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Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

AFI
The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates have the knowledge and skills to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.

AFI Rationale
Because the assessment referred to as the Teacher Work Sample does not require students to apply the information gained from assessments, there is no evidence of candidate capacity to monitor student progress and, as a result, no clear basis for measuring candidate impact on student learning.

Rejoinder
The unit disagrees with the BOE conclusion that it “lacks sufficient evidence that candidates have the knowledge and skills to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.” There is no single assessment titled “Teacher Work Sample,” and, therefore, we are confused by the BOE’s rationale.

As described in detail in the Institutional Report, Standard 2, and further elaborated upon in the IR Addendum, pp. 3-6, the unit’s assessment system utilizes numerous data points that address each element of the AFI. These assessments, to which the BOE team had access throughout the accreditation process, include the following: 1) Signature Assignment (SA) exemplars and executive summaries of SA data; 2) mentor teacher and university supervisor final evaluations of candidates’ practicum and student teaching experiences; and 3) program evaluation survey data. All accreditation assessment data is accessible via our electronic exhibit rooms, as follows:

Exhibit Room:  http://westoahu.hawaii.edu/ncate-exhibitrm
Exemplars:  https://www.taskstream.com/ts/schwartz16/exhibitroom--password: 12345)

In support of our response, and to assist the UAB in its deliberations, selected exhibits taken from the above online sites are provided in the Rejoinder Appendix, pp. 2-13.

Exhibit 1c.1b, Signature Assignment Data.Executive Summary
Exhibit 1c.1a, Student Teaching Final Evaluations
Exhibit 3c.2a, Student Teaching Evaluation Form
Strong evidence of candidates’ ability “to apply the information gained from assessments and to monitor student progress” is found throughout the data derived. For example:

**Field Experience Evaluations.** The most telling evidence of UHWO teacher candidates’ positive impact on student learning is found in mentor teacher and university supervisor final evaluations of candidates’ practicum and student teaching experiences. Without question, the student teaching mentor teacher, especially, has first hand knowledge of the day-to-day impact of preservice teachers’ ability to use knowledge gained from assessments, to monitor student progress, and to make adjustments to instruction.

Student Teaching Final Evaluation data (Exhibit 1c.1a, Rejoinder Appendix, p. 6), reported by mentor teachers over two academic years, revealed 100% of candidates reaching acceptable-to-target scores (range: 0 = unacceptable; 1 = acceptable; 2 = target) on standards and benchmarks relevant to this AFI. To assist the UAB in better understanding the unit’s point, critical benchmarks, aligned with State and Professional Standards (Exhibit 3c.2a: Student Teaching Evaluation Form, Rejoinder Appendix, p. 9), are as follows:

**HTSB Standard 6:** Designs and Provides Meaningful Learning Experiences;
**ACEI Standard 3.1:** Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction.
**Critical Benchmark:** The extent to which the candidate...

- Plans and implements logical, sequenced instruction and continually adjusts plans based on learner needs.

**HTSB Standard 8:** Uses assessment strategies
**ACEI Standard 4:** Assessment for instruction
**Critical Benchmark:** The extent to which the teacher candidate:

- Uses a variety of appropriate assessment strategies to enhance knowledge of learners & appropriately modifies teaching & learning strategies.

**HTSB Standard 9:** Demonstrates professionalism
**ACEI Standard 5.1:** Professional growth, reflection, & evaluation
**Critical Benchmark:** The extent to which the teacher candidate:

- Reflects on practices and monitors own teaching activities and strategies, making adjustments to meet learner needs.

**Signature Assignments.** Signature Assignment (SA) data also reveals a “clear basis for measuring candidate impact on student learning.” As seen in Exhibit 1c.1b (Rejoinder Appendix, p. 2), 100% of candidates achieved acceptable-to-target scores on relevant standards and benchmarks.
The following descriptions of exemplary signature assignments provide the UAB with a context for the data reported in the Exhibit 1c.1b, Signature Assignment Data. Executive Summary. Candidate exemplars, too lengthy to include in this rejoinder, are accessible via the unit’s TaskStream electronic exhibit room:
https://www.taskstream.com/ts/schwartz16/exhibitroom–password: 12345

**EDEE 424. Case Study of a Struggling Literacy Learner.** The teacher candidate informally assesses the listening, speaking, reading, writing, visualizing, and visually representing skills of a student (grades 4-6) who has been identified as a struggling literacy learner. Data is analyzed and used to develop an intervention plan.

**EDEE 455, Science Methods II. Looking at Students’ Understanding of Science Concepts**
One of the most important aspects of a teacher’s job is to uncover what a student understands or doesn’t understand about a specific science concept. Understanding is not about repeating the “right” answer or science fact, but the student’s core understanding of the science concept. One effective way to uncover students’ understandings is to engage them in a one-on-one conversation in which teachers ask questions and listen to students’ answers. The purpose of this assignment is to give you practice designing assessment questions, first on paper and then as tools in a conversation with a student through a Science Interview Question Guide you will develop. . . After the interview, prepare a verbatim transcript that you will use to assess the student’s grade-level understanding of the science concept targeted by the questions. . . Use actual quotes and information from your transcript and analysis to synthesize what the student’s understanding of this science concept is and provide suggested activities or experiences for the parent or guardian to help their child progress to the next level of understanding.

**EDEE 490. The Teacher and Student Work Sample + Reflection.** This Student Teaching assignment is specifically designed 1) to illustrate the effectiveness of the candidate’s teaching on student learning, and 2) to provide evidence of the candidate’s progress in becoming a reflective practitioner who uses assessment data to strengthen instruction, inform practice, and promote student learning. To complete this assignment, the candidate first describes what he/she considers to be the best or most successful lesson that was planned and delivered during student teaching. Next, the candidate selects student work samples that illustrate high, medium, and low (H-M-L) performance on the intended outcome(s). Finally, the candidate analyzes the H-M-L work samples, describing and reflecting upon the impact of their teaching on student learning.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

AFI #1
The unit does not regularly and systematically involve the professional community in the development and evaluation of its assessment system.

AFI Rationale
The professional community input in the development and evaluation of the assessment system is limited to undocumented discussions and one meeting with members of the TEAC in which data from the assessment system was dispensed. Interviews with arts and science faculty and with stakeholders revealed that little information is known about the unit's assessment system and how data are used to inform program and unit changes.

Rejoinder
The unit disagrees with the BOE conclusion that it “does not regularly and systematically involve the professional community in the development and evaluation of its assessment system.” Evidence to the contrary was available to BOE team members during the accreditation process via TEAC meeting minutes located in the Electronic Exhibit Room: http://westoahu.hawaii.edu/ncate-exhibitrm, as well a during the on-site visit opening poster session and visit interviews.

RE: Documentation of meetings and discussions with the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC)

- TEAC Meeting Minutes--Exhibit 2b.1c, located in the Electronic Exhibit Room, as well as on the CD of Electronic Exhibits that was provided to the BOE Chair, upon arrival at the team hotel workroom on January 26, 2013. (See minute excerpts, pp. 5-7 below).

- TEAC PowerPoint Presentation (Rejoinder Appendix, p. 17)---Requested by and subsequently e-mailed to Standard 2 BOE team representative on January 28, immediately after the on-site interview with the unit chair and unit TaskStream administrator.

During the aforementioned January 28 interview session on Standard 2, the unit chair and TaskStream administrator explained in detail the ways in which the unit has involved the professional community in the continuous improvement of unit operations, drawing particular attention to the November 1, 2012 meeting minutes (Rejoinder Appendix, p. 14) and PowerPoint presentation. At no time did the BOE representative bring to our attention that there were “undocumented discussions. . . [regarding] the development and evaluation of the assessment system.” We would have appreciated knowing at the time if for some reason the BOE did not
have access to exhibits, such as meeting minutes and program evaluation surveys, in support of the issue under scrutiny here.

RE: Regular, systematic involvement of the professional community

Between June 27, 2011 and November 1, 2012, the unit met with its Teacher Education Advisory Council a total of four times. As seen in the agenda and the minutes of every meeting, discussions indeed took place regarding assessment data collected and B.Ed program changes resulting from data analysis.

Of particular relevance to the AFT is the PowerPoint presentation (Rejoinder Appendix, p. 17) made to TEAC members during the fall 2012 meeting. Having recently prepared the IR and IR Addendum, the unit felt ready to provide a comprehensive overview of its assessment system and findings, in order to engage TEAC members in a substantive discussion of how data could be used to inform continuous improvement of unit operations.

The unit is committed to the NCATE continuous improvement model, in efforts to provide its candidates with the highest quality teacher preparation program. TEAC membership is made up of professional community stakeholders, including partner school mentor teachers and principals, alumni, and liberal arts and science support faculty. The Division takes seriously advisory council’s suggestions for the continuous improvement of its elementary teacher education program. Within the context of the unit’s multi-dimensional assessment system, TEAC meeting minutes illustrate the impact of council recommendations with regard to change in unit operations. Following are excerpts from TEAC minutes (Electronic Exhibit 2b.1c).

November 1, 2012:

Council Recommendations:

RE: candidate low Praxis II scores in the Social Studies: (Data Source: Praxis Scores)

- Increase candidate Civics content knowledge special modules or other electives courses
- Engage the liberal arts support faculty in a discussion of how to improve candidates’ social studies content knowledge, overall, via the General Education curriculum.

RE: differentiated instruction, in the context of special needs students (SPED): (Data Source: Surveys of alumni)

- There was general consensus among council members that it is a good idea to provide more field-based SPED experiences for our candidates and that the current SPED course is a natural fit into the current Block 3.

RE: increasing employer (principal) responses to unit surveys (Data Source: Program Evaluation Surveys)
- Fay [Principal at a partner school] will provide Jonathan [TaskStream Administrator] with the name of the HIDOE contact person in charge of such requests to survey employers and their staff. He will follow up and report back to the unit.

March 19, 2012:

**Council Recommendations:**

RE: Employer & Employee survey data on HTSB Standard 10: Communications with parents: Expressed concern: “Teacher candidates don’t know how to communicate with parents.”

- Encourage student teachers to participate in parent/teacher conferences; Engage in role-playing scenarios during methods courses; write letters to parents during the Early Field Experience and other methods courses.

October 17, 2011

**Council Recommendations:**

RE: Selection and Orientation of Mentor Teachers [Data Source: Program Evaluation Survey]

- The council recommends implementation of a Mentor Teacher Orientation, which would help new mentors, in particular, gain a better understanding of expectations. [Council member] pointed out that mentor teachers often do not know how much authority to give the candidates when working with their students. [Council member] suggested that placements made over the summer months should be cc’d to mentor teachers’ personal e-mail addresses, in order to facilitate communications.

RE: Should Educational Assistant (EA) and/or Part Time Teacher (PTT) experience be allowed to substitute for the early field experience? [Data Source: TEAC member observation from the field].

- [Council members] explained that there are different kinds of EAs (i.e., counselor EAs). EAs do not lesson plan; a lot of their work is one-on-one with students and not with a full classroom. [Council member] does not recommend counting their EA work as a substitute for EDEE 200. PTT work is also often too specialized (i.e., teach Japanese) and should not count for the early field teaching experience.
June 27, 2011

Discussion on how the council can advise the Division of Education occurred throughout the meeting, with the following issues addressed and suggestions made:

RE: Early Field Experience (EDEE 200) Placements: Should teacher candidates be allowed to make their own placements in the early field experience, a 3-credit, 45-hour requirement? [Data Source: Program Evaluation Survey].

- General consensus was “no.” Principals and most elementary education faculty agreed that it is preferable to have one phone call from UHWO vs. multiple students calling them to request a mentor teacher. With regard to placements in the field, the Elementary Teacher Education program policy has always stated that candidates do not choose their mentors, although they may request placements.

RE: Special Education preparation. UH-Manoa currently requires their undergraduates to take 9 credits of SPED courses, whereas UHWO requires only 3 credits. UHWO graduates may be at a disadvantage when it comes to being hired by the HDOE. SPED staffing is a critical need in the State. [Data Source: TEAC member observations from the field].

- [Council member] suggested that we develop the SPED curriculum in order to strengthen candidate knowledge of special education teaching and learning. [Unit member] noted that development of the Special Education area of concentration is in the Strategic Planning document and high on the agenda for development and implementation, give the high HDOE need.

RE: What do council members believe are the major strengths of the UHWO Teacher Education programs? [Data Source: Program Evaluation Survey]

- Field-based experiences – Principals like the fact that we closely mentor our candidates beginning with the early field experience and extending into practicum and through student teaching.
- Lesson plans – All lesson plans written and implemented during the practicum experiences, in particular, are content-based.
- Theoretical stance – Candidates are being prepared to develop and deliver inquiry-driven lessons that are grounded in constructivism.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

AFI #2
The unit does not assess unit operations.

AFI Rationale
Discussions in the IR Addendum and with faculty confirm that faculty reflections on candidate performance lead to changes in the content and/or structure of courses during subsequent semesters, but not to unit operations as defined by NCATE.

Rejoinder

The unit disagrees with the BOE conclusion that it “does not assess unit operations.” In its response to standard-by-standard question prompts in the Institutional Report, the unit carefully detailed its activities relative to governance, planning, budget, personnel, facilities, services and procedures (advising and admission), and resources in support of our mission to prepare candidates. With the exception of our “challenging budget,” none of the aforementioned elements of unit operations, as “defined by NCATE,” were called to question in the off-site report nor, to the best of our knowledge, during the on-site visit. BOE team members had access to unit faculty meeting minutes, during which agenda items and discussions of issues relevant to unit operations have occurred. If there were issues, we would have appreciated the opportunity to clarify and provide further evidence.

Furthermore, “Discussions in the IR Addendum, p. 5” to which the BOE final report (p. 8) refers, were written in response to the following question posed by the BOE team in their off-site report:

(2) “The IR does not provide information regarding its use of signature assessment results to inform unit operation changes as defined by NCATE.”

Therefore, the unit response, (IR Addendum, pp. 4-6), to question 2 above focused on Signature Assignment assessments, as a means to inform unit operations. Signature Assignment data are only one element of the larger picture of the unit’s continuous improvement model. As noted on page 1 of this Rejoinder, the unit’s multi-dimensional assessment system is used to assess unit operations and is described in detail in the Institutional Report, Standard 2, and further elaborated upon in the IR Addendum, pp. 4-6.

As noted in the IR Addendum, unit faculty meet in the fall of the academic year (AY) to review the previous AY Signature Assignment data and to discuss implications for continuous improvement. “The overall purpose of this special meeting is to discuss and come to agreement on all unit assessments for the upcoming academic year. As described in the Institutional Report, unit assessment data is collected from: Praxis I & II; Candidate Grades; Field Experience Evaluations; Program Evaluation Survey; Candidate Exit Surveys; Employer & Employee Surveys; and Signature Assignments. During this meeting, faculty analyze the previous academic year’s (AY) data across all performance standards (IR Addendum, p. 5).”
Questions that structured these discussions on SA’s were reported in the IR Addendum (pp. 5-6), as follows:

“To determine how signature assignment data, in particular, informs not only individual course assessments but also unit operations, the following questions framed the discussion:

1. Based on last AY data from your signature assignment(s), what changes in content, structure, and assessment (rubric) do you anticipate?
   - Faculty are encouraged to use the same assessment rubrics for the entire AY, in order to maintain consistent collection of useful, comparative data.

2. How does the Executive Summary of Signature Assignment data inform unit operations?
   - Faculty analyzes data summaries to determine trends in candidates’ performance levels, by standard, by semester, and by AY.

The second question above is particularly salient to the AFI. Executive summaries of Signature Assignment Data reveal trends in candidates’ achievement of target on each standard. During the fall meeting, these trends are discussed and compared to summaries of data on candidate performance on all measures in the unit’s overall assessment system named above. For example, upon examination of candidate performance on HTSB Standard 8, Uses Assessment Strategies, aligned with ACEI Standard 4, Assessment for Instruction, the following trend is notable because it reveals the low percentages of candidates achieving target across all professional standards:

Exhibit 1c.1b Signature Assignment Executive Summary, 2010-12:
68% of candidates achieved target (32% acceptable)

Exhibit 1c.1a Student Teaching Evaluations, 2009-12:
72% of candidates achieved target (28% acceptable)

Similar trends were also noted in candidates’ lower performing scores on HTSB/ACEI Standards 10 & 5.2, respectively: Fosters parent and school community relationships/Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies.

Recommendations for addressing the improvement of candidate performance on assessment standards included significantly increasing attention to the topic of “Assessment” via the newly re-designed curriculum (IR, Section 2c.2, p.9). Added attention to home/school/community relations was also recommended. Blocks 1, 2, and 3 methods courses, with practicum, now include a 3-credit seminar with co-requisite field-based placement where candidate knowledge, understanding, development, implementation, and evaluation of assessment strategies are monitored by mentor teachers and university supervisors.

“Block 1 Practicum with Seminar focuses on developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant pedagogy, K-6. Teacher candidates complete 45 hours of supervised practicum in an elementary school classroom, where they put into practice methods and materials that have been studied in their on-campus reading and language arts courses. During the embedded seminar, special attention is given to issues related
Example Evidence: Course syllabi (Electronic Exhibit 1c.2a) illustrate how the topics of assessment and home/school/community are addressed, as in the following Math/Science Methods practicum seminar (EDEE 436) assignments:

**Topic 1 (Math & Science in home/school/community relations):** Observe in your mentor teacher’s classroom and interview him/her about his/her thoughts on how teaching mathematics and science fits within the realm of home/school/community relations. *How does he/she math and science home/school/community relations in his/her teaching? What does he/she see as the benefits of doing so? What does he/she see as the challenges of doing so? From your observations, do you see evidence of home/school/community relations in the classroom?*

**Topic 4 (Math & Science Assessment):** Interview your mentor teacher about *his/her philosophy of assessment. What role does assessment play in his/her teaching? How does he/she assess student learning in mathematics and science? How have you observed assessment being used, both formally and informally, in your mentor teacher’s teaching of mathematics and science?*
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

AFI #3
The unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate data for program and unit improvement.

AFI Rationale
Analysis and evaluation of assessment data are primarily limited to changes at the course level by individual faculty members.

Rejoinder
The unit strongly disagrees with the BOE conclusion that it “does not systematically analyze and evaluate data for program and unit improvement.”

A detailed description of unit data collection, analysis, and evaluation is provided in the Institutional Report (IR), pp. 5-7. These data are indeed systematically collected each semester and continuously examined in the context of recommending programmatic and unit improvements. The unit provided multiple examples of the ways in which it utilizes data to inform not only “changes at the course level by individual faculty members,” but also unit operations, as seen in the following excerpts from the IR, p. 3 and pp. 7-9.

B. The unit

B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The unit meets monthly and publishes its minutes (Exhibit B.1b) on the Laulima Education Division website, in order to record issues discussed and decisions that were voted upon. In the fall semester faculty meet to review data, formulate short and long-term goals, and make recommendations for curricular change or program redesign to improve operations.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

The unit uses its assessment system to regularly and systematically collect and analyze data. The following summarizes how that data is used to inform the continuous improvement process.

Praxis I & II

The unit actively monitors candidates’ progress towards taking and passing their required Praxis exams. During their initial pre-professional courses, Introduction to Teaching as a
Career with co-requisite Early Field Experience, instructors apprise candidates of test preparation resources, including the ETS.org website, webinars, and the UHWO No'eau Learning Center. The introductory course serves as a forum for discussing the relevance of Praxis exams, in the context of becoming effective teachers.

Since program implementation in fall 2007, Praxis I pass rates are 100% for all candidates admitted to the Professional Teacher Education sequence of courses. Once admitted, candidates begin preparing for their Praxis II exam, passage of which is now required for admission to Student Teaching. Data on the newly required Praxis II reveals a pass rate of 95% over four semesters, AY 2010-12 (Exhibit 2c.1a). Candidates who struggle with passing Praxis II seek assistance from the UHWO No'eau Learning Center, as well as ETS.org resources.

Content Area Grades

In addition to Praxis II, the unit also evaluates candidate knowledge of content via disaggregated data on general education and other courses that reflect the Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board and Association for Childhood Education International Content Standards in the following areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and the Social Studies. At the end of each semester, the division Academic Support Specialist collects data on grades earned by candidates in the content areas and prepares a table illustrating content area proficiencies (Exhibit 1c.2d). Faculty uses the grade data to analyze tendencies and to inform decisions about the effectiveness of program content courses in preparing highly qualified classroom teachers.

Clinical Experiences (Student Teaching)

Each semester the TaskStream administrator compiles data on both Mentor Teacher and University Supervisor final evaluations of student teachers. The unit currently uses a student teaching evaluation form (Exhibit 3c.2a) that is aligned with the Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) and the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for teacher preparation. Since program implementation, data indicates that candidate performance on all measures are either acceptable or on target across all standards (Exhibit 1c.1a). For example, five semesters of data reveal the lowest percentage (72%) of candidates achieved a target score on Standard 4, Assessment, as rated by mentor teachers. Conversely, university supervisors rated 94% of candidates as achieving target on Standard 1, Development, Learning, & Motivation, as well as Standard 3, Adapts to Learner Diversity.

Faculty uses the grade data to analyze tendencies and to inform decisions about the effectiveness of program content courses in preparing highly qualified classroom teachers. For example, to increase candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions towards assessing teaching and learning, faculty recommended increasing the amount of attention paid to assessment in not only methods courses but also in the Early Field Experience, Practicum, and Student Teaching seminars. (See detailed description of program redesign in question 2c.2 below).
Signature Assignments

Each semester faculty members are provided disaggregated data on their respective signature assignments and reflect upon the results. Faculty reflections (Exhibit 2b.1) on candidate performance often lead to changes in the content and/or structure of the course during subsequent semesters. For example, Dr. Rick Jones, Science Educator, noted that his fall 2010 candidates appeared to be weak in their ability to design questions that focus on well-defined science concepts that are aligned with the Hawai‘i Science Content Standards, as well as design questions that truly uncover student conceptual understandings. These weaknesses suggested areas for redesign in the course and the instructor’s focus on content.

Signature Assignment Executive Summaries over two academic years (Exhibit 1c.1b) reveal that candidates performed best on Standard 3.4, Active Engagement in Learning (88% on target) and on Standard 2.7, Health Education (100% on target).

The lowest average percent of candidates achieving target were in areas associated with ACEI Standard 3.1, Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction (67% on target); Standard 4, Assessment (68% on target), and Standard 5.2, Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies (64% on target).

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

UHWO B.Ed in Elementary Education: Program Delivery Redesign

In spring 2011, the Division of Education faculty recommended a redesigned program of study delivery, reducing the number of blocked methods courses from four to three, increasing the amount of credit earned for practicum, and eliminating curricular redundancies in the area of multicultural education.

The decision to redesign the way in which the professional teacher education sequence of courses is delivered was based upon the following events:

Since initial program implementation in fall 2007, candidates have voice their desire to complete the program of study in a timely and efficient manner. Given the original structure of the program with four semesters of field-based methods course work prior to student teaching, candidates transferring from other institutions could not complete the program in less than 2.5 years. (83% of our candidates are transfer students).

To remedy the situation, the unit immediately put into place summer school options for blocked methods courses. As a result, our inaugural class of six candidates graduated in fall 2009. But it was not without cost, as the faculty determined that intense, field-based methods courses delivered during a brief, 6-week summer session was not in the best
interest of preparing highly qualified candidates for the work force. One candidate failed her summer school practicum and, therefore, could not student teach in the fall. The summer school option was therefore abandoned.

Repeated inquiries and concerns voiced by transfer students wishing to complete the program in a “more timely manner” continued, resulting in the spring 2010 option to “double-block” methods courses with co-requisite practicum. Double blocking meant that candidates could take Methods Blocks A & C or B &D concurrently and complete a minimum of 70 hours of practicum during a single semester.

A two-semester piloting period (spring and fall 2010 semesters) resulted in serious issues, including faculty and mentor teacher concern over the quality of candidates’ double-blocked content area methods preparation. 70 hours of practicum, in multiple subject areas, over the course of one semester was not practical. Conclusion: double-blocking option was also not in the best interest of the candidate and the overall program.

Additional pressure from UHWO central administration also resulted in education faculty taking immediate action to deliver a program that could be completed by transfer students in 2 years, as opposed to 2.5 years, provided they enroll full-time (15 credits per semester).

**Summary**

In Spring 2011, the following changes were recommended and approved by Division of Education Faculty and the UHWO Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate. All HTSB and ACEI Standards are maintained across the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007-11 Program Delivery</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Program Redesign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods Block A (K-3)</td>
<td>Methods Block 1 (K-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy I</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies I</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block B (4-6)</td>
<td>Methods Block 2 (K-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy II</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies II</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Block C (K-3)</td>
<td>Methods Block 3 (K-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math I</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science I</td>
<td>Teaching Culturally &amp; Linguistically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Block D (4-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Changes:

EDEE 415, Multicultural Education, dropped; Diversity standards maintained across the curriculum, in general, and in EDEE 442, Social Studies Methods (K-6)

EDEF 444, Teaching Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Learners, to be delivered in the new Block 3, fall 2012.

15 restricted electives credits eliminated and replaced by 9 credits of free electives.

Total credits to graduate with B.Ed set at a minimum 121cr.

Elementary Teacher Education Program of Study (Template): effective Fall 2012 for all incoming freshmen (Exhibit 2c.2a).
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

AFI
The unit does not assure candidates effectively measure student learning.

AFI Rationale
Candidates routinely pre-assess student knowledge, identify needed differentiations, and reflect on lesson delivery during field experiences and clinical practice. However, there was no evidence provided, and interviews confirmed, that impact on student learning is not effectively measured.

Rejoinder
The unit strongly disagrees with the BOE conclusion that it “does not assure candidates effectively measure student learning.” We are particularly puzzled by the statement, “there was no evidence provided, and interviews confirmed, that impact on student learning is not effectively measured.” We can only guess there was perhaps a miscommunication regarding the type of evidence sought by BOE members, in support of the standard. Furthermore, our elementary teacher education program is Nationally Recognized by the Association for Childhood Education International. All ACEI standards were MET, without conditions, including Standard IV.5, “Effects on Student Learning,” which requires a rigorous accounting of our assessments that illustrate candidates’ effective impact on student learning.

As previously cited in our Rejoinder to Standard 1 AFI (p. 1), evidence of candidate impact on student learning during all field and clinical experiences was provided to the BOE as follows:

Institutional Report, p. 7
“A number of checks and balances ensure that candidates are developing the proficiencies outlined in our Conceptual Framework, State, and professional standards. For example, all essential assessments, including signature assignments and field experience evaluations, are fully aligned with the standards for the preparation of teachers as defined by the Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) and further aligned with those of the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI). Exhibit 2a.1a illustrates our elementary teacher education curricular alignment with the standards. Data over a two-year period (AY 2010-11 & 2011-12) indicate that candidates are performing at acceptable-to-target levels on all standards. (Exhibit 3b.3a, Practicum Final Evaluations; Exhibit 1c.1a, Student Teaching Final Evaluations; Exhibit 1c.1b, Signature Assignment Data. Executive Summary).”

As is clearly seen in aforementioned Exhibits, 100% of candidates performed at acceptable-to-target levels on the following standards associated with “impact on student learning:” Selected “Critical Benchmarks” illustrate the effective measurement of candidate impact on student learning, as evaluated by university supervisors and mentor teachers.

HTSB Standard 6: Designs and Provides Meaningful Learning Experiences;
ACEI Standard 2.1: Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction.
Critical Benchmark: The extent to which the candidate...
• Plans and implements logical, sequenced instruction and continually adjusts plans based on learner needs.

**HTSB Standard 7:** Uses active learning strategies  
**ACEI: Standard 3.3:** Development of critical thinking & problem solving  
**Critical Benchmarks:** The extent to which the teacher candidate:

• Provides challenging learning experiences, which develop higher order thinking skills.

**HTSB Standard 8:** Uses assessment strategies  
**ACEI Standard 4:** Assessment for instruction  
**Critical Benchmark:** The extent to which the teacher candidate:

• Uses a variety of appropriate assessment strategies to enhance knowledge of learners & appropriately modifies teaching & learning strategies.

**HTSB Standard 9:** Demonstrates professionalism  
**ACEI Standard 5.1:** Professional growth, reflection, & evaluation  
**Critical Benchmark:** The extent to which the teacher candidate:

• Reflects on practices and monitors own teaching activities and strategies, making adjustments to meet learner needs.

Further evidence of our candidates’ ability to effectively impact student learning is seen in the survey data reported on p. 10 of the Institutional Report, as follows:

**1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ ability to help all students learn?** If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

---

Data from Graduate Exit Surveys (Exhibit 1a.4a) reveal that candidates felt UHWO had prepared them with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be effective teachers and to help all children learn. As previously reported, they came away from the program feeling confident about lesson planning and delivering effective instruction yet somewhat less confident in their ability to differentiate instruction.

Employee Survey data (Exhibit 1a.4b) revealed that graduates who were full-time teachers felt prepared to assess and analyze student learning, to make adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning (3.67 average score), and to differentiate instruction for both ELL students (3.28 average score) and special needs students (3.22). Respondents also ranked as “prepared to very prepared” their ability to create a positive, inclusive, respectful, and caring learning environment for all students. Qualitative data was telling. Graduates wrote:
“UHWO helped me learn to formulate lesson plans, differentiate my teaching/assessments, reflect on my teaching...Constantly assess student learning/achievement and my teaching to best fit the needs of my students...to look at the strengths and challenges of the whole child.”

In the Employer Survey (Exhibit 1a.4c), principals rated UHWO graduates’ preparedness in helping all students learn. Principals rated teacher “prepared” (3.6 average score) in their ability to assess and analyze student learning, make adjustments to instruction, and monitor student learning. Differentiating instruction for special needs students was rated 3.4, while differentiating instruction for ELL learners was rated 1.8. Nevertheless, principal's also rated teachers' ability to create positive learning environments for students as prepared to very prepared, with average ratings of 4.4 for the ability to recognize issues of diversity while working in the classroom and promoting respect and developing a sense of community in the classroom.
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

AFI #1
There is limited evidence that the unit’s conceptual framework is known, articulated, and shared throughout the unit and professional community.

AFI Rationale
Onsite interviews demonstrated that the conceptual framework was not known by, particularly, candidates and university faculty outside the unit. Within the division of education, the two programs have strongly differing philosophical beliefs.

Rejoinder
The unit disagrees with the BOE conclusion that “There is limited evidence that the unit’s conceptual framework is known, articulated, and shared throughout the unit and professional community.”

The unit’s Conceptual Framework is described in all course syllabi (Electronic Exhibit 1c.2a) throughout the candidates’ program of study. Furthermore, the overall field-based curriculum, course objectives, and signature assignments are grounded in basic tenets of the CF: delivering high quality instruction that addresses the needs of the whole child; embracing social justice and equity for all; becoming reflective practitioners and life-long learners.

To BOE statement that “the conceptual framework was not known by, particularly, candidates and university faculty outside the unit” is incorrect.

- We expect our candidates to develop conceptual understandings central to the Conceptual Framework (CF), as opposed to being able to literally repeat the goals, as stated above, in an interview setting. The unit’s multiple assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions clearly demonstrate their understanding, application, and mastery of unit goals as articulated in the CF. (e.g., Exhibit 1c.1b, Signature Assignment (SA) Data. Executive Summary, Rejoinder Appendix, p. 2, and SA exemplars). Candidate exemplars are too lengthy to include in the Rejoinder Appendix; however, we invite UAB members to access the Exemplar Exhibit Room at their discretion.

- The unit highlighted candidate knowledge, understanding, and application of its Conceptual Framework during the January 27 Poster Session. The EDEF 310, Education in American Society, poster featured a candidate exemplar of the Signature Assignment: Philosophy of Teaching & Learning (Rejoinder Appendix, p. 20).

- With regard to “university faculty outside the unit,” unit faculty work closely with faculty from the liberal arts and sciences who support candidate preparation in the areas of educational psychology, children’s literature, math for elementary school teachers, and earth science courses. These colleagues are fully aware of the unit’s CF by virtue of their involvement in the unit’s Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC), which meets twice yearly to discuss issues of program continuous assessment and development.
Furthermore, liberal arts and science support faculty serve alongside unit faculty at monthly meetings of university standing committees and the faculty senate (Exhibit 6.2, *UHWO Faculty Governance Chart*, Rejoinder Appendix, p. 21), where issues of education course, curriculum, and program development are discussed and voted upon. Within these university-level contexts, all faculty become aware of the CF and workings of the unit’s continuous improvement efforts.

The unit would like to take this opportunity to make perfectly clear to the UAB what is meant by the BOE statement, “Within the division of education, the two programs have strongly differing philosophical beliefs.”

The “two programs” to which the BOE member is referring are as follows:

- The UHWO Division of Education houses only one Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) program in elementary education, leading to K-6 licensure in the State of Hawai‘i. Seven elementary education faculty staff this program.

- A non-licensure, on-line Early Childhood Education (BA) program is housed in the Division of Social Science, not in the Division of Education. However, the two early childhood education faculty members who staff the non-licensure ECE program are members of both divisions: Social Science and Education.

In the context of the unit’s developing its conceptual framework and involving the professional community, the BOE final report states, “The education division’s two programs operate without philosophical compatibility[sic] and full collaboration” (6.1, p. 17).

As noted in NCATE Unit Standard 6, footnote #1, “At its discretion, the unit may operate with a single framework for all programs or a different framework for each or some of its programs.” ([http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#1](http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#1)). Therefore, the difference in philosophies between the unit’s licensure and non-licensure programs is acceptable.

**Background:** Early in the development of the unit’s Conceptual Framework (CF), all unit faculty (elementary and early childhood) met to discuss the content and organization of the CF. It was at these meetings that the “strongly differing philosophical beliefs” came to the forefront. In short, early childhood education faculty does not believe in standards-based teacher education. Faculty agreed to disagree. As a result, the early childhood education (ECE) faculty voluntarily removed themselves from discussions of what ultimately became the unit’s CF. The ECE faculty also removed themselves from the unit’s Teacher Education Advisory Council, indicating they wished to form their own early childhood advisory group.

We want to emphasize that the fundamental differences in philosophy of teaching and learning do not impact unit operations and its effective preparation of elementary teachers who are recommended for K-6 licensure in the State of Hawai‘i.
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

AFI #2

The unit does not have in place a mechanism to systematically and regularly engage the professional community in the design, implementation and evaluation of the unit and its program.

AFI Rationale

The unit has a Teacher Education Advisory Council. It has not included arts and science faculty. The P-12 membership has not had regular and systematic data driven decision-making responsibilities. The visiting team saw its membership list, but no policies that focus the TEAC mission.

Rejoinder

The unit disagrees with the BOE’s conclusion that it “does not have in place a mechanism to systematically and regularly engage the professional community in the design, implementation and evaluation of the unit and its program.”

Evidence to the contrary was available to the BOE throughout the accreditation process, from Institutional Report, to IR Addendum, to Electronic Exhibits, to on-site interviews, as follows:

### Institutional Report (IR), p. 4

The unit’s Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) is made up of K-6 classroom teachers, who have also served as mentors to candidates, school principals, early childhood administrators, and UHWO Elementary Teacher Education alumni. The council meets with unit faculty each semester to discuss teacher preparation issues and to advise the unit. During these meetings, unit faculty also apprise the council of the status of the elementary teacher education program and share assessment data that is used to inform the decision-making process with regard to program design, implementation, and evaluation. TEAC agenda and minutes are located in Exhibit 2b.1c. [See Rejoinder Appendix, p. 13]

**TEAC:** The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) membership includes partner school principals and mentor teachers, alumni, UHWO liberal arts and science support faculty, and unit elementary education faculty members. The purpose of the advisory council is threefold: 1) To offer advice & counsel for the continuous improvement of our teacher education program(s); 2) to share knowledge from the field; 3) to provide feedback on proposed teacher education initiatives.

In its fall 2012 meeting on November 1, members of the advisory council and unit faculty
came together to discuss the content and structure of the unit’s assessment and evaluation system. All stakeholders put forth recommendations for the continuous improvement of the unit’s evaluation system. For example, council members discussed the low response rate among principals and employers surveyed by the unit. One possible explanation is the fact that the Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) does not require its teachers or administrators to respond to surveys of any kind, unless an official letter of endorsement accompanies the request. The Taskstream administrator has followed up with the HIDOE, and the unit is now in compliance with the required protocol. The agenda and minutes of this recent meeting are included in the attached Electronic Exhibit 2b.1c. TEAC Agenda & Minutes. [See Rejoinder Appendix, p. 14].

### On-site Interviews (January 27-29, 2013)

BOE team members had the opportunity to interact with TEAC representatives at the Sunday evening poster session, as well as during on-site visits to partner schools, in efforts to validate members involvement in unit operations.