2004.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Data for some decision points are not systematically summarized, aggregated, and analyzed. (ITP)
2. The unit assessment system does not reflect feedback from employers of graduates. (ITP)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Please see response above.

**Section 7. Unit capacity**

**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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. **Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:**

**Final Student Teacher evaluations continue to provide helpful guidance in improving the student teaching experience for teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and supervising Hanover College faculty. Although all student teachers who were program completers (May, 2007) earned either level 3 (developing) or level 4 (proficient) in student teaching, sub-scores revealed somewhat weaker areas that guide our work during the current year: use of engaging introductions to activities; use of insightful questions to promote divergent responses; development of opportunities for solving real world problems; effective time management; use of displays, including student work, to enhance learning; use of effective questioning strategies; and support for students’ self evaluation. A new sub-score for the current year, “demonstrates attention to multicultural frameworks” will give us data for the future in this important area. We will discuss this sub-score with our Advisory Board this fall and get their input.**

**Our Education Advisory Board provided helpful ideas in response to sub-scores on the student teaching evaluation related to cultural responsiveness. In collaboration with the Advisory Board we generated ideas to guide student teachers, cooperating teachers, and faculty supervisors. This cultural responsiveness section of the assessment evaluates each student teacher on how well he/she demonstrates appreciation of student diversity in cultural identity and language, pursues opportunities for extending learning with regard to issues of cultural/language diversity, and designs learning activities which respect and enrich student diversity. Advisory Board members suggested that student teachers utilize examples from different cultural perspectives, read and discuss stories that have various cultural versions, celebrate the cultures of children within the classroom, utilize guest speakers who represent different cultures, bring in artifacts from various cultures, listen to music in other languages, establish pen pals with students in another culture, use the Internet to bring other cultures into the classroom, and attend cultural events available in the community.**

Written and oral feedback from cooperating teachers and from student teachers helped supervising Hanover College faculty identify areas for improvement for the current year: a more significant amount of space for narrative description of the student teacher’s progress and overall competence was added to the midterm/final evaluation forms; Level 4 (proficient) is now reserved for the final evaluation process; all faculty supervisors now provide regular feedback on student teacher reflective journals; videotaping is done by midterm in order to provide good feedback for implication later in the student teaching experience; and supervising faculty now organize regular student teaching seminars throughout the student teaching experience. Also in response to this feedback from cooperating teachers and student teachers, we have developed an informal evaluation to supplement our formal final student teacher evaluation. This additional form will allow both cooperating teachers and supervisors to highlight several specific strengths and several specific areas that have room for improvement as student teaching comes to an end.

The urban teaching experiences of Hanover College continue to be implemented. Student teachers have the option of doing student teaching in Cincinnati, Louisville, or Indianapolis, with supervising faculty commuting to those urban schools on a regular basis. Beginning in 2003-2004 percentages of 14-week urban student teachers have been 2003-2004 - 25% urban, 2004-2005 - 32% urban, 2005-2006 - 24% urban, 2006-2007 - 25% urban, and 2007-2008 40% urban. Thus, during this time span urban student teaching has been at 24% or better and is significantly higher (40%) for the current year. In addition to the full-time urban student teaching, ALL Hanover College student teachers who do the bulk of student teaching in rural/small town settings have a 2-3 day supervised urban experience at the conclusion of the student teaching semester. A new elementary school, Engelhard Elementary School in downtown Louisville, was the site for this short urban experience in 2006-2007 and will again host student teachers this year. Arlington High School in Indianapolis was the site for secondary student teachers. All cooperating teachers at Arlington have been teachers of color. This year we have one student teaching mentor of color in Cincinnati. This is the first time we've had a minority represented in our pool of community school mentors. All portfolios must show evidence of these urban experiences.

The Hanover College Education Department continues to collaborate with school principals and superintendents in the placement of all student teachers. This collaboration begins with placement of Education students during their freshman and sophomore years and during their methods courses in the junior year. Many local schools are involved in a variety of field placements throughout each teacher candidate’s participation in the Teacher Education Program. The sequence of field experiences provides a minimum of 100 hours of field work prior to 14-week full-time student teaching.

Especially at the junior and senior level, teacher candidates develop pre and post assessments, analyze student work samples, participate in collaborative assessment conferences, and focus heavily upon aligning objectives, instruction, and assessment. Portfolios must include analysis of student work samples. All elementary and secondary teacher candidates participate in collaborative assessment conferences, and local teachers join in the collaborative assessments with elementary teacher candidates as they analyze student work samples and suggest ways to improve assessment strategies and student performance.

Rubrics for teacher candidate portfolios (which are developed over the four years and supported with a series of four .25 credit courses) include attention to technology use with K-12 students, long range planning through units of study, clear communication of high expectations for all students, and three sub-headings related to cultural responsiveness. Field work experiences are a significant part of the final portfolio with much attention to reflection and analysis of teaching, student learning, the classroom environment, and alignment of standards and behavioral objectives with instruction and student assessment.

Many local education experts participate in classrooms at Hanover College. Superintendents, principals, the director of assistive
Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

**Standard 4. Diversity**

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

During the 2005-06 school year the faculty in the education department worked on developing a curriculum project to address issues of diversity. We began this work by meeting frequently during the fall semester to explore our similarities and differences in our thinking about issues of diversity and to examine our current statements related to diversity. We spent part of each weekly department meeting discussing these issues related to diversity and had several meetings outside our regularly scheduled meeting. We also devoted a significant portion of our yearly retreats to developing this curriculum project. This project encourages inquiry.

We discovered in these meetings that we have similar ways of thinking about diversity and that our conceptual framework captures of collective thinking well. We also agreed that we needed to engage in a sustained, multi-year project to integrate the principles of our conceptual framework that relate to cultural diversity better throughout our curriculum. We also agreed that we needed to improve our efforts in recruiting and retaining students of color. We agreed to work on a curriculum project that transforms our culture at the departmental and college levels to address issues of diversity more effectively in order to prepare our students better for teaching in diverse classrooms and to work toward making our student body more diverse.

We developed a curriculum project that facilitates our department's inquiry of these areas that we want to improve. We finalized a document that outlines this curriculum project during the 2006 fall semester. Adam Howard, faculty member and facilitator of this curriculum project, wrote the draft of this document and then the department as a whole — including both faculty and staff — worked to shape the final document. We considered this document a sort of roadmap for directing our inquiry and efforts toward improving areas related to diversity. We used Susan Rankin’s transformational tapestry model that includes four different areas to direct our inquiry: current campus culture, assessment, transformation via intervention, and transformed culture.

We spent the winter and spring terms addressing the first stage of this project, which explores our current campus culture. In order to explore our current culture we spent several department meetings developing questions related to our departmental and college-wide culture. We surfaced 30 questions related to different aspects of our culture including faculty, student, culture, and policies. We then categorized the questions to identify 8 larger areas of our inquiry: educational policies, education department faculty and staff, students, education department field work, course work, assessment of candidates, admissions, and institutional.

At the end of the 2006-07 school year we made the decision to spend this current year exploring the questions and larger categories that relate to the students, faculty and staff in the education department. In other words, we decided to begin with ourselves and our students. During the yearly retreat in August 2007 we focused on the questions related to faculty and staff, students, education department field work, and course work. Out of this discussion we developed a survey for our students to take at the beginning of the education program in the foundations of education course and toward the end during student teaching. We focused this survey on questions related to urban schools. This allows us to assess what students learn about cultural diversity in our urban experience program as well as get a sense of students’ thinking about cultural diversity as it relates to urban environments. We decided to administer this survey at the beginning of students’ coursework in the education program, at the beginning of student teaching, and after students have completed their urban experience in student teaching. This will generate data to identify where students are with issues of diversity at three important points in their course of study.

We are currently looking at our own beliefs about multicultural education and issues of diversity. The faculty and staff of the education department recently completed a survey develop by Kay Williams, faculty member. This is a starting point for us exploring our own understandings.

In addition to the curriculum project we are currently evaluating the college-wide Panthers Teach Program. We are working with the dean of students and a member of his staff to make this program sustainable after the initial grant that we received to develop this program runs out at the end of this school year.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:
1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

In the past year, Education faculty have encouraged diverse peer interaction, despite the fact that current candidates are predominantly white, middle/upper middle class from middle U.S.A. We do have one candidate who can claim Cherokee heritage. 74% of the current candidates come from Indiana high schools. 8% of the current candidates are from Texas, Illinois, or Colorado. Candidates are less ethnically diverse that the previous year. This is representative of the general campus population of students. First, the Department's Spicer Phillips scholarship covered the majority of cost for EDU 230 Critical Issues (required) participants to spend nine days in Atlanta and Alabama to study the civil rights movement of the '60s. Participants visited Miles College, an historically black college in Birmingham. Participants were able to mingle with Miles' teacher candidates (350 of Miles students are teacher candidates!) around the campus and at lunch. The same participants spend four full days in an all-Black Tuscaloosa elementary school where the teachers were predominantly of color. Second, the Department assisted in hosting Panthers Teach (Hanover's small teacher recruitment program) high school students of color on our campus. Hanover teacher candidates shared their rooms for two over-nighters and invited guests to Hanover classes and community schools during the school day. All student teachers do have at least a three-day urban school experience where they work with cooperating teachers of color and with a student population that is at least 30% students of color.

We are hopeful about having a new College administrative focus, that there will be more opportunities to recruit and interaction with diverse peers.

The Spanish and Education departments are planning to sponsor a week-long visit by two Guatemalan teachers who are interested in our sending Hanover students to their school for internships. This would give Spanish-speaking teacher candidates (we currently have four majors) an opportunity to work in a Guatemalan school that emphasizes the preservation of the Mayan culture and language. The College has committed funds to cover half of the expenses to get the two teachers to campus in February, 2008. The Hanover Presbyterian Church and the campus' Haq International Center are also sponsors.

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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

Three of the four professional faculty have earned doctorates and experience in school settings at the levels that they supervise; the fourth faculty member has a master's degree and extensive teaching experience in varied K-12 settings. Kay Williams was promoted to associate professor and received tenure during the 2006-2007 year. She has been granted a sabbatical for winter and spring terms, 2008. Also during 2006-2007 Adam, Kay, and Judy served as mentors for Dr. Debbie Hanson, who joined the faculty in the fall. All faculty members are involved in scholarship. Three of the four have published during the 2006-2007 year, with Adam Howard publishing, LEARNING PRIVILEGE: LESSONS OF POWER AND IDENTITY IN AFFLUENT SCHOOLING (Routledge) and both Debbie Hanson and Judy Roberts publishing articles. All four faculty have made presentations at a variety of professional conferences. Each faculty member integrates diversity and uses multiple assessment strategies to evaluate candidate work. The student teacher evaluation forms and the portfolio scoring guide have been revisited yearly and changes are made to reflect program changes and increased expectations in terms of analysis, assessment, and responses to diversity.

During 2006-2007 two faculty members wrote grants; one grant was a collaborative effort with Hanover College science faculty, the Hanover education department, and local elementary teachers, and the other grant will provide professional development for Hanover education faculty to travel to Alverno College for professional development. All faculty serve on college-wide committees such as the teacher education committee, community board of standards, assessment committee, class committees, search committees, and the Hanover Childcare Center board. One faculty member has facilitated Project Wild and Science Blitzes for local schools, and another is developing a program for visiting educators to come from Guatemala to Hanover College. Two faculty members are regularly involved in state-wide meetings and in networking with state and regional teacher educators. In fact, one faculty member serves on the board for the regional organization of teacher educators.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

The Unit's admission and recruiting practices are currently being examined especially for elementary teacher candidates. The College administration and Curriculum Committee are helping the Education Department propose an elementary education major. While Education coursework will not change, the current program that requires 13 units of credit (54 semester hours) and a liberal arts major (36 semester hours) is difficult to navigate and is not immediately appealing to prospective elementary candidates.

The roles of Department Chair and Unit Head/Director of Teacher Education has been evaluated by Education professors. After six years, the current Director of Teacher Education will pass the mantle in the Fall, 2008 to Judy Roberts, who holds a .4 administrative assignment for the Department.

Education professors have modeled student assessment strategies for College departments and faculty. The College's North Central evaluation will culminate in eighteen months. The Director of Teacher Education is serving her second year on the College's Assessment Committee.

As indicated in Standard 5 above, the Unit has allowed for Education professors to be engaged in a wide range of professional activities. Kay Williams is also trained as an AdvancEd evaluator for Indiana schools. Deborah Hanson serves on the JRST award committee and juries papers for the National Association of Research and Science Teaching. Adam Howard is Chair of the Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies SIG, American Educational Research Association; a member of the Editorial Board, Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, and of the Curriculum Advisory Committee, TransYouth Family Advocates (National Organization); and a Trustee of the Cincinnati Breakthrough Collaborative, Inc.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

If you have another comments, use the space below: