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**SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT**  
**NCATE 2000 Standards**

**Institution:** DePaul University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diversity</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M = Standard Met  
NM = Standard Not Met*
I. INTRODUCTION

DePaul University is a Catholic coeducational institution with its two major campuses in downtown Chicago. The DePaul Center and other buildings in Chicago’s Loop house the administration offices, the Colleges of Commerce and Computer Science, and the Schools of Law and New Learning. The Lincoln Park campus, three miles north, includes the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Education, Music, and Theater. These two locations and six additional suburban instructional sites serve a region that is home to over eight million people.

The university derives its title and fundamental mission from St. Vincent DePaul, the founder of the Congregation of the Mission, a religious community whose members founded DePaul as a liberal arts college in 1898. Motivated by the example of the founder, the university strives to serve urgent human needs and to recognize the ennobling God-given dignity of each person. This religious personalism is manifested by the members of the DePaul community in a sensitivity to the needs of each other and those served, with special concern for the deprived members of society. The university emphasizes the development of a full range of human capabilities and appreciation of higher education as a means to engage cultural, social, religious, and ethical values in service to others.

Today DePaul is a comprehensive, urban institution of higher education. The largest Catholic university in the United States, it serves 23,000 students through the programs of its nine schools and colleges. The university offers bachelor’s degrees in 50 fields, master’s degrees in almost as many, and doctoral degrees in four fields. In 2000, DePaul formed an alliance with Barat College, a small Catholic university in Lake Forest, IL, which became its ninth college and sixth suburban location. The fall 2003 enrollment was 9.2% African American, 9.5% Hispanic/Latino, 8.8% Asian-Pacific, 0.02% Native American, 3.9% Others, 6.4% Unknown, and 61.9% Caucasian.

DePaul intends for its graduates, through their competence and confidence, to become citizen-leaders who make a difference in their society. Thus, the institution attempts to form a community of life-long learners who are responsible members of a global society. Although guided by the Catholic faith, DePaul respects the religiously pluralistic composition of its members and endorses the interplay of diversity as beneficial to intellectual inquiry. Academic freedom is guaranteed as an integral part of the university’s scholarly and religious heritage and as an essential condition of effective inquiry and instruction. As an urban university, DePaul is deeply involved in the life of the community. The School of Education offers educational programming aligned with these intentions with the stated goal of preparing “urban professional multicultural educators,” the centerpiece of the unit’s conceptual framework.

The School of Education (SOE) began as a department in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in 1962 and became a separate school in 1992. The school currently serves 2,300 students in eleven academic program areas. DePaul offers 18 initial teacher certification programs through undergraduate degrees in education and/or graduate programs at the master’s level. These programs are in early childhood, elementary education, special education, music, physical education, and 13 content fields in secondary education: biology, chemistry, computer science, English, French, history, geography, German, mathematics, social studies, Spanish, physics, and visual arts. Candidates in special education complete the Illinois Learning Behavioral Specialist I for grades K-12. A joint baccalaureate program in elementary and special education is offered but has no program completers although 27 candidates were enrolled in fall 2002. Initial certification in physical education is offered at the baccalaureate level only. Initial and advanced programs for music teachers are offered by the School of Music, and
initial and advanced programs for mathematics teachers are offered at the graduate level by the
Department of Mathematics in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Fall 2002 enrollments suggest
that 80% of the effort of the unit is devoted to candidates in initial programs and that 60% of the initial
candidates are enrolled in the graduate-level initial program options.

Master’s degrees are offered as advanced programs for teachers in Bilingual/Bicultural Education and
Curriculum Studies, Music Education, and Mathematics Education. Advanced programs for other
school personnel are offered in educational leadership and school counseling. The SOE also offers an
Ed.D. program with curriculum options in educational leadership and curriculum studies and a
master’s degree in Social and Cultural Foundations of Education, which is viewed as a generalist
program for non-school personnel. Programs offered at Barat include curriculum studies and
educational leadership at the advanced level and elementary education, secondary education, and
special education at the initial level. A master’s degree in elementary education is offered at
Naperville, and certificate programs in education leadership are offered at the O’Hare and Oak Forest
campuses. A well-established three-year master’s program leading to certification in elementary
education is offered jointly with the Glenview Public School District.

The unit is led by the Dean of the School of Education who works with a Professional Education
Council consisting of membership drawn from public schools, program candidates, university
administrators, teacher education faculty, and a representative from urban/private schools. In addition
to the SOE, the School of Computer Science, the School of Music, and the College of Liberal Arts and
Sciences are part of the unit.

Currently the SOE employs 62 full-time faculty, including five former Barat faculty members. The
agreement of DePaul and Barat at the time of the merger was that Barat’s programs in education would
be replaced by DePaul’s but would be taught primarily by the Barat faculty, who would work closely
to assure alignment of the curriculum and assessment system with those of the Lincoln Park campus.
Advisement and field experience placement are centralized in the SOE, with each function deploying
staff as needed to maintain program support at Lincoln Park and the other campuses. The SOE faculty
are in four departments: Teacher Education at Lincoln Park; Teacher Education at Barat; Policy
Studies and Research; and Leadership in Education, Language, and Human Services.

Many changes have taken place in the DePaul SOE since the last NCATE/Illinois visit in 1998.
Notable changes include the following:

- A 45 percent increase in student enrollment
- Changes in leadership by five deans, including interim and acting deans, with the current
  administration beginning in fall 2002
- The merger with Barat College
- Organization of the SOE into departments
- Solidification of a unit assessment system based on the conceptual framework
- Substantial development of the curriculum and assessment of field and clinical experiences with
  coordination through the Office of Field Experiences
- Development of a professional development school model in the organization of field experiences
- Addition of electronic data management systems and of a full-time data manager
- Development of an SOE website
- Adoption of a case management system in staff advising of initial candidates
DePaul University was granted continuing accreditation by NCATE and the Illinois State Board of Education in 1999. The 2003 visit was conducted by a joint team, including five NCATE-designated and five Illinois-designated members. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) provided strong support for the visit. The BOE visited university administrators at the Loop campus and conducted interviews and visits to school partners at the Lincoln Park and Barat campuses. Some candidates and faculty who teach at Naperville and Glenview were interviewed at Lincoln Park.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Introduction

The conceptual framework, originally adopted in 1991 and last revised in 2002, is developed around the theme, “urban professional multicultural educator.” It incorporates the university and school mission statements and a set of ten learning goals that were developed as elements of the undergraduate liberal studies program. These ten goals include 1) mastery of content, 2) articulate communication, 3) capacity to work toward goals independently and in collaboration with others, 4) knowledge of and respect for individuals and groups who are different, 5) development of service oriented, socially responsible values and ethics, 6) critical and creative thinking, 7) development of multiple literacies, 8) formations of a personal aesthetic in arts and literature, 9) self-reflective life skills, and 10) historical consciousness.

At the core of the unit’s conception of the urban professional multicultural educator are the attributes of supporting diversity, examining the implications of difference, and challenging assumptions. In a graphic rendering of the conceptual framework, these attributes are surrounded by the characteristics of the educator who 1) promotes positive transformations; 2) functions as a lifelong learner; 3) integrates, inquiry, theory, and practice; 4) considers multiple perspectives; and 5) exhibits Vincentian personalism. Associated with these five characteristics are indicators of their application to the professional and pedagogical studies offered by the SOE and supported by the content studies and general studies promoted by the unit. The language of the descriptors links the conceptual framework to education research and theory and also to the ten learning goals.

Shared Vision

The conceptual framework grew out of a school-wide discussion of program themes and values. It originally included the values of balancing theory and practice, embracing multiple perspectives, promoting positive transformations, and living the Vincentian principles. Since
1991, the conceptual framework has evolved through discussions at monthly meetings of the SOE faculty. The most recent formal change to the conceptual framework occurred in fall 2002. The centrality of the conceptual framework is evident in publications and public statements of the unit, including advising materials and course syllabi. The goals of each program are based on the conceptual framework. Program goals are linked to candidate performance through course-based assessments. Decisions of the faculty about instruction, research, and service often reflect application of the conceptual framework.

Reorganization of the school into departments has required a new protocol for development of the conceptual framework. The unit assessment system calls for review of the framework every five years by the Professional Education Council (PEC).

**Coherence**

Uniquely suited to DePaul University, the unit’s conceptual framework informs and unifies all programs of the unit. This is accomplished by incorporation of the conceptual framework in the goals of all programs, in the unit assessment system, and in decisions of the faculty about the design and delivery of courses and other learning experiences. Each program includes a core of courses in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Education that support key elements of the conceptual framework.

**Professional Commitments and Dispositions**

The unit’s conceptual framework is complex and suggests the multiple knowledge bases, skills, and dispositions that are valued for candidates. The conceptual framework supports numerous goals of the SOE and its programs. Professional commitments and dispositions are embedded in these goals and reflected in program and course objectives. For example, one of the program goals that implies particular commitments and dispositions is “Identity Development,” which means that the candidate “understands the dynamic nature of identity development and maintains the role of individual agency in bringing about personal and social transformation.” Similar professional commitments and dispositions are identified and assessed in each program.

**Commitment to Diversity**

Commitment to diversity is explicit in the conceptual framework and is approached through alternate conceptualizations, including the concepts of 1) supporting diversity, 2) examining implications of difference, 3) considering multiple perspectives that include the multiple diversities of learners and educators, and 4) living the Vincentian principle of social responsibility. Some or all of these concepts are incorporated into programs of the candidates through core objectives and assessments and through the learning experiences of candidates in classroom and clinical settings. Diversity is widely recognized as a core value of the unit and of the university, which take seriously their mission to the poor and to urban education.

**Commitment to Technology**

Commitment to technology is less pervasive but is evident in the conception of the urban professional multicultural educator as a lifelong learner who acquires multiple literacies, including computer literacy, and knowledge of information technology. The unit’s knowledge base links computer literacy to a larger commitment to access to education across the digital
divide. All programs of the unit have adopted as a goal the appropriate application of information technology. Efforts to realize this goal are somewhat uneven but are evident in acquisition of hardware and software, faculty development to support incorporation of technology in instruction, and introduction of courses and assignments that incorporate information technologies.

**Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards**

The conceptual framework reflects a distinctive institutional vision that permits alignment with state and national standards. This is accomplished through inclusion in the framework of professional attributes such as “content knowledge,” “articulate communicator,” and “aesthetically sensitive.” Key ideas from the conceptual framework have been placed on a matrix that shows their general alignment with DePaul’s ten learning goals, the Standards for All Illinois Teachers, and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for initial programs. The educational leadership program has developed a similar matrix involving the conceptual framework, the ten learning goals, the Illinois Administrative Standards, and the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. At the program level, candidate proficiencies are identified with institutional standards, to which have been recently added “technology, literacy, and disability” in recognition of these themes in the Illinois standards. Details about the alignment of candidate proficiencies with state and national standards have not been articulated for every program.
III. FINDINGS FOR EACH STANDARD

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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

For initial undergraduate candidates, content knowledge is developed through the University Liberal Studies Program which includes 20 quarter hours of core courses in composition and rhetoric, quantitative reasoning, and multiculturalism in the United States and 52 hours of study in the six domains of 1) Arts and Literature, 2) Philosophical Inquiry, 3) Religious Dimensions, 4) Scientific Inquiry, 5) Self, Society and the Modern World, and 6) Understanding the Past. In addition, elementary and early childhood candidates complete a 7-course concentration in a single liberal arts discipline. Secondary candidates complete a minimum of 12 courses in the subject area they will teach. Initial music and physical education candidates major in their teaching fields. Graduate level initial candidates meet the content requirements of their programs through deficiency plans developed at program entry.

Advanced programs offered by the unit include master’s degrees in Curriculum Studies, Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Mathematics Education, and Music Education, and a doctorate in Curriculum Studies. The Social and Cultural Foundations of Education master’s degree is not intended primarily for teachers. Candidates in advanced programs are expected to possess content knowledge at admission to their programs: a GPA of at least 2.75 is required, and they must maintain a 3.0 GPA at DePaul. Content knowledge is further developed in advanced programs through required courses of the major, which often include research and curriculum development related to the content area of the candidate, and in specialty or career focus studies, where candidates are encouraged to continue content studies in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Prior to admission, initial candidates’ basic content knowledge is assessed by the Illinois Test of Basic Skills, an assessment of reading, writing, and mathematics. In 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, the pass rate for initial program completers was 99 percent, and in 2001-2002, it was 100 percent.

Content knowledge is assessed at program completion by grade point average (GPA). The spring 2003 mean content GPAs of candidates in initial baccalaureate programs appear below.
Table 1: Undergraduate Content Area Mean GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2003–2004 Student Handbook for Initial Teacher Education states that beginning fall 2003, all entering undergraduate candidates must have a minimum GPA of 2.75.

The following table provides GPA data for candidates in graduate level initial and advanced programs. The overall GPA means provided include grades from the content courses considered through program admission requirements and other courses.

Table 2: Mean GPAs in Graduate Programs for Initial and Advanced Candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Masters Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education (dual certification)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Masters Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/Bicultural Education</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Studies</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Education</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional standards are clearly present and explicitly stated in program curriculum documents and course syllabi. The extent to which state and professional standards are reflected in programs and courses varies. The Illinois Learning Standards for P–12 students are often evident in curriculum matrices and syllabi. The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, Content Area Standards, Technology Standards for All Illinois Teachers, and Language Arts Standards for All Illinois Teachers and the national professional standards are often less obvious or stated less clearly or completely. It is not clear that all professional and state standards are addressed in the content provided to candidates in initial programs.

Records of program reviews completed by professional organizations and state review panels indicate that initial programs have been approved as follows.

Table 3: Professional Organization and State Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Professional Organization</th>
<th>SPA Review</th>
<th>ISBE Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Bac</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Post-bac</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education (K – 12)</td>
<td>Bac</td>
<td>NASM</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education (K – 12)</td>
<td>Bac</td>
<td>NASPE</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Biology</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>NSTA</td>
<td>Rejoining</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chemistry</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>NSTA</td>
<td>Rejoining</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate application of their knowledge of content is evident. Individual course assignments, Level 1 (beginning) and Level 2 (intermediate) field experiences, and student teaching requirements, and candidate portfolios demonstrate candidate use of content knowledge in university and school settings. Assessments of candidate content knowledge are made using program-designed rubrics. During field experiences, cooperating teachers and candidates assess application of content knowledge, as do cooperating teachers, university supervisors and candidates in student teaching. In these instruments, Likert scaled items are used to assess the extent to which candidates know subject matter and state/local standards and are aware of current issues. One section of the student teaching evaluation includes a series of specific indictors related to the integration of content. The five indicators assess not only the specific content of the subject matter (math) but also the integration of interrelationships of content across disciplines. Another section of this instrument deals with the content specific knowledge of the candidate. For example, the math education instrument lists 15 indicators related to knowledge of math.

Ratings of candidate performance by cooperating teachers, university supervisors, candidates, alumni, and employers show general satisfaction with candidate content knowledge. Some results from 2002-2003 surveys are as follows:

Table 4: Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations of Content Knowledge for Level 2 Field Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits appropriate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows state/local K–12 content area standards</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Evident at an exemplary level 3=Consistently evident 2=Sometimes evident 1=Not evident

Table 5: University Supervisors’ Evaluations of Content Knowledge for Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>01–02 (N=343)</th>
<th>02–03 (N=409)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits appropriate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is aware of current issues and new developments</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows state/local content area standards</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Evident at an exemplary level 3=Consistently evident 2=Sometimes evident 1=Not evident
Table 6: Employers’ Evaluations of Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knows the subject matter they teach</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2001–02, all initial program completers in programs where there were more than ten passed the required State of Illinois Subject Matter Test. In the previous year, the pass rates for candidates in programs with more than ten completers did not fall below 92 percent, although the candidate mean pass rate for comprehensive social studies in 1999-2000 was 84 percent. For first time test-takers in 2001-2002, the pass rate on the content area tests was 85.1 percent.

Use of assessments consistently indicates that candidates are able to demonstrate content knowledge. The assessments and rubrics used in the programs are specifically related to institutional standards and reflect the conceptual framework. An interview with a group of candidates indicated that they had received copies of the Illinois Learning Standards (P-12) and had written lesson plans using them, although the recent switch of one large school district used for many placements from its own student learning standards to the Illinois Learning Standards was a source of confusion. Indicators reflecting the benchmarks of the Technology Standards for All Illinois Teachers and Language Arts Standards for All Illinois Teachers are less apparent in candidate assessments. The extent to which initial candidates are required to demonstrate the content knowledge of the technology or language arts standards is unclear.

**Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel**

Candidates for the educational leadership (principal and superintendent) and school counselor programs are knowledgeable about their fields and can explain principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Multiple assessments of content knowledge include 1) grade point averages, 2) state certification tests, 3) rubrics reflecting program standards, 5) supervisor evaluations of interns, 6) employer surveys, and 7) alumni surveys.

Candidates must maintain a GPA of 3.0 in master’s and of 3.3 in doctoral program course work. The following table indicates GPAs for current candidates in these programs.

Table 7: GPAs of Candidates in Programs for Other School Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters Programs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership – General Administrative</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselors</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership – Superintendent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates also demonstrate their content knowledge on state certification tests. Pass rates were 100 percent for candidates in all three areas of preparation in each of the last three years except for school counselors in 2000-2001, when the pass rate was 86.7 percent.

Assignments completed during course work are evaluated using rubrics that reflect program and institutional goals based on the conceptual framework. These evaluations reveal that candidates have met or exceeded the identified standards for each program.
Content knowledge is demonstrated during the internship experiences of the candidates as revealed through targeted statements in the university and site supervisor evaluations. The table below indicates targeted items related to content knowledge and mean ratings based on a 4-point scale.

Table 8: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Content Knowledge for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group work reflects understanding of group counseling theories</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling efforts reflect understanding of student planning methods</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions reflect understanding of family systems</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows community resources to assist families and students</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows prevention measures to overcome barriers to learning</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies appropriate theories and models in counseling situations</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Leaders</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knows student growth and development</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows applied motivational theories</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows school cultures</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows theories, models, and principles of organizational development</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows community resources</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows learning goals in a pluralistic society</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows principles of effective instruction</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary data from employers (N = 11) who assessed DePaul graduates on a 5-point scale show that 100 percent of them either agreed or strongly agreed that candidates have a broad understanding of the central concepts, principles, and professional knowledge expected in the field. This survey addressed principals and counselors employed in the schools.

A revised alumni survey was administered in the summer of 2003 via the Internet. Alumni agreed that they felt that their programs of study provided them with knowledge of the important principles, concepts, and content of their fields.

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates**

Initial undergraduate and graduate level candidates gain pedagogical content knowledge in professional education courses, methods courses, field experiences and student teaching. This knowledge is also addressed in the program specialty studies components of the programs. These courses and field experiences constitute 25 to 30 percent of the baccalaureate degree requirements. An interview with a teacher graduate of DePaul indicated that this preparation was beneficial for her. She noted that she had received good strategies in teaching reading and language arts. The principal of one school noted that DePaul candidates are prepared with the latest research on teaching and learning, and that they are current with knowledge of cooperative learning, rubrics, and authentic assessment. This observation was supported by BOE observations in classes of the undergraduate program. A candidate reinforced this notion stating, “My education at DePaul has really prepared me to teach in urban schools.”
Pedagogical content knowledge is a primary focus of advanced programs in music and mathematics education and is developed in other advanced programs for teachers. The Bilingual/Bicultural Education program includes courses in biliteracy, language, and content and in methods of ESL literacy development. The Curriculum Studies program focuses on curriculum, including the design and interpretation of curriculum, and also requires 20 quarter hours of work in career emphasis courses that typically focus on content and pedagogical content knowledge. Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through GPA, candidate work, and alumni and employer surveys.

Pedagogical content knowledge of initial program candidates is assessed in several ways. Standard-based rubrics are used to assess assignments such as lesson and unit plans, reflections, case studies, and portfolios that reflect pedagogical content knowledge. These rubrics are most clearly aligned with the institutional standards and serve as an effective means of assessing these expectations. The extent to which they reflect the professional and state standards varies, as noted earlier. A unit plan rubric shared by a candidate included a Likert scaled assessment of use of the Illinois Learning Standards. The candidate’s math unit made reference to these P-12 content standards and also to the NCTM standards. Specific alignment with Illinois Professional Teaching Standards was not as clearly or completely evident. Concern about candidates’ meeting the full range of indicators for these standards was supported in an interview with principals who receive DePaul candidates and in an interview with one cooperating teacher. The extent to which the initial candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in technology or language arts contained in these standards is unclear.

Cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and candidates assess the performance of initial undergraduate candidates during student teaching. This assessment addresses several pedagogical content domains such as planning and instruction and professional practice. Also included are the assessment of student learning and the learning environment, diversity, technology, and assessment. Candidate ratings by cooperating teachers and supervisors are consistently high and demonstrate that the pedagogical content knowledge of initial undergraduate candidates is clearly present. One cooperating teacher explained that DePaul candidates are ready to teach and that they are well prepared. She stated that candidates are able to relate to students with special needs. Another cooperating teacher shared that a student teacher was “very sensitive” to the needs of a student in her class with Asperger’s Syndrome. An interview with a group of principals provided more evidence of the quality of pedagogical content knowledge preparation. One was “very pleased” with recent DePaul student teachers, typifying one as bright and competent. He said that the quality of candidates has increased over the past few years. This sentiment was shared by another principal present, and another suggested that this was due in part to the efforts of the supervisors. As she explained “they go beyond the minimum.” All of these principals agreed that DePaul candidates were well prepared due to DePaul’s “contemporary approach” and “engaged practices.”

University supervisor evaluations of pedagogical content knowledge of 2003 candidates in initial programs upon completion of their student teaching experience are summarized below.
Table 9: University Supervisors’ Evaluations of Pedagogical Content Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01–02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses materials and examples appropriate to discipline</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings multiple perspectives to discussion of subject matter</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates connections to other content areas</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Evident at an exemplary level 3=Consistently evident 2=Sometimes evident 1=Not evident

Candidates facilitate student learning of the subject matter through presentation of the content in clear and meaningful ways and through the integration of available technology. Over 96 percent of initial candidates surveyed in 2003 indicated that they had at least the basic skills to integrate technology into their classrooms. In interviews, however, candidates expressed concern about their lack of consistent exposure to applications of computer technology in P-12 classrooms.

Annual surveys of university supervisors addressed their perceptions of the technology knowledge and skills of student teachers as indicated in Table 10. These findings indicate supervisory perception of competence in this area on the low side compared to other items from this survey cited in the Institutional Report. Candidates’ areas of greatest strength as perceived by supervisors were their commitment to student learning, their respect for student ideas and contributions, and their willingness to work with parents.

Table 10: University Supervisors’ Evaluations of Technology Knowledge and Skills for Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01–02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates students’ technology knowledge, skills, and dispositions</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates opportunities for students to use technology tools for learning</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrates technology into the curriculum</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Evident at an exemplary level 3=Consistently evident 2=Sometimes evident 1=Not evident

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

The Institutional Report indicates that professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial teacher candidates are developed through the Social and Cultural Foundations requirements in research, theories of learning, and history/sociology of education and in the specialty studies component for each program. This knowledge is assessed by the recently initiated Illinois Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT), GPA, candidate work in courses, performance during field experiences and student teaching, self-evaluations, employer evaluations, and alumni evaluations.

The APT was recently instituted in Illinois as one way of assessing teacher professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Beginning in October 2003, candidates must pass this test prior to receiving their initial certificates. The scores of DePaul candidates who took the APT in October, 2003 are provided below.
Table 11: Assessment of Professional Teaching Standard Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Tested</th>
<th>Number Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean GPAs for initial and advanced candidates in graduate and undergraduate programs in professional education courses are provided below.

Table 12: Professional Education Course GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Initial Masters Programs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>Secondary Education (dual cert.)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>Special Education (dual cert.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Advanced Masters Programs      |    |      | Doctoral Program         |    |      |
| Bilingual/Bicultural Education | 29 | 3.72 | Curriculum Studies       | 61 | 3.76 |
| Curriculum Studies             |    |      | Social/Cultural Foundations | 24 | 3.83 |
| Math Education                 | 62 | 3.36 | Music Education          | 16 | 3.66 |
| Music Education                |    |      | Doctoral Program         |    |      |
| Curriculum Studies             | 24 | 3.79 | Doctoral Program         |    |      |

In an interview, cooperating teachers commented on their perception of the value of professional course content to initial candidates. One indicated that there was “lots of support” during the capstone experience that accompanies student teaching. Another commented that the student teacher she supervised “got a lot out of the capstone course” and that she was “very pleased with classroom management.” A display prepared by teacher candidates noted that the capstone course lays “a foundation for later pursuing NBPTS certification.”

Candidate work is assessed for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills using rubrics based on relevant standards. These rubrics are used to assess assignments in courses and other candidate work. Assignments include lesson and unit plans, micro-teaching, case study or situation analysis, review of P-12 curriculum and assessments, use of technology, research papers, and logs or reflective journals. These rubrics provide a clear explanation of the extent to which the candidate met or did not meet the standard in question. Lengthy explanations are provided for each segment of the scoring scale, resulting in a clear picture of the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial candidates. Numerous examples were provided and reviewed. Samples of work assessed from “met” to “not met” were examined. These instruments provide feedback to the candidate resulting in a clear sense of the extent to which professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are attained. Candidate data from application of multiple rubrics are being aggregated for use in program evaluation.
As noted for the rubrics used to assess pedagogical content knowledge, locally-developed instruments are most closely related to institutional standards and also reflect the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) for P-12 students. As one university supervisor noted, “candidates are conversant in the Illinois Learning Standards” and indicated that they are able to apply them. As with the other rubrics, assessment of other state and professional standards is not as clear. These standards are mentioned less often or less specifically. One supervisor noted that university supervisors assess candidate core technology and language arts standards and that cooperating teachers assess content standards. A cooperating teacher indicated that the student teacher “was familiar with the standards” but did not specify which ones. The extent to which candidates have or are able to demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in state core technology or language arts standards is unclear.

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors assess candidate performance in level 1 and 2 field experiences and student teaching. The data from these assessments indicate that initial candidates are able to demonstrate high levels of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Table 13: Cooperating Teacher Evaluations of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills in Level 2 Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates appreciation of range of student needs, talents, and interests</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects students’ backgrounds, ideas, and contributions</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates professionally with school faculty and staff</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts constructive criticism and uses it in a positive manner</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates professional and responsible behavior in all interactions</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs instruction at appropriate level of students’ development</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs instruction that is sensitive to diverse styles and needs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets challenging yet achievable goals</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons encourage motivation, engagement, and productive work</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses effective instructional strategies</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses assessment as a systematic part of the learning process</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates professionally with school faculty and staff</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts constructive criticism and uses it in a positive manner</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates professional and responsible behavior in all interactions</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Cooperating Teacher Evaluations of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills of Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01–02 (N=343)</th>
<th>02–03 (N=409)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Learning</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Students</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Conduct</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews of university supervisors confirm that candidates are adequately prepared in pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. One supervisor noted that candidates take into account the “whole child” and demonstrate “habits of mind” that present and demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge. One principal indicated that DePaul candidates get involved; they don’t sit back. They assist teachers. She attributed this to the discussions candidates have with DePaul faculty. Some difficulties with professional and pedagogical knowledge were noted during interviews with cooperating teachers and principals. One teacher indicated that a student teacher found it difficult to think about or do long range planning. A principal noted that one candidate decided to cease student teaching due to lack of readiness and the constraint of outside conflicts. For the most part, however, mentors commented on the quality of candidates and the adequacy of their preparation.

Candidate self-evaluations and employer evaluations support the finding that initial candidates have and can demonstrate competence in many aspects of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The extent to which candidates possess the knowledge stated in all state and professional standards is more clear for some standards than others.

**Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel**

Candidates in the educational leadership (principal and superintendent) and school counselor programs complete assignments in courses, projects, and activities during practicum and internship experiences that demonstrate their professional knowledge and skills. All assignments are aligned with the DePaul standards for the associated program. The DePaul standards are aligned with state and professional standards. Candidate progress is assessed using grade point averages, study of assignments, supervisor evaluation of internship performance, employer evaluations, and alumni surveys. Master’s candidates must maintain a 3.0 GPA, and doctoral candidates, a 3.3 GPA.

Interviews with candidates in the programs and with faculty responsible for their instruction indicate that technology is integrated into the coursework and assignments required for these programs. Examples include but are not limited to:
- The use of Blackboard for group discussion
- E-mail communication outside of class hours
- Internet searches to research course topics
- Spreadsheet use for financial information
- Spreadsheet use for student records
- Presentation software for course and internship presentations
- E-journals on reserve to facilitate library research from home
- Use of government databases, and
- Evaluation of web sites.

Skills in conducting and analyzing research are developed through course assignments in the programs. Assignments addressing students, families, and communities provide candidates with knowledge and skills for working with diverse students, families, and communities. Some of the products resulting from these assignments are used in the schools for which they are developed, affording the candidates the opportunity to evaluate the quality of the products. The emphasis on supporting student learning is apparent throughout all program and internship assignments.
Professional knowledge and skills are assessed using assignments appropriate to each program such as case studies; analysis of educational situations or problems; review, use, and analysis of P–12 assessment instruments; applications of technology; investigation and analysis of a school’s community, climate, and/or vision; statements of educational philosophy; logs or reflective journals; essays; discussion papers; and research papers. Full implementation of this part of the assessment system is planned for fall 2004. Data on the number of candidates meeting standards related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through these types of course assignments during winter and spring 2003 appear in the following tables.

Table 15: School Counselor Candidates: 12 of 31 Standards Addressed in Course Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Number</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Principal Candidates: 8 of 20 Standards Addressed in Course Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Number</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Superintendents: One of 20 Standards Addressed in Course Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Number</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates in the educational leadership (principal and superintendent) and school counselor programs are required to develop proposals for their internship experiences. The proposals outline goals that candidates set for their learning during the experiences. The goals address the program standards, and projects and activities are planned that facilitate meeting the goals and standards. The university faculty responsible for the internship experiences must approve the
proposals, ensuring that they appropriately reflect the breadth and depth of knowledge and skills expected for completion of the programs. Through interaction with the university and site supervisors, the goals are monitored. Formative and summative evaluations are completed during the internship experiences. Additional goals may be formulated during the experiences to further develop candidates’ knowledge and skills.

During the internship for school counselor candidates, knowledge and skills are assessed on a number of specific items related to individual and group counseling, individual student planning, family systems support, program development and evaluation, prevention education, assessment of students, and professional orientation. Data from ratings (on a 4–point scale) by internship supervisors (N=8) appear below.

Table 18: Site Supervisors’ Evaluations of Professional Knowledge and Skills for School Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The candidate ensures that...</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chooses and uses appropriate counseling techniques for individual students</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses group counseling methods appropriately</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides individual advisement to help students with planning and goal setting skills</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects understanding of family systems in his or her interactions</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses needs assessment data in planning an effective counseling program</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes effective prevention programs for students</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes and interprets testing information appropriately</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates actively and demonstrates leadership appropriate for the internship situation</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational leadership candidates are evaluated on a number of specific items related to vision of educational excellence, instructional program, management and operations, collaboration, laws and ethics, all of which influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of education. Data from ratings on a 4–point scale by internship supervisors (N=22) appear in the table below.

Table 19: Site Supervisors’ Evaluations of Professional Knowledge and Skills for Education Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The candidate ensures that...</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school’s vision is effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school community is involved in school improvement efforts</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All individuals are treated with fairness</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school works within the framework of relevant policies, laws, and regulations</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses from employers (N=11) on a 2003 survey related to DePaul graduates’ professional knowledge and skills showed strong agreement that other school personnel candidates possessed the indicated competencies. Alumni responded positively to an Internet survey question asking whether their programs of study provided them with the professional knowledge and skills necessary for their role of administrator or school counselor.

Dispositions for All Candidates

Dispositional statements are indicated on the rubrics used to assess assignments. This facilitates the process of assuring that candidates are able to evidence the expected dispositions in their work. Sets of assignment-related rubrics have been developed for each dispositional statement.
for each program. Dispositional statements also appear on the Level 1 and Level 2 field experience evaluation forms. This provides a means for assessing candidate demonstration of dispositions. Assessment indicators of dispositions of initial candidates by cooperating teachers using a 4-point scale are provided below.

Table 20: Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations of Dispositions during Field Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates the value of education in individual students’ lives</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects students backgrounds, ideas, and contributions</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys interest in inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates the value of education in individual students’ lives</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates commitment to helping all children learn</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys interest in inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional data were provided from student teaching and employer evaluations. Similar methodology for the assessment of dispositions of candidates is used in programs for other school personnel. Tables 18 and 19 refer to dispositions as well as professional and pedagogical knowledge of principal, superintendent, and school counselor candidates as perceived by site supervisors.

Evidence of candidate dispositions was cited by principals. A principal of a school that had hosted both field experience students and student teachers said that what typifies DePaul candidates is their exposure to urban education and all it means. He shared that the DePaul programs do a good job of bringing to reality the commitment, “I want to make a difference.” Another principal indicated that prospective teachers “have to have a passion for teaching” and that the DePaul candidates “are open to what the teachers want them to learn. They are open to constructive criticism.” She noted that the feedback she receives from cooperating teachers confirms that DePaul candidates possess this disposition. In her estimation, “The level of professionalism is much higher” among DePaul candidates. She concluded the interview by saying, “I wouldn’t hesitate to have students from DePaul. I wish I had more positions.”

Interviews with faculty provide more evidence of the appropriate dispositions of candidates. One commented that the readiness of candidates is noted in the extent to which they are “interested in the mission” of the DePaul community, expressing a “commitment to justice and urban teaching.” Another noted the connection of the conceptual framework to the expected dispositions, commenting, “We take seriously the conceptual framework, the reflective practitioner.” Another stated, “Students leave here as agents of change,” and they “give a lot of attention to multiple perspectives.”

One candidate provided insight about the source of the dispositions candidates develop. She stated, “As far as multicultural education, DePaul stresses that as much as it can.” She explained that the focus on urban education is excellent and stated what was done in classes related to the conceptual framework of urban education in a diverse community.

**Student Learning for Teacher Candidates**

Current candidates are frequently exposed to the Illinois Learning Standards although this appears to have been less true for graduates. Initial program candidates have frequent
opportunities to develop lesson and unit plans that focus on appropriate student learning and processes for assessing what students learn.

Several indicators on the student teaching evaluation focus on the ability of initial candidates to provide and assess student learning as indicated in the following data from university supervisor and candidate evaluations.

Table 21: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Candidates’ Effect on Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs instruction at appropriate level of students’ development</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts instruction to meet student needs and interests</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses instructional strategies that are sensitive to diverse styles and needs</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses assessment to facilitate further planning</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically adjusts plans to meet student needs</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusts instruction based on feedback</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses assessment as a systematic part of the learning process</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Cooperating Teacher’ Evaluations of Candidates’ Effect on Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs assessments to measure student learning</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprets assessment to determine learning gains</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates positive effect on students’ content knowledge</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates positive effect on students’ skill levels</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on how strategies for instruction affect student learning</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the Likert scale data, the student teaching evaluation provides cooperating teachers and university supervisors the opportunity to cite specific examples of how lessons result in student learning. These vignettes provide very specific documentation that what candidates do is translated into what students know.

Results of the employer survey verified through a mean of 4.68 on a 5-point scale that employers perceive DePaul graduates as having “a positive effect on student learning so that they make gains in subject matter knowledge and in skill levels.”

**Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel**

Candidates from the educational leadership (principal and superintendent) and school counselor programs are able to create positive environments for student learning. Multiple assessments are employed to evaluate candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in this area including: grade point averages, internship site supervisor ratings, employer evaluations, alumni survey, and coursework assignments.

Mean grade point averages for 69 principal candidates were 3.69; for superintendent candidates, 3.81; and for school counseling candidates, 3.75.

Evidence that candidates can create positive school environments comes from internship site supervisor evaluations. Data indicate that both school counselors (N=8) and educational leaders (N=22) are judged by their supervisors to be able to create a positive learning environment.
Table 23: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Environment for Student Learning for School Counselors (4-point scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers the implications of age, gender, culture, etc. when conducting assessments</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions reflect understanding of family systems</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is sensitive to different family constellations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is sensitive to multicultural diversity and values of families</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds effectively to needs of disabled, gifted, and at-risk students</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses community resources as appropriate to enhance the counseling program</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Leaders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers diversity in developing learning experiences</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses school culture and climate on a regular basis</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves school community in school improvement efforts</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies, clarifies, and addresses barriers to student learning</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaped public policy to provide quality education for students</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and nurtures relationships with community leaders</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly uses information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employer evaluations reflected 73% strongly agree and 27% agree that a DePaul graduate “creates a positive environment for student learning, building upon the characteristics of the students and relevant policy contexts.” Alumni report they developed the knowledge and skills needed to create positive environments for student learning.

Course assignments related to student learning completed by the candidates met standards with few exceptions. Candidates are provided the opportunity to meet with the course instructor for remediation and are able to revise assignments that fail to meet the standards.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The data consistently indicated that candidates in all programs possess the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional and pedagogical knowledge associated with the institutional standards, which are based on the conceptual framework. Assessments based on institutional standards provide evidence of appropriate candidate dispositions and candidate effect on the learning of students. The extent to which candidates possess the knowledge stated in all state and professional standards is more clear for some standards and in some program than for others. This concern about documentation is addressed as an Area for Improvement in Standard 2.

**C. Recommendation:** Met

**D. Areas for Improvement:**

- **New** None
- **Corrected** None
- **Continued** None
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Assessment System

The School of Education (SOE) has established a unit assessment system in concert with its university and school partners and stakeholders. The primary vehicle for partner and stakeholder participation in the development of the assessment system is the Professional Education Council (PEC). The primary purposes of the PEC are:

- to advise the unit head and unit on curriculum and new courses related to school personnel preparation programs, and
- to set policy for the unit on non-curricular issues such as 1) assessment of professional education program candidates’ and graduates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions as articulated by the program conceptual framework and state and national standards, and 2) assessment of unit operations.

The PEC meets monthly and is chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Programs of the SOE. The Dean of Education and other deans offering education programs serve as ex-officio members.

The unit assessment system is aligned with the conceptual framework. The assessment system provides for collection and analysis of data from multiple sources on applicant qualifications and candidate and graduate performance. The unit utilizes the data to inform decisions about initial and advanced programs.

The unit’s conceptual framework for both the initial and advanced programs features the urban professional multicultural educator as described by six strands, 1) Supports diversity, 2) Promotes positive transformation, 3) Exhibits Vincentian personalism, 4) Considers multiple perspectives, 5) Integrates inquiry, theory, and practice, and 6) Functions as a lifelong learner. Institutional standards interwoven with these strands are the ten learning goals established by the university as expectations for all DePaul students: 1) Disciplinary expertise, 2) Articulate communication, 3) Goal directedness, 4) Respect for individuals who are different, 5) Service-orientation that is socially responsible and value and ethically framed, 6) Critical/creative thinking, 7) Multiple literacies, 8) Aesthetic sensitivity, 9) Self-reflection, and 10) Historical consciousness. Matrices show the thematic alignment of the six strands of the conceptual framework with the ten learning goals, the Standards for All Illinois Teachers, and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) or other appropriate national standards. The alignment of detailed expectations within the state and national standards beyond the broad conceptual level is not always clear.

Alignment with the conceptual framework of candidate assessments such as admissions criteria, field experience evaluations, and follow-up studies of alumni is clear. Rubrics used for
assessment of assignments and portfolios in the following initial and advanced programs are aligned with the conceptual framework and institutional standards (learning goals).

- Curriculum Studies (Advanced)
- Early Childhood Education (Initial)
- Educational Leadership-Principal (Advanced)
- Educational Leadership-Superintendent (Advanced)
- Elementary Education (Initial)
- Physical Education (Initial)
- School Counseling (Advanced)
- Secondary Education (Initial)
- Special Education (Initial)

The unit has established an Assessment Committee with membership from each department in the SOE and from Music and Mathematics Education. The committee, chaired by the SOE Associate Dean, is charged with oversight of the university teacher education assessment system and making recommendations for change to the SOE dean and the PEC. The unit’s assessment initiatives are supported by the university administration in that the unit has employed a “data project manager” who serves as an ex-officio member of the Assessment Committee and reports directly to the Dean of Education. The data project manager works closely with the university Office of Institutional Planning and Research, other offices in the university, and state agencies, to share data and coordinate data collection and analysis for the teacher education program. The data project manager has prepared and submitted a number of reports on candidates and faculty that include but are not limited to:

- Illinois Basic Skills test results and analysis
- Licensure test results and analysis
- Candidate progress reports (cumulative GPA, hours completed, field experience evaluations, admission and program completion status)
- Candidate demographics, qualifications, performance and follow-up data
- Faculty (demographics, qualifications, and performance)
- Unit (program effectiveness, advising, clinical practice, and unit operations)
- Employer surveys
- Alumni surveys

The assessment system utilizes seven clearly delineated transition points for collection of data related to the monitoring of initial candidates. The transition points are described as 1) Teacher Education Candidate Status, 2) Stage I--Student Teaching Application, 3) Stage II--Petition for Academic Clearance, 4) Stage III--Request for Student Teaching Approval, 5) Exit from Student Teaching, 6) Request for Certification, and 7) Exit from Program. The unit collects and analyzes multiple types of data to monitor candidate admission to, continuation in, and completion of the program. Examples of data sources include: 1) cumulative GPA (high school and university), 2) SAT results, 3) state mandated examinations (basic skills and licensure), 4) field experience assessments, 5) student teaching assessments, and 6) student advisement assessments. Many of the instruments, such as those for field experience and student teaching, have multiple assessments within them. For example, field experience and student teaching protocols require assessments by candidate, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.
Transition points for monitoring advanced candidates include admission to the professional education unit, admission to the internship/practicum, exit from the internship, and exit from the licensure program. The data to be considered in decision-making at these transition points have been determined at the program level. The time line for implementation of the unit assessment system calls for comprehensive data collection beginning in 2003-04 and 2004-05.

The unit is systematic in establishing fairness and consistency in the use of assessment instruments. Faculty routinely meet to score candidate assignments and portfolios so as to establish the reliability and validity of the instruments used. During the winter 2003, a Group Portfolio Rating Session was held to establish interrater reliability for the rubric used to evaluate candidates’ student teaching portfolios. Each portfolio was evaluated at least twice. The intraclass correlation coefficient was 0.79, which indicates a substantial degree of interrater reliability. During June 2003, the associate dean and three faculty members studied the reliability of instruments used to score candidate work in LSI 446 Psychology and Education of the Exceptional Child. During September 2003, educational leadership faculty met to analyze scoring of final essays from A&S 485 School Law to study consistency in faculty scoring.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

The unit systematically collects information about applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, the competence of graduates, and unit operations to improve overall program quality. The assessment plan delineates the specific types of data to be collected, the data collection schedule, and the person(s) responsible for collecting and analyzing the data. The assessment system encompasses collection and analysis of data in three domains as follows:

Candidate Assessment
- Candidate Demographics
- Candidate Qualifications
- Candidate Performance
- Candidate Follow-Up

Faculty Assessment
- Faculty Demographics
- Faculty Qualifications
- Faculty Performance Data

Unit Assessment
- Conceptual Framework Effectiveness
- Program Effectiveness Data
- Student Services Effectiveness Data
- Field Experience Effectiveness Data
- Assessment System Effectiveness Data
- Unit Resources/Operations Effectiveness Data

Multiple types of data are collected and analyzed to assess candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions. The following items are examples of data that are or will be collected and analyzed annually when the assessment system is fully implemented:
- Content area GPA
• ISBE basic skills and content area test scores
• Faculty evaluations of candidate work using scores from rubrics
• Faculty recommendations for student teaching
• Level 2 field experience evaluations by cooperating teachers
• Student teaching supervisor evaluations
• Student teaching cooperating teacher evaluations
• Candidate self evaluations
• Graduating senior evaluations

Data about candidate performance are collected from alumni and employers every three years. The instruments observed by the BOE included cover letters that named the DePaul graduates employed at the school and asked the principal to respond specifically on the basis of their performance.

An example of a report generated after analysis of institutional data is *Performance of DePaul University School of Education Students on the Illinois Basic Skills and Content Area Tests*. Submitted to the Assessment Committee on May 8, 2003, this report presents interesting statistics to be addressed by the unit as follows:

- 50 percent of African Americans candidates pass the basic skills test the first time.
- 74 percent of Hispanic candidates pass the first time.
- 80 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander pass the first time.
- 91 percent of Caucasian candidates pass the first time.
- The highest probability of passing the content area test was at the first administration.
- At the second attempt, 60 percent of candidates pass the content test; at the third, 20 percent; and at the fourth, 0 percent.

The Dean of the SOE has appointed an Appeals Committee to receive, resolve, and maintain records of the complaints of candidates as they move through the program. The committee is chaired by the Associate Dean of Academic Programs and makes decisions about requests for academic exceptions such as course substitutions and for exceptions to processes such as admission to the unit or exit from student teaching. The appeals process gives recourse on non-grade issues that impact candidates. The teacher education unit adheres to a system of deadlines and benchmarks identified in their program documentation as “decision points.” The committee has addressed approximately 24 complaints since its creation in January 2003.

Technology is an integral component of the candidate monitoring and assessment system. EdTrack is used to monitor candidate progress and is linked to the PeopleSoft system of the university. The data project manager can pull selected student data and deposit them in EdTrack for program utilization, and data are downloaded from PeopleSoft nightly. The EdTrack system contains records of items such as credit hour completed, cumulative GPA, content letters of recommendation, field experience hours completed, personal identification data and other data pertinent for monitoring candidate academic progress. Information on EdTrack is validated by teacher education personnel and is available to candidates and faculty.

**Use of Data for Program Improvement**

Data about candidates, faculty and programs are regularly and systemically collected, analyzed, and used to improve candidate performance and unit operations. The unit presented numerous
examples of instances of use of data for improvement of programs as guided by its conceptual framework. Some examples included:

- Candidates regularly receive feedback on their work from faculty who use rubrics that reflect institutional standards.
- Candidates receive feedback on their field experience performance.
- During student teaching, mid-term formative assessments are used to help candidates improve their performance.
- The Assessment Committee uses evaluations of instruction to assess instructional quality and make recommendations for improvement.
- Improvements resulting from study of candidate performance on rubrics and instructional practices were described for six specific courses.

Data from a student services survey and the follow-up survey of graduates were used to restructure candidate field placement. The data indicated that candidates needed more assistance in locating appropriate schools for field experiences and in completing the placement process. As a result, the unit has eliminated all self-directed field experiences, revising the curriculum so that a minimum of 100 hours of field experiences are incorporated into courses.

Other program or institutional improvements resulting from the use of data follow:

- Addition of a credit-bearing student teaching seminar for initial graduate level candidates
- Revision of the assessment instrument for field experiences and student teaching
- Improvements in master’s coursework for advanced candidates
- Improvements in the Ed.D. program
- Increasing technology opportunities for candidates
- Improvements in partnerships with school districts
- Improvements in faculty development in technology
- Increased resources for technology
- An increase in full-time faculty positions
- Revision/redesign of student handbooks

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has developed and implemented an assessment system aligned with its conceptual framework. The assessment system enables informed decision-making by collecting and analyzing data about candidates and faculty although the assessments used do not always attend to the details of state and national professional standards. The assessment system is managed by an Assessment Committee chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Programs. The newly established position of data project manager enables the collection and analysis of data consistent with the unit assessment system. There are numerous examples of the use of the assessment system to improve candidate performance and unit operation.

**C. Recommendation:** Met
D. Areas for Improvement:

New

1. For the initial program assessments, clarity about the alignment of the professional and state standards with candidate learning goals is uneven.

Rationale: Program documents such as curriculum matrices, syllabi, and assessments refer regularly to institutional standards based on the conceptual framework. These curriculum documents and assessments document the broad, general connection of the themes and topics of the institutional standards to state and national professional standards but do not uniformly address the details contained in state and national standards. For example, documentation of attention to some of the Standards for All Illinois Teachers, with their focus on specific applications of technology and teaching reading across the content areas, is lacking.

Corrected None

Continued None
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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

All programs for the preparation of teachers that lead to a state credential for P-12 schools, as well as the programs for other school personnel (school counselors, principals and superintendents), include a field experience and/or clinical practice component completed in P-12 schools. These experiences and their assessments are designed to reflect the unit’s conceptual framework and provide a sequence that enables candidates to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions of an urban professional multicultural educator. For initial candidates, field experiences are an integral part of the course work prior to student teaching and begin upon admission to the unit.

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

The unit has formal relationships with P-12 partner schools that support candidates’ learning in field experiences and clinical practice. These agreements are formalized through written agreements with the schools that outline the responsibilities of both parties. The unit faculty and the partner school recommend the classrooms for field experience placements.

Partnership agreements are also in place for student teaching and internship placements. They stipulate the conditions under which candidates are placed in schools, the responsibilities of both parties for placement decisions, the selection of cooperating teachers or onsite supervisors, and the roles and responsibilities of each party. While candidates may request particular placements, the final decision rests with the Office of Field Experiences in collaboration with the school or district.

The unit has recently added the position of Assistant Dean for Field Experiences and Outreach and created a centralized Office of Field Experiences. This office has clarified procedures for field and clinical experiences; developed handbooks outlining requirements, expectations, and procedures; and established policy and procedures for monitoring student progress. The addition of a field placement officer has clarified the procedures, requirements and expectations for field and clinical experiences and the monitoring of student progress.

Candidates apply for student teaching approximately a year prior to the intended quarter, with final approval occurring the quarter prior to student teaching. The application folder includes a resume, records of academic accomplishments, three required recommendations from Level 1 and Level 2 field experience faculty, and a summary of field placements. The Student Teaching Committee composed of program and field placement office representatives reviews the application. Recommendations by school administrators and cooperating teachers are also considered. While school site administrators and candidates indicate an appreciation for the
candidate’s ability to request placements, it is clear that the field placement officer makes the final determination of placements.

DePaul has a resident teacher certification program that involves collaboration with Glenview District 34. This program is offered in a three-year sequence in which candidates earn an elementary teaching certificate and a master’s degree in Teaching and Learning. Using curriculum and assessment instruments developed jointly by DePaul faculty and Glenview District 34 teachers, the program features courses taught by both faculties. Glenview candidates are selected through a rigorous and competitive process and are then placed as interns in one of eight schools for the first year (the equivalent of field experience and student teaching) and as resident teachers for the following two years, during which they complete the course work for the master’s degree. Glenview teachers serve as mentors to candidates as they progress through the program. The jointly developed assessments used in this program reflect both the Glenview system for teacher evaluation and the elementary education program standards linked to the conceptual framework.

In the educational leadership program (principal and superintendent) candidates complete multiple field assignments in their courses followed by an internship in a P-12 school, often the school of employment. Site and university supervisors work with the candidates to determine appropriate projects and activities for accomplishment of internship goals within the school setting.

Candidates in the school counseling program complete both a practicum course and an internship. During the internship, candidates perform substantive tasks typically carried out by school counselors, often in a school in which they are employed as teachers. The candidate, the site supervisor, and the university supervisor sign an agreement that structures the internship. Consultations with site and university supervisors are a regular part of the internship experience.

**Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practices**

**Design of Field Experiences for Initial Programs.**

The DePaul field experiences reflect the unit’s commitment to its conceptual framework, emphasizing the dispositions of an urban, professional multicultural educator. In both the undergraduate and graduate initial programs, candidates are required to complete a minimum of 100 clock hours of supervised field experience with students in the schools. A minimum of 210 hours are required for graduate (dual certification) special education; a minimum of 225 hours are required for undergraduate special education. These field experiences must encompass the range of grade levels in which the candidate is seeking certification. At least one placement must be in a multicultural setting. Candidates must document that the field experience sites include students of various socio-economic levels. Candidates may select experiences from a network of over 120 field experience partner schools that serve the Lincoln Park, Naperville, and Barat campuses. Agreements with schools in the network enable all parties to understand expectations.

Undergraduate elementary and secondary candidates must complete at least 10 of their required clock hours of field experience in a special education setting. Graduate candidates must complete a minimum of 10-15 hours in special education, depending on the campus in which
the candidate is enrolled. Undergraduate special education majors must complete at least 10 clock hours in a general education setting. Additionally, a regular education candidate may complete no more than 35 hours in any one school, and a special education candidate may complete no more than 40 hours in one school.

Field experiences are designated as Level 1 (beginning) or Level 2 (intermediate). Level 1 field experiences involve observing; assisting a teacher; working with small groups; tutoring students; conducting research about students, classrooms, schools and communities; and completing any other assignments as specified by the course instructor that involve interaction with students. A specific Level 1 DePaul evaluation form is used that reflects the conceptual framework and provides for cooperating teaching or faculty member assessment of the candidate’s work at the end of the quarter. These completed evaluation forms are turned in to the course instructor for approval, verification, and awarding of course credit.

Level 2 field experiences may involve any of the activities listed above and also include, at a minimum, a culminating activity that involves the teacher candidate in designing and delivering a lesson to a large or small group of students either independently or in collaboration with the teacher. The Level 2 field experience evaluation reflects the conceptual framework and is completed by either the cooperating teacher or the university faculty member. This form is returned to the course instructor for approval, verification, and awarding of credit for the course.

All field experiences are attached to specific education courses. Therefore, they have immediate relevance to what is being studied in class and provide opportunities for candidates to immediately apply professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions. Because of their relationship to course assignments, field experience hours must be completed during the quarter in which the class is taken. Some instructors require specific placements for field experiences. For others, candidates may select from the DePaul Field Experience Network and make their own contact with these schools.

The following table indicates the number of courses in each program that require field experiences.

Table 24: Number of Courses that Include Field Experience in Initial Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Teaching in Initial Programs**

Clinical practice is intended to be sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate the proficiencies expected by program standards. The final clinical experience in
initial teacher education programs is a full-time, 10-week minimum student teaching experience completed in P–12 classrooms.

This table lists the unique requirements of some programs to meet certification guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Early Childhood</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>Special Education (undergrad)</th>
<th>Graduate dual certification (Special Ed and Elementary Education)</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 weeks in Pre-K</td>
<td>5 weeks in Elementary</td>
<td>10 weeks in K-8</td>
<td>5 weeks in Elementary</td>
<td>8 weeks in Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, some programs require student teaching experiences of five weeks at each of two different sites or levels. In the regular, longer student teaching experience, candidates are provided the following timeline for their activities: an introductory teaching phase (first week), initial phase (first and second week), sustained teaching phase (four weeks), full teaching phase (four to eight weeks) and concluding phase (one week). In the five-week period, by contrast, candidates have an introductory phase of one or two days and full teaching from the third day to the fifth week, with a mid-term evaluation in the third week and a final evaluation in the fifth week of each experience. The five-week period is insufficient for providing candidates the opportunity to demonstrate proficiency at each level as defined by the institutional, state, and national standards. Recent graduates and employers stated that a longer student teaching experience was needed to prepare candidates for their professional responsibilities.

During student teaching, candidates participate in a 4-credit capstone course in the undergraduate programs or a 2-credit student teaching seminar at the graduate level.

Candidates are supported in student teaching by a university supervisor and a cooperating professional on site. To qualify to serve as supervisors, faculty must hold or be eligible to hold a state teaching certificate in the area they supervise and have contemporary experience in the level and subject they supervise. To qualify to serve as a cooperating teacher or site supervisor for internships, individuals must hold state certification in the area in which they supervise and have at least three years of experience in the professional role of supervision. The expectations for cooperating teachers and university supervisors are outlined in the field experiences handbook provided to supervisors and candidates, and are also available on the web site.

During the student teaching experience, candidate performance is monitored and evaluated by the university supervisor on a common set of standards that are aligned with institutional standards and reflect state and professional standards. Candidates are also assessed by the cooperating teacher using a set of standards that are specific to the content area and discipline. Candidates complete two mid-term self evaluations (content and core) and two final self evaluations.
Candidates in initial programs evaluate both their university supervisor and their cooperating teacher. Similarly supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluate each other using a form with indicators assessed on a four point scale. The tables below summarize the results of these evaluations.

Table 26: Candidates’ and Supervisors’ Evaluations of Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ Evaluations Of Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ Evaluations Of Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Candidates’ and Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ Evaluations Of Supervisors</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations Of Supervisors</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical Practices for Other School Personnel**

Practicum and internship experiences for other school personnel are extensive and intensive enough to allow candidates to demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Candidates in the educational leadership (principal and superintendent) and school counselor programs develop a proposal that becomes a contract for an internship experience that includes a minimum of 150 clock hours in the school setting. Candidates in each program set goals that are related to program standards and then identify projects and activities that will be engaged in to meet these goals. Contracts that include these proposals are approved by the faculty member charged with direction of the clinical components of the programs. Approval of the contracts is not automatic. The experience must be in a setting that will extend the depth and breadth of the candidate’s experience and knowledge base and where the candidate can experience authentic diversity that incorporates some element of working with special needs populations. The candidates in both programs develop their proposals to incorporate direct experiences working with students with exceptionalities and in settings with diverse populations of varying ethnicities, races, genders, and socioeconomic groups. Approval of the contract is not granted unless these elements are present.

Both the university and site supervisors monitor and evaluate candidates’ progress through the clinical experiences for other professional school personnel. The university supervisor has at least four on–site observations and meetings with the candidate and the site supervisor, one at the beginning of the experience, two during the experience, and one at the conclusion of the internship. The school counselor candidates review their progress with the university and site supervisors midway through the experience and develop additional goals to further knowledge and skills during the remainder of the internships.

In the programs for other school personnel, technology is used to facilitate communication with the university supervisor and candidates, who log and verify the clock hours set by their contracts, as well as maintaining reflective journals about their experiences. Journal entries culminate in a reflection paper at the conclusion of the experience. School counselor candidates must tape and critique a counseling session as a part of their self-reflection.
Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn

Candidates, school faculty, and university faculty jointly conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout the various field experiences and clinical practice components of the programs. The field experiences and clinical practices provide opportunities for reflection and receipt of feedback from peers and clinical faculty. The brevity of some placements minimizes the extent to which these elements can be present. The evaluation forms that are used reflect the urban professional multicultural educator framework in both initial programs and programs for other professional school personnel.

In the initial programs, field experiences, clinical practice, and related course work require candidates to reflect continually on their practice. Candidates reflect through lesson evaluation, decision-making, modifications, and essays on their career choice. Results from aggregation of candidate self-evaluations during Level 2 field experiences and student teaching were included in the Institutional Report. The instruments used were based on the conceptual framework as reflected by institutional standards.

Candidate lesson plans include the Illinois Learning Standards for P-12 Students and reflection on the effect of the lesson on students. Administrators comment on the leadership role assumed in the schools by DePaul candidates and recent graduates. The candidates and recent graduates model the application of standards-based teaching and technology for other school faculty. DePaul candidates use technology in their teaching. Both administrators and cooperating teachers acknowledge the comfort level of initial candidates in using the web and PowerPoint in their teaching. Cooperating teachers noted a lack of candidate ability to use other applications of technology such as multimedia in their teaching. They also recognized candidates’ willingness to try new ideas in the use of technology when they are suggested. Candidates appear to use the other technology that is available to them in their placements, which may include overhead projectors, listening centers, and/or video players.

Additional data about initial candidate performance in field experiences and student teaching is included in the sections of findings for Standard 1 that include the content, pedagogical content, and professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates perceived by cooperating teachers and supervisors. Extensive data are collected from candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers about candidate performance, and data are collected, also, from alumni and employers about the teaching performance of graduates.

Candidates who do not receive successful evaluations during field experiences or clinical practice are counseled individually by faculty. Individual plans are made to provide support for the candidate. This process intentionally reflects the disposition of Vincentian personalism. Consultation may lead to a change in placement, suggestions for additional resources and strategies, and/or a change in career and curriculum choices.

Candidates in a new graduate initial program leading to dual certification in special education (ages 3 through 21) and elementary education (grades K-9) are required to complete a minimum of 210 field experience hours, including hours at each of the levels for which they will be certified. The first cohort is scheduled to student teach in Spring 2004, so no data are available on candidate performance in the clinical experiences for this program. However, data on pre-student teaching field experiences indicate a wide range of placements from pre-K
through grade 12, as well as placements that enable candidates to work with students who have a range of disabilities to address changing state requirements for cross categorical special education certification.

The assessment processes for the educational leadership and school counseling programs are both formative and summative, with the final evaluations reflecting all of the DePaul program standards. Both the university supervisor and the site supervisor have responsibility for evaluating the candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and the results of some of these assessments are included in the BOE report in Standard 1 sections that deal with the content and professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates in programs for other professional school personnel.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs are reflective practitioners committed to the urban professional multicultural educator model. Candidates regularly reflect on their practice, have multiple experiences in a variety of settings, and receive feedback from peers and supervisors throughout their field experiences and student teaching or internships. The unit monitors candidate progress and assesses performance using multiple measures.

**C. Recommendation:**  Met

**D. Areas for Improvement:**

**New**

Student teaching placements of five weeks are insufficient for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

*Rationale:* Some programs require two clinical practice experiences of five weeks each. A five-week placement does not provide candidates adequate intensive and extensive experiences to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions associated with the content area or level of the placement.

**Corrected**

(Former Standard I.H Quality of Field Experiences) The self directed nature of early field and clinical experiences does not guarantee all candidates a well-planned and sequenced set of experiences consistent with the unit’s conceptual framework.

*Rationale:* The unit has added a position of Assistant Dean for Field Experiences and Outreach, a web-based student placement tracking system (EdTrack), and new requirements for candidate field experiences and evaluations that ensure that candidates have a well planned and sequenced set of field experiences. All Level 1 and Level 2 field experiences are now associated with courses and are planned and implemented in conjunction with course assignments.

**Continued** None
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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The knowledge base that supports the unit’s conceptual framework depends on the work of Schwab, Schulman, and Darling-Hammond. Focusing on the idea that educators should consider fellow educators, learners, context, and content in their work, this foundation supports the unit’s position on developing their curriculum and instructional experiences in ways that support the diversity standard. This orientation is exemplified through the program strands that include a focus on transformation, identity development, and understanding differences. Each one of the unit’s programs has intentionally addressed these issues through the lens of the conceptual framework.

All candidates in the programs at both the initial and advanced levels must take a common core of courses that focus on issues related to living in a diverse society. Courses that meet this intent include SCU 207 Social and Historical Issues in Education for undergraduate candidates; SCG 408 Education and the Social Order for initial and advanced graduate candidates at the master’s level and candidates in the principal and school counseling programs; and SCG 711 Culture, Power, and Education for doctoral candidates. Additionally, there is strong evidence that diversity is infused throughout courses in the unit’s programs. Examination of syllabi reveals that the unit’s approach to diversity is broad and concentrates on multiple aspects of diversity, including exceptionality, gender, socioeconomic, religion, language, and sexual orientation. Given this emphasis, the unit places a high value on the development of candidate dispositions, at both the initial and advanced levels, and this is reflected in multiple ways through the various programs.

Careful and thoughtful infusion of diversity occurs throughout the unit’s curriculum. On evaluations of the teaching of faculty, candidates reported favorably in response to the statement, “The instructor created an environment that fostered mutual respect and tolerance for differences of opinion and interpretation of materials.” Mean scores ranged from 3.52 to 3.66 on this item in different years. While faculty acknowledge that they could extend their work in this area, they are pleased with the degree to which this aspect of their work is being embraced within the unit.

Supervisor evaluations of the diversity skills of student teachers and educational leadership and school counseling interns reflect notable levels of performance by the candidates. On six indicators related to diversity that were applied to candidates in student teaching, for example, evaluations all had a mean of 3.2 or greater on a four-point scale where 4 indicated “Evident at an Exemplary Level,” and 1 indicated “Not Evident.” The indicators in this survey related to
developing positive climates for social integration, addressing multiple perspectives, and working with colleagues and communities to support students with exceptionalities. School counselors were rated on two indicators that focused primarily on the use of appropriate interpersonal skills. Their performance means were 3.75 and 3.88 (n=8). Educational leaders (n=22) were rated on four indicators that focused on the establishment of an equitable community through modes of facilitation and were rated by supervisors with means from 3.64 to 3.81.

Both initial and advanced candidates demonstrated skill in designing and implementing lessons and providing other services to address diverse student needs. This area is stressed by the unit faculty through numerous assignments and practical applications in the field. Candidates demonstrate their developing expertise through frequent articulations, and faculty expect the incorporation of diverse perspectives in both written products and in oral illustrations of their work. Candidates are also required to reflect on their field experiences throughout each quarter. The formative feedback they receive from faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers and other practitioners reinforces development of skills in working with diverse student populations. Furthermore, employers supported this premise by indicating a strong belief that the unit’s graduates were prepared to address diversity in multiple manifestations (i.e., gender, socioeconomics, ethnicity, and exceptionalities) in educational settings.

**Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

Of the full-time faculty employed by the unit, 40 percent are male, 24 percent are faculty of color. The percentage of faculty of color has dropped over the past five years, although the unit has substantially expanded the number of its faculty. While this percentage has declined, there is evidence that the unit has made good faith efforts to employ additional faculty of color. Of the 75 part-time faculty, 45 percent are male, 17 are people of color. Of the student teaching supervisors, 48 are Caucasian and eight are people of color. In the fall of 2002, a workshop was held to address the issue of increasing faculty diversity across the university. A faculty search committee from the unit was required to attend. While the percentage of faculty of color has not increased thus far, the unit has made the necessary plans to improve faculty representation.

The university community has conducted numerous programs addressing the issue of faculty retention. Through the Office of Diversity, for example, selected faculty representatives work to increase their knowledge base about what is required to recruit and retain faculty of color and to create supportive networks across campus for faculty of any underrepresented group. The building of networks for faculty of color is further supported through a luncheon that is held each year only for this group. Again, the idea behind this program is to decrease the isolation of faculty of color and build relationships that extend throughout the university community. Another example of a university wide initiative was a seminar held in February 2003, on “Institutionalizing Multiculturalism at DePaul University.” The purpose of this seminar was to build understanding of the issues behind this topic and create a greater institutional space for dialogue across the university. A more recent example was a conference focusing on women’s leadership within university settings. The aim of the conference was to address issues of gender in the academy, including tenure and promotion, administrative representation, and increasing networks to support the work of women in the academy. There were 240 women attending this conference, and organizers stressed that the concerns and recommendations raised will set a new series of agenda items for the university and its various units.
Unit faculty have been given numerous opportunities to broaden their understanding of diversity issues. During the 2001-2002 academic year, for example, three faculty retreats were held, each addressing the impact of diversity on schooling and its corollary effect on higher education faculty. These retreats, planned primarily by faculty in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and Research, were attended by approximately 75 percent of the faculty. Feedback from these seminars was circulated to unit faculty, and additional steps are being planned.

Candidates are placed for field experiences and clinical practice with a wide variety of cooperating teachers and supervisors. For example, in the most recent quarter, the following table shows the extent of ethnic diversity of some of the cooperating teachers for student teaching.

Table 28: Ethnicity of Cooperating Teachers in Fall 2003 Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>136 (72%)</td>
<td>29 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit members recognize that these percentages could be reflective of greater diversity in ethnic representation, and they continue to seek qualified professionals to further their work in this area.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Candidates expressed an appreciation for the diverse perspectives that exist within their university courses. In 2002-2003, of the 883 undergraduate candidates, 33 percent are students of color. Although this percentage has dropped since 1999-2000, the decline appears to be a fluctuation rather than a trend. The distribution of candidates by ethnicity has been relatively constant over the past few years, while the overall number has grown substantially. For graduate level candidates, the total 2002-2003 headcount is 1,091, of which 19 percent are students of color. The following table shows the past and current distributions of candidates by ethnicity at the undergraduate and graduate levels:

Table 29: Numbers of Undergraduate and Graduate Candidates by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students of color</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the first year in the last five that the percentage of graduate candidates who are students of color has dropped below 21 percent. However, as noted above, the number of candidates has increased significantly in the past five years, with a 23.7 percent increase in the number of undergraduate candidates and a 28 percent increase in the number of graduate candidates. The unit has some initiatives in place to increase the ethnic and racial diversity among its candidates. For example, two scholarship programs, the Delia Mae Stewart Scholarship Fund and the Golden Apple Foundation Academy, are used primarily to recruit candidates of color.

Diverse candidates within the unit are supported through various services run through the university program, Students Together Are Reaching Success (STARS). This program addresses transitions for students of color and first generation college students. It sponsors two luncheons for first year students and a mentoring program to help students make transition through the university programs. For the 2001-2002 academic year, STARS participants had the following one-year retention rates as compared to the rest of the university:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>STARS Still Attending</th>
<th>Rest of DePaul Still Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers suggest that the program is affecting the retention rates of African American and Hispanic students at the university.

Through the Office of Diversity, candidates are given opportunities to serve on various committees and work in other capacities on behalf of the unit. It should be noted that, unlike traditional university students, the unit’s candidates are frequently away from campus with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students of color</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fieldwork obligations. To the degree possible, however, diverse candidates are represented on a number of unit committees.

The SOE sponsors Productive Learning Strategies (PLuS), a comprehensive program of support for students from across the university with specific learning disabilities and/or attention deficit disorders. This program served 130 students in 2001-2002. The Learning Opportunities Program at the Barat campus offers similar support to students with learning disabilities. It is not known how many of the candidates served were from the unit.

**Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools**

The unit, at its Lincoln Park and Barat campus locations, has the benefit of location within a diverse community. At Lincoln Park, initial teacher and other school personnel candidates make extensive use of the Chicago public and private schools. While the candidates can self-select their placements, they are required to complete at least one field experience in a multicultural setting with faculty approval. Within the service area of DePaul the diversity of P-12 school populations varies widely, with percentages of Caucasian students ranging from 91.8 to 0 percent. Dominant ethnic groups in area schools may be African American, Hispanic, or Caucasian. Similarly, the socioeconomic status of school populations varies widely. In addition, initial candidates in regular education programs are required to spend at least one placement in a special education setting, and candidates in special education programs spend at least one placement in a regular education classroom.

In interviews, both initial and advanced program candidates expressed appreciation for both the extensiveness and intensiveness of their work with diverse students. Candidates indicated that their selection of DePaul was often related to its reputation for enabling graduates to serve the community and their commitment to the urban professional multicultural educator theme. Candidates also remarked that the environments in which they complete field experiences and clinical practice display a wide range of student academic performance. In all of these placements, candidates are expected to account for their response to student differences in their professional work and to focus on the learning and other needs of individual students.

Candidates completing their programs at the Barat campus, which is located in a higher socioeconomic region north of Chicago, are required to complete at least one field experience in a multicultural setting. In the area near Barat, there are multiple sites that meet the criteria of the faculty. P-12 schools in the Barat College placement network serve students who range from 96.1 percent to 11.9 percent Caucasian and include a wide range of socioeconomic levels. Placements of regular education candidates in special education settings and of special education candidates in regular education settings is similarly required at the Barat campus.

In addition to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status as components of diversity, candidates discussed the various needs of students, including language acquisition, variation in achievement, and disability. Candidates at both the Lincoln Park and Barat campuses indicated that their fieldwork allowed them to gain experience in working with a wide range of students in P-12 settings.
Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has designed and implemented a curriculum and set of expectations for candidates that increase their understanding and competence in working with diverse student populations. Unit faculty, including university supervisors, and P-12 practitioners constantly provide information and feedback to guide and assess development of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions consistent with the focus of the conceptual framework on diversity. The unit has made provision to assure that field experiences support the development of candidates through work with diverse K-12 student populations.

The unit employs a diverse faculty and incorporates university supervisors who represent the diversity of the local population. This effort has resulted in an environment that is conducive to addressing issues of diversity with candidates who selected DePaul because of its reputation for preparing them to make a difference in a diverse society.

C. **Recommendation:** Met

D. **Areas for Improvement:**

- **New** None
- **Corrected** None
- **Continued** None
STANDARD 5: Faculty Qualifications

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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Qualified Faculty

The SOE includes 62 full-time faculty in the 2003-2004 academic year. Of these, 55 are tenured or tenure-track faculty, and 47 hold a doctoral degree in their area of expertise. Two of the remaining eight faculty members hold other terminal degrees (an M.F.A. and a J.D). Of the seven full-time faculty on non-tenure lines, four have master’s degrees and three hold doctoral degrees. Six faculty (including the dean) are full professors, 19 are associate professors, 30 are assistant professors, 5 are visiting instructors, one is a visiting scholar, and one is a superintendent in residence. Most faculty have experience working in P-12 schools as indicated in the table that follows.

Table 31: SOE Full-time Faculty by Tenure Status, Rank and Years of P-12 Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
<th>Years Experience Not Provided</th>
<th>0 Years P-12 Teaching</th>
<th>1-5 Years P-12 Teaching</th>
<th>6-10 Years P-12 Teaching</th>
<th>11-15 Years P-12 Teaching</th>
<th>16-20 Years P-12 Teaching</th>
<th>20+ Years P-12 Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not T-Track</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty vitae were provided for 69 adjunct faculty members, all of whom hold at least a master’s degree. Of these, the 40 part-time university supervisors bring from three to more than 21 years of P-12 teaching or other professional experience.

Cooperating teachers who work with candidates during field experiences and clinical practice meet the qualifications specified by the unit: being certified in the area and at the level of their teaching assignment and having a minimum of three years’ of teaching experience, including at least one year in their current building.

Unit faculty in other schools and colleges are also qualified to work with teacher candidates through doctorates and experience in their areas of expertise. For example, of the seven full-time faculty who teach in the Music Education program, six hold the doctorate and one holds an MM.
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Teaching is an institutional as well as a unit commitment at DePaul University. Alumni and candidates give high ratings to faculty members’ knowledge and understanding of content in their fields. Mean ratings of faculty teaching competence from five years of alumni surveys and five years of student evaluations at the end of courses were provided in the Institutional Report. They showed that faculty are perceived to have good command of what they teach, and that they have other characteristics of good teachers such as stating course goals and objectives, presenting issues and ideas, providing feedback, and fostering an environment of respect and tolerance.

Candidates in initial and advanced preparation programs are provided with opportunities to develop their abilities to reflect, think critically and analytically, and problem solve. Most faculty model instructional strategies that fit varied candidate learning styles and needs. Initial candidates described classes in which they experienced individual and group projects, focused discussions, tactile/hands-on experiences, demonstrations, intervention strategies, interdisciplinary lesson design, microteaching experiences, and portfolio preparation.

Advanced candidates revel in the way professors stretch their thinking, work through simulations and case studies, emphasize the importance of societal and political contexts, provide for depth as well as breadth in subject matter learning, and guide candidates through the components of research processes to make them not only burgeoning researchers but critical consumers of qualitative and quantitative research. They describe the teaching of DePaul faculty as “engaging,” “differentiated,” “fair,” and providing “a good balance of theory and application.” A candidate completing a master’s program stated, “I feel really prepared to do further graduate work. A doctoral student stated, “I feel like I am in a community of thinkers.” Another added, “Professors have created a really open environment where we all can communicate.”

Consistent with the urban professional multicultural educator focus of the conceptual framework, unit faculty model integration of diversity, including candidate ability to work with exceptional students, in their teaching. A review of syllabi indicates that faculty incorporate diversity through such assignments as readings, discussions, films, individual and group projects, papers, unit plans, and field experience assignments. Working with special needs students is addressed in coursework, field experiences, and during the clinical semester.

Faculty use and model a wide variety of assessment strategies to address the diverse learning needs of candidates in their classes. While faculty believe that some use of traditional exams and quizzes is necessary and appropriate, they readily provide examples of how Vincentian principles inform more personalized assessment. One professor has candidates complete learning style inventories at the first class meeting. Another integrates reflective self-analysis of videotaped teaching into course assessment. Across programs, faculty assessments provide candidates with examples of how to assess student acquisition and application of knowledge through journals, case studies, lesson/unit plans, papers, portfolios, presentations, and use of PowerPoint and video tapes.

Faculty members have made collective documented progress in their use of computer technology in teaching. Between 2000 and 2002, some, but not all, of the classrooms available to SOE faculty were outfitted with computer projection and Internet access. Increasing numbers
of the faculty have come to use Blackboard, record keeping software such as Excel, PowerPoint, e-mail, websites, and the Internet. Some are using digital cameras or scanners. Initial candidates at Lincoln Park stated that most faculty talk about technology, but not everyone uses it, and “it never really happens as part of any methods class.” One secondary candidate reported taking an excellent course in content-specific technology, but the course is elective rather than required. Asked if they had been exposed to technology at DePaul sufficiently to use it, initial candidates at the undergraduate and graduate levels stated that they had not.

Neither did Lincoln Park candidates report consistent modeling of technology integration in field experiences and clinical practice settings. While some settings were exemplary, others had only broken computers or provided limited access to technology for students.

Pre-service candidates at the Barat campus and master’s level interns in Glenview reported a much different experience. Their cooperating teachers demonstrated a seamless integration of technology in the classroom and guided candidates in acquiring needed skills. One principal reported that DePaul candidates “coming in are comfortable with [technology] but are not sure where it improves instruction,” Another added, “I haven’t noticed any … problem learning to use it once they have some exposure.”

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Faculty demonstrate consistent participation in professional conference presentations, and 40 of the full time faculty have written books, book chapters, book reviews, journal articles, or other publications since 1998. Professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work related to teaching, learning, and their fields of specialization. In the last five years, SOE faculty members have collectively produced nearly 250 scholarly publications as indicated in the following table.

Table 32: Scholarly Publications, School of Education Faculty, 1998–99 through 2002–03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Book Chapters</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Journal Articles</th>
<th>Other Publications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure-track faculty have been involved in over 300 professional presentations of scholarly work in the same time period. Over 70 percent of the associate and full professors have published in the past five years, and others have been active in grant-writing and administrative, professional, or community leadership roles. Faculty in the SOE embrace endeavors pertaining to traditional research and to the scholarship of application, discovery, integration, or teaching.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Professional education faculty serve the university and the profession in ways that are consistent with the mission of the institution and unit. DePaul’s commitment to service is a distinctive characteristic. Public service is understood to refer to activities that carry resources from the university into the community.
Service to the university and school is also an important part of faculty responsibility. SOE faculty have provided leadership for literally every significant committee, council, and advisory board in the university. During the last five years, they served or are serving on over 50 university committees ranging from the Faculty Council to the University Research Council. Faculty also serve on advisory boards for centers and interdisciplinary programs in Liberal Arts and Sciences. In the SOE, faculty serve regularly on over 30 committees that include permanent, school-wide committees such as the Personnel Committee and ad hoc committees such as those formed to develop new programs. They also serve regularly on university and SOE search committees.

Over the past five years, SOE faculty have served as officers, conference chairs, and members of key committees of 26 professional organizations. They have served as editors, editorial board members, and reviewers for 40 scholarly journals and as reviewers of conference papers for six national professional associations. In addition, faculty have reviewed proposals for eight funding agencies, including the Ford and Spencer Foundations. They have served as members of NCATE and ISBE accreditation teams and on a variety of ISBE committees.

Professional education faculty are also engaged in dialogues about the design and delivery of instructional programs in both professional education and P–12 schools and are actively involved in service to P–12 schools. Individual SOE faculty have developed in-service workshops and consulted with over 90 classrooms, schools, and/or school districts to provide support for teachers, principals, and staff members. In addition to the service activities of individuals, the unit supports the following centers and institutes that serve the local community.

**Center for Urban Education.** This center works to improve the Chicago Public Schools through programs that involve teachers and parents in school-wide and inter-school development. Projects include the Teacher Leadership Network, the Connected Curriculum Project, the Teaching Connections Project, and the Teacher Resource Center. The center currently serves 26 inner city schools.

**The Stockyard Institute.** This center supports exploratory arts practice within the Back of the Yards community of south Chicago. Through cooperation with the San Miguel School and its community, DePaul University and many artists, activist groups, and arts organizations have established a place to perpetuate dialogues and disseminate critical arts practices within this community and beyond.

**Institute for Teacher Development and Research.** This institute, begun in Fall 2003, supports the moral and intellectual life of teachers and the multiple dimensions of thoughtful and committed teaching. Professional development activities are focused on professional collaboration, on-going intellectual work, and thoughtful deliberation about curriculum, pedagogy, human development, and the moral, ethical, and social context of the schooling process.

**Collaboration**

SOE faculty support the conceptual framework tenet of collaboration in various aspects of the university, P-12 settings, and the broader community. Both faculty and administrators described collaborations of unit faculty with faculty across the university to improve the
performance of candidates. Similarly, the unit participates in a number of collaborative P-12 school and community partnerships, externally funded initiatives, and university supported or faculty developed programs activities. The unit currently maintains four professional development partnerships with P-12 schools and plans six additional partnerships with agreements signed for implementation by the fall 2004.

The table below illustrates the intent of eight notable collaborative activities.

Table 33: Collaborations of DePaul SOE Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America Reads</td>
<td>K-12 students</td>
<td>Tutoring Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gear-up Challenge</td>
<td>Fifth through tenth grade students</td>
<td>Assistance to improve academic preparation, and assistance to parents to become more academically involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning by Association</td>
<td>After school students</td>
<td>Tutoring services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Digital Divide</td>
<td>Two Chicago Catholic Schools</td>
<td>Technology outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentian Urban Resident Teacher Program</td>
<td>Newly certified teachers serving in Catholic Schools</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Science Center for Education and Research</td>
<td>Broker Facilitators</td>
<td>Space Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music Program</td>
<td>School Students</td>
<td>Music Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Learning Lab</td>
<td>Children and Youth</td>
<td>Remedial Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant monies enable the unit to provide service to additional P-12 school initiatives including some that focus on teacher performance, literacy enrichment, school involvement with parents and community resources, early intervention, and personnel training in special education. Faculty performing community service for the university have been involved in over 80 school or school related projects to enhance learning opportunities for P-12 students or to assist schools, and community related agencies.

**Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance**

The unit conducts regular, systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty performance. Procedures, expectations, and criteria are clearly delineated and published in the faculty handbook, and promulgated both electronically and through documents available from the university publication’s office. Formal reviews are conducted annually based on teaching, scholarship, and university service. Department chairs review all faculty annually to provide feedback on performance during the past year, communicate future expectations, and provide opportunity to develop personal goals for the coming year.

Courses are evaluated by candidates at the conclusion of each term, and the results provide immediate feedback regarding course delivery and teaching strategies to both regular and adjunct faculty. Department chair monitor the teaching of adjunct faculty, provide feedback to the faculty, and make subsequent employment decisions. Tenured and tenure track faculty submit annual self-reflections on their teaching as one component of the annual review process.

Data collected from peer, candidate and self evaluation become part of faculty portfolio submitted for consideration for promotion and tenure. Annually, unit faculty develop goals that are aligned with the urban professional multicultural educator framework and that address
teaching, scholarship, and service. The department chair meets with each faculty member by March 1 to reach agreement about the faculty member’s goals, with a follow-up meeting held by November 1 to review progress in fulfilling the goals and as a basis for determining possible new initiatives to attain the goals.

Tenure track faculty have two and four year performance reviews to assist them with their work at the university and to prepare for the processes involved in applying for promotion or tenure, normally in the sixth year. For promotion and tenure, peers and students systematically review teaching performance; peers and experts in the field assess scholarly contributions; and peers within the unit evaluate levels of service to the university.

Successful candidates for tenure follow a process that includes the following steps:

1. Submission of required documentation
2. A positive vote from tenured faculty members within the unit (A student who attests to the applicant’s teaching skills also votes)
3. A positive recommendation from the Dean of the SOE
4. A positive recommendation from the Executive Vice President
5. A decision to extend tenure by the President

**Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

A number of university offices and councils provide opportunity for faculty to grow professionally. Most notable are the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Office; the Office of Faculty Development; and the University Research Council/Quality of Instruction Council. In addition, the School of Education provides mentoring services for recently employed faculty.

The Teaching, Learning and Assessment Office provides a number of services related to the enhancement of teaching, assessment, and student learning. This is accomplished through frequent seminars; web-based clearinghouses of information about teaching, learning, and assessment; and workshops on the proper use of effective tools and techniques for program assessment and scholarly research.

The Office of Faculty Development provides orientation programs to help acclimate new faculty to DePaul’s mission, culture, and climate, and utilize the resources at their disposal. The office also sustains the vitality and productivity of faculty through internal grants for teaching, research, and service.

The University Research Council/Quality of Instruction Council administers a paid leave program intended to support academic projects. Faculty may apply for competitive instructional leaves or competitive research leaves. Leaves may be extended up to a full academic year.

The SOE Faculty Development Committee provides mentoring for new faculty in order to provide social and emotional support while also developing understanding of institutional procedures, practices, and culture. Other professional development activities of the unit include the diversity seminars described on page 40 and a distinguished speakers series of the Department of Social and Cultural Foundations.
Overall Assessment of Standard

Professional education faculty are qualified for their positions through advanced study of their disciplines and experiences working in P-12 schools. Although they do model many good teaching practices, faculty do not provide consistent modeling of the integration of technology. Faculty are appropriately engaged in research and in service to the university and profession. They are active in fulfilling the commitment of the institution to public service and engage in partnerships with schools and other agencies to improve education. Systematic and comprehensive reviews of faculty are used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service through goals that reflect the conceptual framework. Professional development opportunities support the goals of the institution and the unit.

C. Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement:

New

1. Systematic modeling of the application of technology in the teaching of courses in initial programs is not consistent.

Rationale: Initial program candidates report inconsistency in the modeling of technology in their courses. A faculty survey conducted in 2001 showed unevenness in the application of technology from program to program and from course to course. In spite of investment of resources in hardware, software, and faculty development, systematic modeling of technologies by faculty to assure initial candidate exposure to a range of appropriate applications that they can apply in their own teaching is lacking.

Corrected None

Continued None
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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Unit Leadership and Authority

The School of Education, one of nine schools and colleges, is administered by a dean, an associate dean, two assistant deans, and four department chairs. Leadership has undergone significant changes since the last accreditation in 1998, including interim deans and a restructuring under the current dean into four departments. Since the arrival of the new dean in the fall of 2002, many SOE committees have been reconstituted, the most important one being the Professional Education Council (PEC). This committee reports to the dean on all issues related to curriculum and policy in the unit. The PEC is chaired by the associate dean, and its membership includes faculty and administration from the SOE, professional and practitioners from P-12 education, and representatives of the other colleges which offer and support programs leading to certification, the School of Computer Science, the School of Music, and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Governance in the SOE encompasses 62 faculty and degree programs at the Naperville and Barat campuses, which operate as integral parts of the school, as well as at the main campus in Lincoln Park. The entire school shares in the urban professional multicultural educator conceptual framework, performance standards, and assessment system. Faculty from all campuses attend and vote at all SOE faculty meetings and serve on both university and SOE committees. Tenure and promotion review and curriculum and program development all occur through school-wide committees.

The unit’s recruiting and admissions practices are described clearly and consistently in numerous publications, catalogs, and websites. Candidates in the advanced level programs and candidates from the Barat and Naperville campuses have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The unevenness of advising for undergraduate and graduate candidates at Lincoln Park noted by the 1997 BOE continues. In 2001, 197 initial candidates responded to a student services survey. For the item, “offers appropriate quality and quantity of information,” 31.6% responded very good or excellent. In 2003, 46.1% of 260 candidates rated this item at this level. For another item, “provides long-range academic plan,” the rating in 2001 was 43.2% at the very good to excellent level, improving to 48.9% in 2003. A last example from this survey related to the evaluation of overall advising services. In 2001, 29.9% rated it in the very good to excellent category, while in 2003, the rating rose to 40.8%. At the Lincoln Park campus, the ratio of advisees to an advisor is 560 to 1. Candidates reported that they did not receive appropriate, consistent, and accurate advice.
Unit Budget

The SOE receives sufficient budgetary allocations that are at least proportional to other units on campus to provide programs that prepare candidates to meet institutional standards. Within the university, resources to support the mission and growth of each college and school are allocated according to funding formulas derived from student enrollment growth, credit hour growth, and average class size. Comparative credit hour statistics from three other colleges in the following table show that the SOE has grown relative to other units and is referred to as a “growth college” by university administrators. The SOE has resources comparable to its growth through the formula.

Table 34: SOE Growth in Credit Hour Generation Compared to Three Other Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit hours 1997/98</th>
<th>Credit hours 2001/02</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease Over 5 Years</th>
<th>% Change Over 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>129,210</td>
<td>143,318</td>
<td>14,108</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34,824</td>
<td>40,233</td>
<td>5,409</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA&amp;S</td>
<td>235,182</td>
<td>328,716</td>
<td>93,534</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>13,924</td>
<td>15,390</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary and benefit budgets for the same years show that the SOE has been treated fairly in terms of allocation of new faculty and staff positions.

Table 35: SOE Budget Indicators Compared to Other Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary &amp; benefits 1997/98</th>
<th>Salary &amp; benefits 2001/02</th>
<th>Dollar Change Over 5 Years</th>
<th>% Change Over 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>$14,692,775</td>
<td>$21,260,897</td>
<td>$6,568,032</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$4,083,293</td>
<td>$5,884,343</td>
<td>$1,800,976</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA&amp;S</td>
<td>$20,941,367</td>
<td>$34,770,385</td>
<td>$13,829,018</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>$2,672,113</td>
<td>$3,688,584</td>
<td>$1,016,471</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The funds provided for SOE faculty office support, travel, development, and research are on a par with the other colleges and schools on campus. All faculty have computers, access to e-mail, the Internet, and a wide range of software. Copying, printing, and office supplies are adequate for faculty and administrative needs. The level of support for computing, communications, and instructional technology is excellent.

To support candidates’ ability to easily access program information and advising, the SOE invested $33,364 into the development of a newly designed and updated website. In addition, a $92,400 investment (over 3 years) was made to develop the EdTrack candidate tracking and advising system, which provides detailed data for monitoring candidate progress as well as program and unit assessment.

Personnel

Personnel resources in the SOE have grown over the past five years in relationship to the growth of candidates in all programs. The number of full-time faculty has grown from 38 in 1998/1999 to 62 this academic year. Central support staff has experienced a similar growth, including support at the Barat and Naperville campuses. In 1998/99, the staff numbered 20; in 2003/2004, 33 fulltime positions are allocated.
The normal tenure track faculty load is nominally nine courses per year, or three courses a quarter. However, all tenure-track faculty receive a two course reduction for scholarship and research. Seven courses or 21 quarter-hour credits are comparable to the 18 semester-hours (six 3-credit courses) for graduate teaching specified in NCATE Standard 6. There is no differentiation between undergraduate and graduate assignments when determining workloads at DePaul. Most faculty teach at both levels. There are appropriate load reductions for administrative and supervisory work as well as an automatic one-course reduction for first year faculty. While most supervision of clinical practice is handled by part-time faculty, those full-time faculty who do supervise are assigned no more than six candidates per quarter, which counts as one course.

Approximately 75 qualified part-time faculty are used each year. Almost all have advanced degrees and are incorporated into the culture of the SOE on a yearly basis. They are re-employed newly each quarter and are mentored by full-time faculty or chairs. Most are practitioners in the field who reported that they are made to feel very much a part of the university and the SOE.

**Unit Facilities**

The unit facilities are spread out but they meet the needs of candidates in all sites in meeting standards. Many but not all classrooms support the use of technology in instruction. Education students have access to 13 computer labs on six campuses with over 600 computers. Seven of these labs have overhead projection systems for classroom use. The library facility and curriculum library are well used and excellent places to work and study. The Richardson Library contains nearly 1.2 million titles in various formats. Over the past five years, the SOE has been able to spend an average of $38,000 on new books, videos, and other non-electronic materials and $28,000 per year on new serials.

**Unit Resources Including Technology**

The unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. Prior to 2003, the unit operated with one centralized budget and did not make specific allocations to programs. With the recent restructuring into departments, departmental budgets are allocated by formula according to department size, generally based on faculty headcount. As an example, the table below shows the budget for the Teacher Education Department at Lincoln Park for 2003/2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmentals</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorariums</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Materials</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Printing</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Travel | $25,300
---|---
Total | $73,600

With the support of the president, an adequate budget has been committed to upgrade and integrate technology into every aspect of the university. The unit has sought both internal and external resources in the past five years to support faculty and candidate integration of technology into instruction. A series of grants has been received by the SOE over these past five years to assist in bringing technology to every classroom, including a U.S. Department of Education grant of $739,000, a Digital Divide Grant, an Electronic Portfolio Grant, and RE3 Partnership Grant. Recently, in response to recommendations from the SOE Technology Committee, $15,000 was allocated to purchase additional video cameras and software for use by candidates and faculty. Classrooms on all campuses continue to be converted to “smart” classrooms. There are 163 classrooms so configured at the beginning of this academic year.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The SOE is the professional education unit, and its dean serves as the head of the unit. Unit facilities and technology resources improve every year to support the increasing candidate population. Faculty and professional staff have continued to increase to accommodate the growth. However, the advising of candidates, particularly on the Lincoln Park campus, has struggled to be effective. The student services model has created extremely large advising loads, well over 500 to an advisor. The present structure is inadequate to fully support the advising goals and objectives of the unit.

C. **Recommendation:** Met

D. **Areas for Improvement:**

**New** None

**Corrected** None

**Continued**
(Former standard II.C Monitoring and Advising the Progress of Candidates) The unit lacks an effective system to appropriately, consistently, and accurately advise candidates and monitor their progress.

*Rationale:* The installation of EdTrack, the School’s web-based advising and tracking system in the fall of 2001 has improved candidates’ access to information about their own progress towards student teaching. However, the overall advising of undergraduates in the teacher preparation program at the Lincoln Park campus still remains problematic.
IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
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   Cooperating Teacher Feedback on Student Teaching Evaluation Forms
II.A.9: Preparation of Faculty
Meeting Notes
II.A.10: Preparation of Supervisors
Meeting Notes
II.A.11: Interrater Reliability Study
Summarized Data – Student Teaching Portfolios

**Element II.B: Data Collection, Analysis and Preparation**

II.B.1: Data Project Manager
Job Description

II.B.2: Education Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes

II.B.3: Recommendations for Improvement from Assessment Committee
Minutes and Notes
Report on Performance of Candidates on Illinois Basic Skills and Content Area Tests
Report on Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, and Self – Ratings of Student Teachers

II.B.4: Long Range Planning Process

II.B.5: Description of Data Sources
Checklist for Admissions
Student Teaching Field Experience Evaluation
Faculty Recommendation for Admission to Student Teaching
Supervisor Evaluation of Student Teacher Candidate
Supervisor Evaluation of the Intern
Candidate’s Self-Evaluation of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions
Graduating Senior Survey
Employer Survey of Graduate’s Performance
Alumni Survey
Student Course Evaluation
Candidate and University Supervisor Evaluations of Cooperating Teacher
Candidate and Cooperating Teacher Evaluations of University Supervisor
Student Services Survey
Faculty/Staff Evaluation of University Support Units
Faculty Technology Survey
Part-time Faculty Colleagues Survey of Support
Merit Review Criteria for Evaluation
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines for Mentoring and Peer Review

II.B.6: Education Appeals Committee
Appeals’ Guidelines
Summary of Appeals’ Decisions

II.B.7: Degree Audit
Samples of Degree Progress Reports from PeopleSoft

II.B.8: Ed Track
Samples of Ed Track Records

II.B.9: The Field Experience Documentation System
Samples of Field Experience Documentation System Records

II.B.10: Tracking Progress in Program Standards
Samples of Degree Progress Report with Program Standards Added
Memos and Meeting Notes

II.B.11: Admissions Database

**Element II.C: Use of Data for Program Improvement**

II.C.1: Full List of Changes and Improvements

II.C.2.a: Assessment and Feedback during Field Experiences
   Field Experience Evaluation Forms
   Field Experience Feedback
   Charge of the Student Support Committee – Draft 2003

II.C.2.b: Student Teaching Midterm Self-Evaluation

II.C.3.a: Improvements in Teacher Education Coursework
   Early Childhood Education
   Elementary Education
   Secondary Education
   Special Education
   Field Experiences and Student Teaching

II.C.3.b: Improvements in Advanced Master’s Program Coursework
   Curriculum Studies
   Educational Leadership
   School Counseling
   Special Education

II.C.3.c: Improvements in Ed.D. Program
   Ed.D. Program – Recommendations for Modification
   Ed.D. Meeting Minutes

II.C.4: Improvements in Technology Opportunities for Candidates
   Technology Proposal – Spring 2002
   Survey of Faculty and Technology – Fall 2002
   Technology Survey Results – Summary by Program – Fall 2002
   Recommendations for Faculty Use of Technology – Winter 2003
   Memo from Dean Jennings
   IBM Grant
   PT3 Grant

II.C.5.a: Improvements in Internal Partnerships
   LA&S Faculty Survey Result
   Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Joint Degrees
   Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Accreditation
   Program Reports
   Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Content Area
   Advisors
   Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Field
   Experiences
   Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Accreditation
   Program Reports
Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Meetings with LA&S Chairpersons
Education Faculty Collaboration with Faculty in Other Academic Units – Collaborations – Barat Campus

II.C.5.b: Improvements in External Partnerships
Internal Stakeholders Focus Group Summary
Professional Development Partnership Agreements

II.C.6: Improvements in Technology Opportunities for Faculty
Survey of Faculty and Technology Results and Recommendations
Technology Coordinating Committee Proposal
Technology Appropriations Memo
IBM Grant
PT3 Grant
Summary of Technology Training Opportunities
Technology Professional Development Opportunity Notes and Memos
Training Course for Online Instruction

II.C.7.a: Improvements in Governance
Academic Program Review Reports
Consultants Report
School of Education Minutes Related to Organizational Structure

II.C.7.b: Improvements in Technology Resources
Survey of Faculty and Technology Results and Recommendations
Technology Coordinating Committee Proposal
Technology Appropriations Memo
IBM Grant
PT3 Grant
Summary of Technology Training Opportunities
Technology Professional Development Opportunity Notes and Memos
Training Course for Online Instruction

II.C.7.c: Improvements in Advising
Advising Survey Results – 2001
Advising Survey Results – 2003
Changes in Advising Notes and Memos

II.C.8: Academic Program Review Report
Guidebook for University Academic Program Review
Academic Program Review Report School of Education
Academic Program Review Report Math Education
Academic Program Review School of Music

II.C.9: Memoranda of Agreement
Memorandum of Agreement – School of Education
Memorandum of Agreement – Math Education
Memorandum of Agreement – School of Music
Progress Report of Memorandum of Agreement – School of Education

II.C.10: Teaching, Learning and Assessment Report
Assessment Process Handbook
Teaching, Learning and Assessment College Report – School of Education
II.C.11: Long Range Planning Process

**Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

**Element III.A: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

**III.A.1:** Field Experience Network
- Field Experience Network Agreements
- Directory of Field Experience Network Schools
- Demographic Information on Network Schools – Illinois School Report Cards

**III.A.2:** Clinical Practice Network
- Student Teaching Agreements
- Directory of Clinical Practice Network Schools
- Demographic Information on Network Schools – Illinois School Report Cards

**III.A.3:** Teachers Feedback on Evaluation Forms
- Summary of Feedback from Cooperating Teachers – Level I Evaluation Forms
- Summary of Feedback from Cooperating Teachers – Level II Evaluation Forms
- Summary of Feedback from Cooperating Teachers – Student Teaching Evaluation Forms

**III.A.4:** Professional Education Council
- Professional Education Council By-Laws
- Professional Education Council Minutes

**III.A.5:** Tuition Vouchers for Cooperating Teachers
- Tuition Voucher Letter
- Record of Tuition Vouchers (2002-03)

**III.A.6:** DePaul-Glenview Program
- DePaul/Glenview Mentor Program Handbook
- DePaul/Glenview Annual Report 1999
- DePaul/Glenview Annual Report 2000
- DePaul/Glenview Annual Report 2002
- DePaul/Glenview E-Mail

**III.A.7:** Chicago PDS Partnerships
- PDS Agreement – Prescott School
- PDS Agreement – Lincoln Park High School
- PDS Agreement – Oscar Mayer School
- Student Teaching Placements – Lincoln Park High School
- DePaul NewsLine Announcement of PDS Initiative

**III.A.8:** PDS partnership for Naperville and Barat
- PDS Meeting Notes – District 203 Naperville
- PDS Meeting Notes – District 187 North Chicago (Barat)

**III.A.9:** IBM RE3 Grant

**III.A.10:** New Teacher Induction Partnership Grant Application

**III.A.11:** Unit Faculty Collaboration with School Partners
- Meeting Minutes
Element III.B: Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

III.B.1: Field Experience Opportunities
- Field Experience Handbook – Initial Programs (Excerpt)
- Field Experience Handbook – Advanced Programs
- Field Experiences Music Education Programs

III.B.2: Field Experience Network School Agreements
- Letter of Agreement
- Sample Signed Agreements

III.B.3: Field Experience Requirements in Courses
- Field Experience Handbook – Initial Programs
- Field Experience Handbook – Advanced Programs

III.B.4: Field Experiences Handbook
- Field Experience Handbook – Initial Programs
- Field Experience Handbook – Advanced Programs

III.B.5: Elementary Education Field Experiences
- T&L 413 Course Syllabus
- T&L 413 Field Experience Work Samples

III.B.6: Early Childhood Education Field Experiences
- ECE Course Syllabi

III.B.7: Physical Education Field Experiences
- EE/PE 317 Course Syllabus
- EE/PE 317 Field Experience Documentation Sample

III.B.8: Distribution of Field Experiences Across Grade Levels
- Summary of Data for Field Experiences Across Grade Levels

III.B.9: Field Experience Evaluation Instruments
- Field Experience Evaluation Form – Level I
- Field Experience Evaluation Form – Level II

III.B.10: PDS School Partnerships
- PDS Agreement – Prescott School
- PDS Agreement – Lincoln Park High School
- PDS Agreement – Oscar Mayer School
- PDS Meeting Notes for Naperville

III.B.11: Bilingual/Bicultural Education Field Experiences
- Field Experience Handbook – Advanced Programs (Excerpt)

III.B.12: IBM RE3 Grant

III.B.13: Student Teaching Requirements
- Field Experience Handbook – Initial Programs (Excerpt)
- Mandatory Student Teaching Meeting Agenda

III.B.14: Student Teaching Expectations
- Field Experience Handbook – Initial Programs (Excerpt)
- Summarized Data – Supervisors’ Evaluations of Student Teaching

III.B.15: Evaluation of Student Teachers
- Supervisor Evaluation Form
- Cooperating Teachers Evaluation Forms

III.B.16: Educational Leadership Internship Agreements
Element III.C: Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

III.C.1: Entry Criteria for Clinical Practice
  Decision Point Criteria – Initial and Advanced

III.C.2: Exit Criteria for Clinical Practice
  Decision Point Criteria – Initial and Advanced

III.C.3: Assessments in Clinical Practice
  Supervisor Evaluation Form
  Cooperating Teachers Evaluation Forms

III.C.4: Reflection during Field Experiences
  Samples of Candidate Reflections

III.C.5: Reflection during Student Teaching
  Samples of Candidate Reflections

III.C.6: Self-Evaluation during Student Teaching
  Samples of Self-Evaluations during Student Teaching

III.C.7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation during Internship
  Samples of Reflections during Internship

III.C.8: Development of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions
  Field and Clinical Evaluation Forms
  Summarized Data of Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations – Level I Field Experiences
  Summarized Data of Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations – Level II Field Experiences
  Summarized Data of Supervisors’ Evaluations – Student Teaching
  Summarized Data of Cooperating Teachers’ Evaluations – Student Teaching
  Summarized Data of Supervisors’ Evaluations of Interns – Other School Personnel
  Description of Student Support Committees
Element IV.A: Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

IV.A.1: DePaul Graduates Teaching in Chicago Public Schools
IV.A.2: Knowledge Bases for Diversity Standards
IV.A.3: Programs Standards related to Diversity
   Bilingual/Bicultural Educational Standards
   Curriculum Studies Standards – Masters
   Curriculum Studies Standards – Doctoral
   Early Childhood Education Standards
   Educational Leadership (Principal) Standards
   Educational Leadership (Superintendent) Standards
   Elementary Education Standards
   Music Education Standards
   Physical Education Standards
   School Counseling Standards
   Secondary Education Standards
   Social and Cultural Foundations Standards
   Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction/Special Education (LBS1) Standards
IV.A.4: Syllabi for Social and Cultural Foundations Courses
IV.A.5: Instructional Strategies to Support Diverse Students
   Sample Course Syllabi
IV.A.6: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Diversity Skills
   Summarized Data – Supervisor Evaluations of Diversity for Student Teachers
   Summarized Data – Supervisor Evaluations of Diversity for Other School Personnel
IV.A.7: Graduating Seniors’ Self-Evaluations
   Summarized Data of Seniors’ Self-Evaluations of Knowledge of Diversity
   Summarized Data of Seniors’ Self-Evaluations of Skills related to Diversity
IV.A.8: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Candidates’ Diversity Dispositions
   Summarized Data of Supervisors’ Evaluations of Diversity Dispositions – Student Teachers
   Summarized Data of Supervisors’ Evaluations of Diversity Dispositions – Other School Personnel
IV.A.9: Employers’ Evaluations of Diversity Dispositions
   Summarized Data of Employers’ Evaluations of Dispositions – Teachers
   Summarized Data of Employers’ Evaluations of Dispositions – Other School Personnel
IV.A.10: Graduate Students’ Evaluations of Diversity Climate at DePaul
Element IV.B: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

IV.B.1: Faculty Diversity
  Summary of Full-Time Faculty Diversity
  Summary of Part-Time Faculty Diversity
  Summary of Supervisor Diversity
  Recruitment of Diverse Faculty

IV.B.2: Scholarly Publications and Presentations
  List of Faculty Publications
  List of Faculty Scholarly Papers and Presentations

IV.B.3: Faculty Diversity Retreats
  Meeting Materials and Notes

IV.B.4: Faculty Development Activities related to Diversity
  List of Professional Development Opportunities
  Memos and Announcements related to Diversity Opportunities

IV.B.5: Seminars on Recruiting Diverse Faculty
  Workshop Materials and Notes
  Guidebook for Search Committees

IV.B.6: The Strategic Plan - Recruitment Goals - Diverse Faculty Strategic Plan

IV.B.7: DePaul University Report on Diversity

Element IV.C: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

IV.C.1: Candidate Diversity
  Summary of Candidate Diversity

IV.C.2: Candidates' Evaluations of Teaching
  Summarized Data of Candidates’ Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

IV.C.3: Strategic Plan – Recruitment Goals for Candidate Diversity
  Strategic Initiative Task Force Report on Diversity
  University Task Force Report on Diversity

IV.C.4: Delilia Mae Stewart Scholarship Fund
  Description and Budget for Delilia Mae Stewart Scholarship Fund

IV.C.5: Golden Apple Scholars
  Lists of DePaul Golden Apple Scholars
  Golden Apple Scholar Recruitment Materials

IV.C.6: Undergraduate Graduation Rate for Students of Color
  Summarized Data of Graduation Rates for School of Education
  University Report on Retention and Graduation Rates

IV.C.7: Award Nominations for Students of Color

IV.C.8: Academic Support for Students of Color
  Office of Multicultural Student Affairs Annual Report 2003

Element IV.D: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools

IV.D.1: Field Experience Network Schools - Diverse Students
  Directory of Field Experience Network Schools
  Demographic Information on Network Schools – Illinois School Report Cards

IV.D.2: Candidate Experiences with Diverse Students
  Summarized Data involving Multicultural Settings
IV.D.3: America Reads Project
Demographics of Schools – America Reads Tutoring Project

IV.D.4: Candidate Experiences with Students with Disabilities
Summary of Field Experience Hours involving Exceptional Children
Sample Reflections related to Experiences with Exceptional Children

IV.D.5: Confronting Issues of Diversity through Feedback
Summary of Field Experience Hours involving Multicultural Settings
Sample Reflections related to Experiences with Multicultural Settings
Summarized Data related to Diversity Skills And Dispositions

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

Element V.A: Qualified Faculty
V.A.1: Faculty Qualifications
Summary of Faculty Qualifications
Faculty Vitas – Department of Leadership in Education, Language and Human Services
Faculty Vitas – Department of Education Policy Studies & Research
Faculty Vitas – Department of Teacher Education – LPC
Faculty Vitas – Department of Teacher Education – Barat
Faculty Vitas – Unit Faculty
Faculty Vitas – Part-Time Faculty

V.A.2: Faculty Experience in Schools
Summary of Faculty Experience in Schools

V.A.3: Supervisors Qualifications and Experience
Summary of Supervisor Qualifications and Experience
Faculty Vitas – Supervisors

Element V.B: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching
V.B.1: Candidates' Evaluations of Faculty Teaching
Summarized Data – Candidates’ Evaluations of Faculty Teaching
Summarized Data – Graduate Students’ Evaluations of Academic Experience

V.B.2: Excellence in Teaching Awards
Recipients of University Awards and Grants for Instruction
Profiles of SOE Excellence in Teaching Awards

V.B.3: Incorporating Diversity in Instruction
Sample Syllabi – Incorporating Diversity in Instruction

V.B.4: Candidates’ Self-Evaluations - Integrating Diversity in Instruction
Summarized Data – Candidates’ Self-Evaluations - Integrating Diversity in Instruction

V.B.5: Faculty Modeling of Technology Use
Memo – Video Conference
Sample Syllabi – Technology Use

V.B.6: Supervisors’ Evaluations of Candidate’s Technology Skills
Summarized Data – Supervisors’ Evaluations of Candidate’s Technology Skills

V.B.7: Candidates' Self-Evaluations of General Technology Use
Summarized Data – Candidates' Self-Evaluations of General Technology Use
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V.B.8: Candidates' Self-Evaluations Instructional Technology Use
Summarized Data – Candidates' Self-Evaluations Instructional Technology Use

V.B.9: Candidates' Evaluations of Faculty Teaching of Critical Thinking
Summarized Data – Candidates' Evaluations of Faculty Teaching of Critical Thinking

V.B.10: Graduating Seniors' Self-Evaluations of Ability Critical Thinking
Summarized Data – Graduating Seniors' Self-Evaluations of Ability Critical Thinking

V.B.11: Candidates' Self-Evaluations of Critical Thinking About Technology
Summarized Data – Candidates’ Self-Evaluations of Critical Thinking about Technology

V.B.12: Candidates' Self-Evaluations of Teaching Critical Thinking Skills
Summarized Data – Candidates' Self-Evaluations of Teaching Critical Thinking Skills

V.B.13: Faculty Modeling of Instructional Strategies
Sample Syllabi – Instructional Strategies Use

V.B.14: Candidates' Self-Evaluations of Teaching Instructional Strategies Use
Summarized Data – Candidates' Self-Evaluations of Teaching Instructional Strategies Use

V.B.15: Faculty Modeling Of Assessment Strategies
Sample Syllabi – Assessment Strategies Use

V.B.16: Candidates' Self - Evaluations of Assessment Strategies
Summarized Data – Candidates' Self - Evaluations of Assessment Strategies

V.B.17: Faculty Modeling of Strategies for Diverse Learning Styles
Sample Syllabi – Strategies for Diverse Learning Styles Use

Element V.C: Modeling Best Professional Practices In Scholarship

V.C.1: Scholarly Publications
Summary List of Faculty Publications
Letters and Memos related to Faculty Publications

V.C.2: Scholarly Presentations
Summary List of Scholarly Presentations
Letters and Memos related to Scholarly Presentations

V.C.3: Internal and External Grants
Summary List of Faculty Grants
Report from Office of Sponsored Programs and Research

Element V.D: Modeling Best Professional Practices In Service

V.D.1: Excellence in Service Awards
Recipients of University Awards and Grants for Service
Memo related to Service Awards

V.D.2: Service to the University
Summary List of Faculty Service to the University and School of Education
Lists and Letter related to Faculty Service

V.D.3: Professional Association Membership
Summary List of Faculty Membership in Professional Associations

V.D.4: Service to the Profession
Summary List of Service to the Profession
Letters and Memos related to Service to the Profession
V.D.5: Service to P-12 Schools
- Summary List of Service to P – 12 Schools
- Letters and Memos related to Service to P – 12 Schools

V.D.6: Center for Urban Education
- Center for Urban Education Website
- Demographic Information – Center for Urban Education Partnership Schools

V.D.7: The Stockyard Institute
- Description of Stockyard Institute

V.D.8: Institute for Teacher Development and Research
- Description of Institute for Teacher Development and Research

**Element V.E: Collaboration**

V.E.1: Professional Education Council (PEC)
- Professional Education Council By-Laws
- Professional Education Council Membership List
- Professional Education Council Minutes

V.E.2: Membership of Strategic Planning Task Force
- Strategic Planning Committee Membership List
- Strategic Planning Committee Letters and Notes

V.E.3: Membership of Liberal Studies Council
- Membership List

V.E.4: Secondary Education Content Area Advisors
- List of Advisors

V.E.5: Joint Appointments
- Memo from Dean Mike Mezey

V.E.6: Joint Degrees
- Membership List of Joint Degree Discipline Based Teams
- Memos and Notes Related to Joint Degrees
- Meeting Minutes

V.E.7: Support for Students with LD – Lincoln Park
- Productive Learning Strategies Website

V.E.8: Support for Students with LD – Barat
- Learning Opportunities Program Website

V.E.9: Chicago Professional Development Partnerships
- PDS Partnership Agreements – Chicago

V.E.10: Professional Development Partnerships for Barat and Naperville
- PDS Partnership Notes – Barat
- PDS Partnership Notes – Naperville

V.E.11: DePaul - Glenview Partnership
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Description
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Annual Report 2003
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Annual Report 2002
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Annual Report 2001
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Annual Report 2000
- DePaul - Glenview Partnership Annual Report 1999
V.E.12: America Reads
   America Reads Project Description
   America Reads Service Provider Reports
V.E.13: GEAR-UP
   GEAR-UP Project Description
   GEAR-UP Performance Report 2001 - 2003
V.E.14: Learning by Association Project
   Learning by Association Community Technology Center Grant Report 2003
   Published Articles related to Learning by Association Project
V.E.15: Bridging the Digital Divide Project
   Description from Website on Bridging the Digital Divide Project
V.E.16: VUE Resident Teacher Project
   Description from VUE Resident Teacher Project Website
V.E.17: NASA Space Science Center for Education & Outreach
   Description from NASA Space Science Center for Education & Outreach
V.E.18: Community Music Program
   Description from Community Music Program
V.E.19: The Reading and Learning Lab
   Description of Reading and Learning Lab – Brochure and Letter
   Summary of Clients’ Schools and Demographics
V.E.20: Additional Collaborations with LA&S Faculty
   Lists, Memos and Notes
V.E.21: DePaul Prep Academy
   Description from Website of DePaul Prep Academy
   P – 12 Student Work Samples

Element V.F: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
V.F.1: Candidates' Evaluations of Faculty Teaching
   Summarized Data – Candidates’ Evaluations of Faculty Teaching
V.F.2: Faculty Reflections on Teaching - Annual Reviews
   Sample Faculty Reflections on Teaching
V.F.3: Peer Reviews of Teaching
   Sample Peer Reviews of Teaching
V.F.4: Promotion and Tenure Materials
   Sample Promotion and Tenure Materials
   Dr. Christopher Worthman’s Promotion and Tenure File
V.F.5: Long Range Planning Process
V.F.6: Faculty Professional Development Goals
   Faculty Professional Development Goals – Department of Leadership in Education, Language and Human Services
   Faculty Professional Development Goals – Department of Education Policy Studies & Research
   Faculty Professional Development Goals – Department of Teacher Education – LPC
   Faculty Professional Development Goals – Department of Teacher Education – Barat
**Element V.G: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

V.G.1: Professional Development Resources for Individual Faculty Needs
Memos and Notes

V.G.2: Professional Development Opportunities
Summary List of Faculty Professional Development Opportunities
Recipients of University Professional Development Grants, Awards, and Leaves
Part-Time Faculty Handbook
Leadership Institute for Department Chairs Participant List
Faculty Travel Expense Report - 2003

V.G.3: Faculty Development Opportunities: Instruction
List of Professional Development Opportunities for Instruction
Recipients of University Grants, Awards, and Leaves for Instruction
Memos, Notes and Announcements related to Professional Development Opportunities for Instruction

V.G.4: Faculty Development Opportunities: Scholarship
List of Professional Development Opportunities for Scholarship
Recipients of University Grants, Awards, and Leaves for Scholarship
Memos, Notes and Announcements related to Professional Development Opportunities for Scholarship

V.G.5: Faculty Development Opportunities: Service
List of Professional Development Opportunities for Service
Recipients of University Grants, Awards, and Leaves for Service
Memos, Notes and Announcements related to Professional Development Opportunities for Service

V.G.6.a: History of the Conceptual Framework
Conceptual Framework – History of Development
Memos and Notes – Development of Conceptual Framework

V.G.6.b: Faculty Development Opportunities: Conceptual Framework
Conceptual Frame on School of Education Website
Meeting Agendas and Materials related to Faculty Development Opportunities – Conceptual Framework
Part-Time Faculty Handbook

V.G.7: Faculty Development Opportunities: Performance Assessment
Announcements, Memos and Letters related to Faculty Development Opportunities – Performance Assessment

V.G.8: Faculty Development Opportunities: Diversity
Announcements, Memos and Letters related to Faculty Development Opportunities – Diversity

V.G.9: Faculty Development Opportunities: Technology
Announcements, Memos and Letters related to Faculty Development Opportunities – Technology

V.G.10: Mentoring New Faculty
Invitations and Agendas – Mentoring New Faculty

V.G.11: Process for Mentoring and Peer Review
Handbook on Mentoring and Peer Review
Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

Element VI.A: Unit Leadership and Authority
VI.A.1: Professional Education Council
  Verification of Unit Authority
  Professional Education Council By-Laws, Membership and Minutes
VI.A.2: The SOE’s Barat and Naperville Campuses
  Authorization of Programs at the Barat Campus
  Barat and Naperville Collaboration Minutes and Notes
VI.A.3.a: Resources for Counseling and Academic Advising
  Sample of University-Wide Student Service Resources
  Student Service Resources on the SOE Website
  On-line Orientation slide show
  Freshman/Transfer Orientation Materials (Premier DePaul/Transfer Transition)
  Elementary and Secondary Long Term Plan Advising Materials
  Student Handbooks
  E-mail Communication with Candidates – Ed Track and Ed Major Announcements
  Handbook for Academic Success
VI.A.3.b: Collaboration of Office of Student Affairs Across the University
  Summary of Student Affairs University-Wide Collaborative Activity – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Student Affairs – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Office of Student Enrollment – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Academic Resource Center – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Academic Policy Committee – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Career Planning and Placement – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with DePaul School of Music – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Extended Campuses – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with Kappa Delta Pi Honor Society – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with ISBE Certification Board – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with University Office of Mission & Values – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with Liberal Arts & Sciences – Memos and Notes
  Collaborations with Student Affairs & Student Teaching – Memos and Notes
VI.A.4: Candidates' Evaluations of Student Affairs Services
  Summarized Data – Candidates’ Evaluations of Student Affairs Services 2001
  Summarized Data – Candidates’ Evaluations of Student Affairs Services 2003
  Summary of Changes in Advising
  Candidates’ Comments related to Academic Advising
VI.A.5: Dean’s Advisory Council Membership
  Agendas and Minutes
VI.A.6: Department Chairs Meeting Minutes
VI.A.7: Faculty Meeting Minutes

Element VI.B: Unit Budget
VI.B.1: Comparison of Faculty Salaries to Other Doctoral Institutions
Element VI.C: Personnel
VI.C.1: SOE Full-Time Faculty
  Summary of Degree and Rank for Full-Time Faculty
VI.C.2: Faculty Teaching Load
  Summary of Faculty Teaching Load 2002-2003
  Full-Time Faculty Assignments and Workload 2002-2003
VI.C.3: Part-Time Faculty Qualifications
  Summary of Part-Time Faculty Qualifications
  Summary of Supervisor Qualifications
VI.C.4: Development Opportunities for Part-Time Faculty
  Invitations, Agendas and Meeting Notes
  Part-Time Faculty Handbook
VI.C.5: Faculty Evaluations of University Support Services for Scholarship
  Summarized Data – Faculty Evaluations of University Support Services for Scholarship
VI.C.6: Staff Qualifications
  Staff List
  Staff Resumes
  Staff Goals

Element VI.D: Unit Facilities
VI.D.1: Unit Facilities
  Table of Unit Facilities – Lincoln Park
  Table of Unit Facilities – Loop
  Table of Unit Facilities – Barat
  Summarized Data – Faculty Evaluations of University Facilities

Element VI.E: Unit Resources Including Technology
VI.E.1: Departmental Budget Allocations
  School of Education Budget 2003-2004
  Allocations for Travel
VI.E.2: Data Project Manager Position
  Data Project Manager Job Description
VI.E.3: Technology Resources for the Assessment Plan
  Ed Track Database
  Field Experience Documentation System
  Admissions Database
  On-Line Grading Instructions
  Memo related to Tracking Standards
  Summarized Data – Faculty Evaluations of University Support for Technology
VI.E.4: Learning by Association Grant
Learning by Association Annual Report
Learning by Association Grant Performance Report
VI.E.5: Digital Divide Grant
Digital Divide Grant Reward Notification
VI.E.6: Electronic Portfolio Grant
Electronic Portfolio Grant Application
VI.E.7: IBM RE3 Grant
IBM RE3 Grant Invitation to Participate
VI.E.8: PT3 Grant Application
PT3 Grant Application
VI.E.9: Budget Allocations for Technology
School of Education Budget 2003-2004
Memo from Dean Jennings
VI.E.10: Resources for On-Line Instruction
On-Line Course Proposals
Faculty Training Course for On-Line Instruction
Memo – Video Conference
VI.E.11: Enhanced Technology Classrooms by Campus
Table of Unit Facilities – Lincoln Park
Table of Unit Facilities – Loop
Table of Unit Facilities – Barat
VI.E.12: Faculty Computer Lab
Website Information on Faculty Computer Lab
VI.E.13: Technology Tools for Instruction
Website Information on Instructional Technology Services
Faculty and Staff Technology Handbook
Memos related to Instructional Technology
Summarized Data – Faculty Evaluations of University Support for Instructional Technology
VI.E.14: Additional Software in SOE Collection
Lists of Recent Software Purchases by School of Education
VI.E.15: Computer Labs for Candidates
Descriptions of University Computer Labs for Candidates
Descriptions of Specialized Computer Labs for Candidates
VI.E.16: University Library Holdings
Table of University Library Holdings
VI.E.17: Education-Related Library Resources
List of Education Periodicals
Analysis of Education Titles by Year
Description of Electronic Reserve Services
Descriptions and Memos of Library Services
Summarized Data – Faculty Evaluations of University Library Services
Documents Added during Visit

1998 BOE report
1996 North Central Self-Study
1996 North Central Report
DePaul Faculty Handbook
SOE Graduate and Undergraduate Catalogs
ISBE Certification Test Results 2001-02
Fall 2003, Race and Gender of Cooperating Teachers
SOE Faculty Work Loads, 2002-03 and 2003-04
SOE Faculty by Rank, Tenure Status, and Race
SOE Research Leaves for Faculty Development
Evidence of Chicago Public Schools Academic Standards aligned with Illinois Learning Standards
Candidate Files
Glenview Work Samples
Articles regarding the Glenview Program
Dual Certification Handbook and Candidate Records of Documentation of Pre-K and Secondary Field Experience Hours
Performance Assessment Course Summary Sheets and Standards Assessment Statistics
ISBE Core Standards Matrices
Guidelines for DePaul Public Service, Quality of Instruction, and University Research Councils
Faculty Development Opportunities
APT Scores
SOE Organization Chart
SOE Student Advising Handbook
Physical Education Field Experience Placement Sites
Description of Candidate Self-Evaluation Survey methodology
Course Syllabi with multiple sections – consistent assessment of standards
List of new faculty teaching experience
Description of field experiences in ECE, PE, Dual Cert.
## NCATE Interview Attendees

### University Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doris Brown</td>
<td>Assoc. Vice President Teaching &amp; Learning Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Bryan</td>
<td>Instructional Technology Consultant to SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald E. Casey</td>
<td>Dean of the School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemarie Cooper</td>
<td>Coordinator of Library Services, Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Delaney</td>
<td>Dean of Barat College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmut Epp</td>
<td>Dean of School of Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Guan</td>
<td>Director of Instructional Technology Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Johnson</td>
<td>Asst. Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Mehnert</td>
<td>Information Services, Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kosak</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd Metzgar</td>
<td>Senior Financial Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mezey</td>
<td>Dean of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Jack Minogue</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Morrissett</td>
<td>Director of Libraries, Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Ortiz</td>
<td>Senior Executive for Institutional Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Scarborough</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Schaefer</td>
<td>Asst. Vice President, Budget Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Taylor</td>
<td>Instructional Coordinator (Library) – Library Liaison to SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Townsend</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Weaver</td>
<td>Instructional Technology Consultant, Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela E. Weffer</td>
<td>AV Academic Affairs/Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOE Administrators and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura BonDurant</td>
<td>Advisor – Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Bordwell</td>
<td>Coordinator of Field Experiences &amp; Student Teaching – Lincoln Park Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bollwark</td>
<td>Data Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Brynn</td>
<td>Advisor – Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Donovan</td>
<td>Associate Chair/Assoc. Professor – Teacher Education Early Childhood Educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Filipiak</td>
<td>Field Office Placement Coordinator – Barat Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hashimoto</td>
<td>Peoplesoft Manager/Degree Coordinator/Certification Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Haymes</td>
<td>Chair/Assoc. Professor – Education Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Humphries</td>
<td>Advisor – Naperville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Jennings</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Julian</td>
<td>Asst. Dean for External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Kuzmic</td>
<td>Chair/Assoc. Professor – Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan M. Lakebrink</td>
<td>Chair – Leadership in Education, Language and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Massey</td>
<td>Advisor – Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melanie Matthews  Advising Assistant – Lincoln Park
David Nissim-Sabat  Advisor – Lincoln Park
Ben Richards  Advisor – Barat
Susan Shamoon  Administrative Assistant, Barat
Margaret L. Strzynski  Budget Manager, SOE
Melinda Wesonga  Advisor – Lincoln Park
Carol Wren  Associate Dean for Academic Programs

SOE Faculty
Elaine Adler  Barat, part time faculty
Joan Berger  Early Childhood Education, part time faculty
Enora Brown  Assoc. Professor – Social & Cultural Foundations Education
V. Ellen Burdge  Visiting Instructor – Elementary Education
Nell Cobb  Assoc. Professor – Elementary/Secondary Education
Jennifer L. Cohen  Asst. Professor – Secondary Education
Al Cohen  Barat, part time faculty
Sheryl Covitt  Elementary Education, part time faculty
Arlene R. Crandall  University Supervisor
Dolores E. Cross  Visiting Scholar – Doctoral Program
Sharon Damore  Asst. Professor – Elementary Education
Kathy De Nicols  University Supervisor
Marie Donovan  Assoc. Chair/Professor – Early Childhood Education
Fr. Anthony Dosen  Asst. Professor – Educational Leadership
Jim Duignan  Assoc. Professor – Elementary/Secondary Education
Joseph F. Ekpo  Human Development, part time faculty
Lucy Felbinger  Asst. Professor – Special Education, Barat
Martha Fewell  Asst. Professor – Secondary Education, Barat
Anna Marie Frank  Assoc. Professor – Physical Education
Ernest M. Grant  Social and Cultural Foundations, part time faculty
Marguerite Grizzi  Early Childhood Education, part time faculty
Debra Gurvitz  part time faculty – Teacher Education
Carolyn Hale  Elementary Education, part time faculty
Margaret Harrigan  Supt. In Residence – Educational Leadership
Katherine Kapustka  Asst. Professor – Elementary Education
Andrea Kaufman  Asst. Professor – Educational Leadership
Hanna Kim  Asst. Professor – Secondary Education
Richard Kozoll  Asst. Professor – Elementary Education
Sonja Lacelles  Early Childhood Education, part time faculty
Yo-An Lee  Asst. Professor – Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Pauline Lipman  Assoc. Professor – Social and Cultural Foundations
Kate Liston  Visiting Instructor – Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction
Jennifer Loncola  Asst. Professor – Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction
Charles Lutzow  Barat, part time faculty
Ginger Malin Asst. Professor – Secondary Education
Fr. Patrick McDevitt Asst. Professor – Human Services & Counseling
Lucine Mastalerz Elementary Education, part time faculty
Gayle Mindes Professor – Teacher Education
Alice Moss Early Childhood Ed., part time faculty, Univ. Supervisor
Lee Mulcrone Barat, part time faculty
Helen Murphy University Supervisor
Chris Murray Asst. Professor – Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction
Judy Napier part time faculty – Teacher Education
Isabel Nunez Human Development, part time faculty
Mary Okwuje Social and Cultural Foundations, part time faculty
Roxanne Owens Assoc. Professor – Elementary Education
Peter Pereira Assoc. Professor – Teacher Education/Curriculum Studies
Dale Peters University Supervisor
Daniel Powers part time faculty – Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction
Amira Proweller Assoc. Professor – Social & Cultural Foundations Education
Barney Ricca Full-Time Faculty – Education, Barat
Steven Rogg Assoc. Professor – Elementary Education
Sr. Frances Ryan Assoc. Professor – Human Services & Counseling
Ken Sarrubi Assoc. Professor – Physical Education
Thomas Schmitt University Supervisor
Penny Silvers Asst. Professor – Education, Barat
Richard Simmons part time faculty
Sonia Soltero Asst. Professor – Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Ellen Steinberg part time faculty - Social & Cultural Foundations Education
Layla Suleiman Asst. Professor – Social & Cultural Foundations Education
Duncan P. Sylvester Asst. Professor – Human Services & Counseling
John Taccarino Assoc. Professor – Social & Cultural Foundations Education
Frank L. Tavano Elementary Education, part time faculty
So-young Tikoo Asst. Professor – Secondary Education
Katie VanSluys Asst. Professor – Elementary Education
Mary Ventrelli University Supervisor
Paul Vorwick University Supervisor
Dennis Walker Barat, part time faculty
Kathryn Wiggins Assoc. Professor – Physical Education/Elementary Education
Nancy Williams Professor – Language, Literacy & Specialized Instruction
James Wolfinger Asst. Professor – Secondary Education
Liliana Zecker Assoc. Professor – Elementary Education

Non-SOE Faculty
Ralph Ashby Full-Time Faculty – History, Barat
Jeffery Bergen Professor – Mathematics
Judy Bramble Full-Time Faculty – Interdisciplinary Science, Barat
Glen Carman Assoc. Professor – Modern Languages
Gary P. Cestaro Assoc. Professor – Modern Languages
Nobuko Chikamatsu Assoc. Professor – Modern Languages
Susanna Epp Professor – Mathematics
Mark Johnston Professor – Modern Languages
Paul Jaskot Chair/Assoc. Professor – Art Department
Roger Jones Professor – Mathematics
Catherine Larsen Asst. Professor – Music Education, University Supervisor
Helen Marlborough Assoc. Professor – English
Patrick McHaffie Assoc. Professor – Geography
Tom Murphy Assoc. Professor – Chemistry/Env. Sciences
Lynn Narasimhan Assoc. Professor – Mathematics
Warren Schultz Assoc. Professor – History
Margaret Silliker Asst. Professor – Biology
Michael Smith Assoc. Professor – Music
Lourdes Torres Assoc. Professor – Modern Languages

Candidates
Elisabete J. Abrantes Elementary Education, Student Teacher
Lilli Barthen Elementary Education, Student, Barat Initial Candidate
Amy Blascoe Student Teacher, Oscar Meyer
Nicholas Bretz Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate
Robert Bruns Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Amy Cascarano Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate
Esther Choi Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Elizabeth Cochran Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Erica Collins Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Bridget Connolly Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Maryneth DeLaMar Educational leadership, Internship – Intern
Michael Deleon Secondary Education, Student
Elizabeth Doran Dual Certification, Student
Jessica Einhorn Elementary Education, Student Teacher
Jim Ernst Secondary Education, Student
Jayson Foster Secondary Education, Student
John Fouser Secondary Education, Student
Laura Franke Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate
Kristina Fritzscche Secondary Education - French, Initial Candidate
Mara Fuller Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Heidi Guendling Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Quinn Hanzel Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate
Ron Harth Learning Behavioral Specialist, Student
Elizabeth Haskins Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Margaret Hermann Student, Barat Initial Candidate
Shelia Hiller Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Stacey Hodits Elementary Education, Barat Initial Candidate
Beth Howard  Student, Barat Initial Candidate
Barbara Hueter  Elementary Education, Student Teacher
Vedad Imamovic  Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Molly Koenig  Secondary Education, Student Teacher
Gynger Landivar  Elementary Education, Student Teacher
George Lowen  Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Kelly Maciejewski  Elementary Education, Initial Candidate
Annette McCafferty  Elementary Education, Barat Initial Candidate
Pete Nixen  HSC- School counseling, Internship – Intern
Mary Oster  Student, Barat Initial Candidate
Jennifer Panush  Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Frank Patrick  Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Rachel Perla  Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Jessica Presti  Secondary Education, Initial Cand.
Laurel Price  Secondary Education, Student Teacher
Renee Ramsey  Physical Education, Student
Laurel Rifkin  Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed, Initial Cand.
Lena Sankhavanija  Secondary Education, Student
Vicki R. Sides  Social & Cultural Foundations, Advanced Candidate
Oliver Sindabi  Social & Cultural Foundations, Advanced Candidate
Rebecca Snyder  Dual Certification – Elementary & Special Ed., Initial Cand.
Velia Soto  Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate
Richard Stamm  Secondary Education, Student
Jim Syrek  Secondary Education, Student Teacher
Joe Tabisz  Physical Education, Student
Nicole Tantillo  Learning Behavioral Specialist, Student
Kendall Taylor  Social & Cultural Foundations, Advanced Candidate
Selina Torres  HSC- School counseling, Internship – Intern
Lauren Tortorice  Physical Education, Student
Kristen Ulery  Educational Leadership, Advanced Candidate
Sara Walls  Social & Cultural Foundations, Advanced Candidate
Beatriz Werner  Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Advanced Candidate

School Partners
Rob Allen  Department Chairperson – Science, Barat HS
Renaud Beaudoin  Principal, Newberry Academy
Frank Belmont  Department Chairperson – Social Studies, Barat HS
Robert Blitstein  Principal – Oscar Mayer
Jennifer Coles  Cooperating Teacher, St. Josaphat
Alejandra Dorantes  1st Grade Teacher, Ortiz de Dominguez School
Kevin Dorken  Teacher on Assignment – Administration, Glenview – DePaul Partnership
Marlene Feder  Communication Department – Teacher, Barat HS
Linda Foley-Acevedo  Asst. Principal, Newberry Academy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Funk</td>
<td>Launch Principal, Oscar Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Goodrich</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher, Lincoln Park HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjelika Herrera-Vest</td>
<td>Principal, Ortiz de Dominguez School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Janelle Lim</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Mays</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Miller</td>
<td>Director of Human Resources, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Weiss Narea</td>
<td>Principal – LaSalle Language Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Nerah</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher, Oscar Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Owens</td>
<td>Coordinator, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Roe</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher, Lincoln Park HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Rohleder</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher, St. Josaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Russin</td>
<td>Principal, St. Josaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Sauri</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, Ortiz de Dominguez School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Schaefer</td>
<td>Department Chairperson – Communication, Barat HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Slaby</td>
<td>Resident I – Clinical Model, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Strilich</td>
<td>Clinical Model Intern, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Terry</td>
<td>Principal – Attea Middle School, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Traback</td>
<td>Principal – Chavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Walther</td>
<td>Principal – Hoffman School, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Weber</td>
<td>Superintendent, Glenview – DePaul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl L. Williams</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, Oscar Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Wright</td>
<td>Principal, Lincoln Park HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko Yamanaka</td>
<td>Teacher – Grade 1, Newberry Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Yu</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher, Oscar Meyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. CORRECTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

None noted.