NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND/CUNY

2800 Victory Boulevard
Staten Island, NY 10314
3/14/2010-3/16/2010

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report

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

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

The College of Staten Island (CSI) is one of the 23 institutions of The City University of New York (CUNY), the nation's largest, urban university. CUNY comprises 11 senior colleges, of which CSI is one; six community colleges; and six honors colleges and graduate and professional schools. CUNY offers 1,750 programs, more than 230 majors leading to associate and baccalaureate degrees, and more than 160 graduate-degree majors. As of fall 2009, enrollment across these 23 institutions has exceeded a record 480,000 students.

The City University of New York traces its roots to an 1847 public referendum that supported tuition-free higher education for city residents. Founded by Townsend Harris in the same year, the Free Academy, which later became the College of the City of New York and then City College of New York, provided poor and immigrant males a higher education. In 1870, Hunter College, founded by Irish immigrant and social reformer Thomas Hunter, was established as a teacher-training school for women. In 1961, Hunter College joined with City College, Brooklyn College, and Lehman College to form the cornerstones of CUNY.

CSI was founded in 1976 through the merger of two existing institutions, Staten Island Community College and Richmond College. Staten Island Community College opened in 1955 and was the first community college to join the CUNY system. Richmond College, founded ten years later, was an upper-division senior college granting bachelor's degrees and master's degrees. By design, Richmond College was experimental and alternative. Programs in education at Richmond College were marked by attention to social justice, multiculturalism, and interdisciplinary instruction. Thus, Staten Island Community College, Richmond College, and CSI were all established to provide their candidates with the knowledge and abilities to contribute to a changing society.

Exhibits:
A.1.1., CUNY's Historical Context
A.1.2., CSI's History

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

The College of Staten Island is, like the University, committed to both access and excellence. This double commitment is especially critical given CSI's status as the only public college on Staten Island and the one instance in which CUNY is represented in a borough by one unit alone. The College offers the associate degree in selected areas, a comprehensive range of baccalaureate programs, selected master's programs, and, in cooperation with the CUNY Graduate Center, doctoral programs.

The College of Staten Island's remarkable campus, with its superb laboratories, studios, and classrooms, serves the pivotal endeavors of teaching and research that promote discovery and dissemination of knowledge while developing human minds and spirits.

The College's faculty, administration, and staff practice their commitment to educational excellence as they instill in students preparing to enter their chosen careers an enduring love of learning, a sensitivity to pluralism and diversity, a recognition of their responsibility to work for the common good, and an informed respect for the interdependence of all people.

The College's mission is driven by 12 strategic goals, one of which is the preparation of educators at all levels and to work collectively to seek new and effective approaches to P-12 education.

Exhibit:
A.2., About CSI: Goals

A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

The College of Staten Island is classified as an urban institution that is located in New York City's least-urbanized setting (as measured by population density). Set in a park-like landscape, the campus is centrally located on Staten Island, New York City's fastest growing borough and New York State's fastest growing county. For example, the estimated population of Staten Island in 2008 was 487,000, representing nearly 10% growth in population since 2000. This growth is significant as CSI has and continues to be the preferred public option of a majority of the borough's higher education attendees.

Exhibit:
A.3., About CSI

A.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

B. The unit

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

The professional education unit at CSI is its Department of Education (herein referred to as the "unit"). A most distinctive and formative characteristic of the unit is its position within the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences. It is not a school of education separate from the mission of undergraduate education, with its own administrative structure, budget, and resources. This unique configuration demonstrates the College-wide commitment to both the liberal arts and sciences in teacher education, and translates into the fact that undergraduate candidates at CSI do not major in Education.

For example, those interested in Early Childhood Education or Childhood Education major in a multidisciplinary program called Science, Letters, and Society (SLS), while simultaneously completing a sequence of courses in education. Undergraduate candidates who are interested in Adolescence Education major in their specific disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, English, History, Mathematics, or Spanish. Consequently, the faculty of the Department of Education collaborate closely with members of these programs.

As an outgrowth of this commitment and collaboration, members from the unit and several of the Liberal Arts and Sciences departments meet on a monthly basis to discuss issues of curriculum, pedagogy, and instruction. This body, the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC), has met for over 20 years and is chaired by the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 1
Professional Education Faculty

Professional Education Faculty	Full-time in the Unit	Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit	Part-time at the Institution & the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)	Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice	Total # of Professional Education Faculty
Number of faculty	24	0	40	0	64

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Undergraduate Adolescent English	Bachelor's	39	NCTE	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Graduate Adolescent English (Sequence 2)	Master's	56	NCTE	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Adolescent Mathematics	Bachelor's	46	NCTM	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Graduate Adolescent Mathematics (Sequence 2)	Master's	24	NCTM	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Adolescent Science	Bachelor's	12	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Graduate Adolescent Science (Sequence 2)	Master's	4	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Adolescent Social Studies	Bachelor's	14	NCSS	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Graduate						Submitted for re-

Adolescent Social Studies (Sequence 2)	Master's	8	NCSS	Yes	Approved	approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Childhood	Bachelor's	286	ACEI	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 2)	Master's	178	ACEI	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Early Childhood	Bachelor's	141	NAEYC	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Undergraduate Adolescent Spanish	Bachelor's	3	ACTFL	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 2)	Master's	54	CEC	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program	Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Graduate Adolescent English (Sequence 1)	Master's	11	State	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Adolescent Mathematics (Sequence 1)	Master's	8	State	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Adolescent Science (Sequence 1)	Master's	14	State	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Adolescent Social Studies (Sequence 1)	Master's	13	State	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 1)	Master's	64	State	No	Approved	Not submitted
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 1)	Master's	51	CEC	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)
Educational Leadership	Post-Master's	32	ELCC	Yes	Approved	Submitted for re-approval (9/15/09)

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are

offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

None of the aforementioned initial or advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies.

The unit offers three alternate route programs for graduate candidates. These programs, referred to as "Sequence 2" programs, are offered in Special Education, Childhood and Adolescence (multiple content areas). Each leads to a MS Ed. and an initial certification. Sequence 2 is designed for college graduates who have not completed programs leading to initial certification and wish to become teachers. Upon satisfactory completion of the program, candidates will have met the academic requirements for initial certification.

Sequence 2 programs differ from Sequence 1 in that they 1) require more course work (45-49 versus 33-34 credits); 2) have a clinical practice component and; 3) lead to initial certification, whereas Sequence 1 programs are advanced and lead to what the New York State Education Department refers to as "professional" certification.

B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]

A number of substantive changes have taken place in the institution and unit. Because the unit is completely embedded in the larger institution, changes that have occurred at the institution-level are significant as they have or certainly will affect the unit. Among these is the creation of three administrative positions. First, in 2008 Dr. William Fritz assumed the role of Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs. Under his leadership, the institution created three positions: Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Susan Holak; Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, Dr. E.K. Park and; Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management, Ms. Mary Beth Reilly. These positions reflect the institution's agenda to improve instruction and assessment, support faculty research, and increase enrollment. Second, the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, of which the unit is a part, is now headed by Dr. Christine Flynn Saulnier, who joined the institution in August 2009.

The changes in administration have supported the institution's enrollment increase: 13,878 students in fall 2009, an all-time high and a six percent increase over last year. Graduates are now accepted at top professional schools, graduate schools, and in a broad array of high-profile jobs. Additional empirical data to support the rise in reputation can be found in the fact that this year enrollment in the entering Macaulay Honors class has doubled and The Verrazano School and The Teacher Education Honors Academy continue to grow. And for the first time in seven years, graduate enrollment increased.

These changes have influenced the unit. For example, the unit developed a 12-month Master's program specifically for recent graduates who had difficulty securing their first teaching position as a result of the New York City's hiring freeze. By scheduling courses in way that enables candidates to complete an advanced program in 12 months, the unit is contributing to the institution's overall increase in graduate enrollment. Moreover, as the quality of entering students increases, the unit has been able to develop programs to attract high-achieving students in Mathematics and Science into its initial preparation programs. For example, The Teacher Education Honors Academy marks the institution's commitment to supporting the unit as it continues to prepare teachers for the City's public schools, particularly in content areas that have been historically hard to staff. A final example is the unit's new Special Education Middle Childhood Generalist (Grades 5-9) program. Started this past year, this program enables candidates to earn a certification that will allow them to seek employment in middle schools.

This program, too, has contributed to the institution's record enrollment. Other substantive changes that have taken place in the unit are described in the exhibit below.

Exhibit:
B.6., Summary of Major Data-Driven Changes

B.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

- **the vision and mission of the unit**
- **philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit**
- **knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit**
- **candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards**
- **summarized description of the unit's assessment system**

VISION AND MISSION OF THE UNIT
Similar to the College and University of which it is part, the vision of the unit is commitment to access and excellence. Consistent with its role as a department within a college that is guided by these twin ideals, the faculty recognizes as their purpose the education of candidates to become effective and dedicated members of the educational community. The unit is committed to providing the breadth and depth of knowledge required to stimulate candidates' growth as professional educators in an environment that is also conducive to personal development. Furthermore, the unit is committed not only to academic excellence informed by research, but also to providing an education that excites and motivates, addresses ethical standards, fosters critical thinking, respects differences, nurtures fairness, acknowledges creativity, challenges existing beliefs and assumptions, promotes the belief that all students can learn, encourages flexibility and sensitivity, and develops expertise in the process of teaching, learning, and educational leadership.

The unit's primary mission is to prepare educators who are dedicated to improving education. Improving education requires that teachers and school leaders develop intellectual autonomy and exhibit professional responsibility. The unit defines intellectual autonomy as the ability to generate ideas that

are influenced but not constrained by the thinking of others. It involves continuous examination of beliefs, values, methods, practices, and approaches to learning and learners. The unit defines professional responsibility as the ability to understand the obligations of the education profession and act in ways that are in accordance with it. These obligations include respect for the structure of the profession, an awareness of existing opportunities and limitations, and participation in the profession's growth. The unit firmly believes, however, that these two foundational ideas are interdependent.

PHILOSOPHY, PURPOSES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The unit's philosophy is reflected in the purposes and goals of its conceptual framework (CF) and has been informed by a number of scholars and theories. A complete list of these references can be found in Exhibit C.1.1. The unit's primary purpose is to graduate candidates who exhibit intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility. To operationalize intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility, the unit's work revolves around three goals and their respective objectives and outcomes. The goals reflect the qualities and skills that candidates develop while they complete their programs. In particular, the unit believes that each of the goals leads to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make educators participatory and responsible citizens in a democratic society and in the profession. The unit intends for these goals and their objectives to result in the empowerment of students, teachers, school leaders, faculty, parents, and the community. These goals, objectives, and outcomes are briefly described below and in more detail in Exhibit C.1.2

GOAL 1: GAIN CONTENT KNOWLEDGE AND DEVELOP PEDAGOGY
Acquire an understanding of subject matter across the curriculum and apply it in pedagogically appropriate ways.

Objective A: Knowledge of Subject Matter.
Outcome: demonstrate breadth, depth, and accuracy of knowledge in the content area.

Objective B: Knowledge of Pedagogy.
Outcome: present subject matter to others in effective, concrete, and conceptual terms.

Objective C: Knowledge of Learners.
Outcomes: 1) demonstrate knowledge of cognitive styles and abilities and 2) demonstrate knowledge of recognition of a variety of characteristics of children (e.g., culture, language, and family).

GOAL 2: ENGAGE ALL STUDENTS
Design and implement instruction that motivates and engages all students.

Objective A: Skill of Planning.
Outcomes: 1) develop lesson plans, including attention to planning for diverse learners; 2) integrate ongoing, short-term plans with long-term goals and learning objectives that meet state standards and; 3) consider alternatives in the event that the plan needs adjusting.

Objective B: Skill of Teaching.
Outcomes: 1) use a variety of teaching methods; 2) implement and modify instructional strategies that promote cognitive, social, and personal development of all students; 3) accept and incorporate students' ideas and questions into the lesson and; 4) integrate technology into the curriculum.

Objective C: Skill of Effective Classroom Management.
Outcomes: 1) use effective classroom management techniques; 2) create a learning environment that encourages positive interactions and; 3) encourage responsibility and leadership.

Objective D: Skill of Assessment.
Outcomes: 1) select and administer a variety of assessment tools; 2) use initial and ongoing assessment to guide instruction; 3) use assessment information to identify supports and adaptations and; 4) use information from multiple assessments to measure instructional impact over time and make necessary adjustments to instruction.

GOAL 3: DEMONSTRATE PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS
Conduct oneself in contextually appropriate ways.

Objective A: Reflective Practice.
Outcomes: 1) demonstrate purposeful self-reflection (e.g., using journals, portfolios) to enhance students' cognitive, social, and personal development and 2) demonstrate purposeful self-reflection to advance teacher identity.

Objective B: Collaboration.
Outcomes: 1) participate jointly in professional activities and 2) communicate and collaborate with P-12 students, colleagues, parents, agencies, and the larger community.

Objective C: Respect for Others.
Outcomes 1) respect the rights and responsibilities of individuals in a democratic society; 2) respect cultural, familial, and linguistic diversity and; 3) respect colleagues, families, and community members. Respect for others through these three outcome areas is demonstrated by candidates' abilities to treat all students, colleagues, and community members with fairness and dignity; their understanding for the need and value of differences; and the belief that all students can learn.

CANDIDATES' PROFICIENCIES
The following six proficiencies are evident throughout all programs and reflect the institutional standards promoted by the unit through its programs:

1. Shared Vision
The CF is designed to guide candidate development toward successful program completion and to provide for program improvement based on levels of candidate success. It is organized from the mission statement to goals to objectives to outcomes, each a more specific subdivision of the previous. Whereas goals are general, long-range purposes, objectives are specific, measurable, and active; outcomes are specific and observable products, benefits, or performances that show that an objective has been met. Goals, objectives, and outcomes are developed in different courses and experiences through the programs of study and are intended to develop from lower to higher outcome levels in later stages of the program.

2. Coherence
The CF provides the foundation for course goals, objectives, and outcomes across programs. These are also the outcomes captured through the unit's assessment system, which allows for program coherence to be continually measured and evaluated. The structure of the CF has evolved to the point where goals, objectives, and outcomes are understood and implemented in all components of education programs, from orientation to field and clinical experiences.

3. Professional Commitments and Dispositions
The goals of the CF articulate a commitment to aiding candidates in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of today's urban educators. Specifically, CSI Goal #3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions, speaks directly to this topic and includes in its objectives the importance of reflective practice, collaboration, and respect of others, all components of dispositions necessary for an effective

educator. Dispositions appropriate for effective teaching are addressed throughout the programs and are assessed through specific assignments, evaluations of application essays, and evaluations of behavior during clinical fieldwork.

4. Diversity and Fairness
The unit's commitment to diversity is embedded in the goals of its CF, especially, CSI Goal 2: Engage All Students. The goals clearly demonstrate a dedication to teaching the diverse students who populate New York City's schools. Courses are designed to increase candidates' knowledge, broaden their perspectives, reinforce the need to treat all students respectfully and fairly, and increase their understanding of and respect for diverse learners, families, communities, and other professionals. The latter upholds the unit's commitment to fairness and a belief that all students can learn.

5. Technology
The integration of technology into coursework is a requirement for every program that was re-registered with the State of New York. The unit's commitment to technology is demonstrated through CSI Goal 2: Engage all Students; Objective B: Skill of teaching; Outcome 4: Integrate technology in the curriculum. Therefore, candidates as well as faculty members use a variety of technologies in class presentations, assignments, lesson plans, and field experiences.

6. Alignment with Professional and State Standards
One method of providing for the quality of our programs is to align the unit's goals with relevant standards. These standards include the New York State Standards for Teacher Education Programs (NYSSTEP), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the Educational Leaders Constituent Council (ELCC).

SUMMARY OF THE UNIT'S ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
The unit's Assessment System has matured since its 2007 Focused Visit and has become an exemplar for other departments across the institution. As the institution's leadership continues to develop and sustain a "culture of assessment," the unit has been actively collaborating with other departments as they too develop their own assessment systems. The unit's Assessment System, as well as those being developed by other departments, consists of three critical components. A more complete description of the unit's Assessment System can be found in Exhibit C.1.3.

First, the Assessment System is focused on "closing the loop." The key assessments identified by the unit are analyzed and interpreted in an effort to make data-driven decisions that improve candidates' course experiences and programs. Changes are then monitored to ensure that they have had the desired effect.

Second, members of the unit's faculty, the institution, and the larger P-12 community are actively involved in the unit's Assessment System. Participation from an array of stakeholders ensures that the system's inputs (i.e., key assessments) and outputs (e.g., changes in programs) have value outside of the unit and reflect issues that are relevant for current and prospective teacher-candidates in P-12 schools. The system was first designed in consultation with these various stakeholders, who continue to shape how, when, and why the unit's candidates are assessed.

In addition to these two components, a third is its reliance on a number of key assessments that enable the unit to get a complete picture of candidates' experiences and proficiencies as they relate to the objectives identified in its CF. Moreover, because data are collected over time, the unit is able to more accurately identify noteworthy trends. The combination of multiple key assessments collected over time permits the Assessment System to provide a thorough and well-informed analysis and interpretation.

Exhibits:
C.1.1., CF References
C.1.2., CF Description
C.1.3., Assessment System

C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the last visit?

There have been no changes to the Conceptual Framework since the unit's last visit. However, since the unit's focused visit in December 2007, the unit has systemically revisited significant elements of the framework in an effort to ensure that it reflects its vision and mission. These conversations have primarily occurred in committees internal to the unit, particularly the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. The consensus that emerged from these conversations was that it was best to first collect, analyze, and interpret data that would ultimately better inform any conversation about the Conceptual Framework's utility. Given that the unit is only two years removed from its focused visit, the unit believes that any changes would be premature until a closer and more thorough examination of the data is possible.

However, the unit has engaged in efforts to convey and educate colleagues across the institution about the Conceptual Framework and how its shapes candidates' experiences. Because the unit's candidates take a significant amount of coursework offered through other academic Departments, the unit believes that it is critical to provide opportunities for faculty external to the unit to both comment on and implement the philosophy, purposes, goals, and objectives that constitute the Conceptual Framework. These discussions have occurred through a number of formal institution-wide committees, including the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum, the General Education and Assessment Committees. The unit expects these conversations to foster a greater awareness that the unit's conceptual framework is one that cuts across departmental boundaries and needs to be informed by faculty external to the unit. When the unit has collected a sufficient amount of quality data, colleagues from across the institution will be involved in the conversation about any proposed changes to the Conceptual Framework.

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

Not applicable.

C.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant

differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates) and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)
- Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)
- Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)
- Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could

be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

For Period: 2007 - 2008

Program	Name of Content Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)	All Content Specialty Tests (CSTs)	214	87
Undergraduate Adolescence Science	Biology CST	1	100
Graduate Adolescence Science (Sequence 2 Initial)	Biology CST	2	100
Undergraduate Adolescence Science	Chemistry CST	1	100
Undergraduate Adolescence English	English Language Arts CST	6	83
Graduate Adolescence English (Seq 2 Initial)	English Language Arts CST	9	88
Undergraduate Adolescence Mathematics	Mathematics CST	1	100
Graduate Adolescence Math (Sequence 2 Initial)	Mathematics CST	2	100
Undergraduate Childhood	Multi-Subject CST	86	88
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 2 Initial)	Multi-Subject CST	45	89
Undergraduate Early Childhood	Multi-Subject CST	24	83
Undergraduate Adolescence Social Studies	Social Studies CST	3	100
Graduate Adolescence Social St. (Seq 2 Initial)	Social Studies CST	10	80
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 2 Initial)	Students with Disabilities CST	7	86
Grad. Special Education (Seq 1 Additional Cert.)	Students with Disabilities CST	18	89

1a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

All of the unit's initial teacher preparation programs have been submitted for national review. The one exception to this is the unit's Undergraduate Adolescence Spanish program, which has for the past several years been under-enrolled (approximately three students per academic year). Because sufficient data were not available, this program was not submitted for national review.

1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that

advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

All candidates in advanced programs (that have not been already submitted for national review) met the minimum level (emerging) of in-depth knowledge of the content areas delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. In addition, in most semesters about 90% of candidates performed at levels deemed proficient or distinguished.

Further evidence implicating the knowledge of subject matter of the candidates comes from GPAs. Those who enter the advanced programs are required to have a minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.75. In addition, candidates must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in their graduate program and are placed on probation if they do not. Finally, candidates eligible to enroll in the two-semester capstone educational research sequence (EDD 630/631) must have at least a 3.0 GPA.

Evidence of this is presented in Exhibit 1a.3., In-Depth Content Knowledge in the Advanced Programs

Exhibits:
1a.3.1., In-Depth Content Knowledge in the Advanced Programs
1a.3.2., Sample Student Work

1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

The alumni survey data indicate that candidates believed that the unit provided effective preparation in content-related areas; those from the Childhood and Special Education programs indicating the highest levels of satisfaction with their preparation.

The prospective employer survey also indicated that employers found CSI graduates to have a "strong" grasp of content. The employer survey was not only sent to employers, but also those who may be likely to hire CSI graduates. Therefore, the response rate for this survey (2.42%) is not as high as may be expected.

Exhibits:
1a.4.1., Preparation about Learners in the Alumni Survey
1a.4.2., Pages 10 - 15 in the Prospective Employer Survey Results

1a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit

must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

All of the unit's initial teacher preparation programs have been submitted for national review.

The one exception to this is the unit's Undergraduate Adolescence Spanish program, which has for the past several years been under-enrolled. Because sufficient data were not available, this program was not submitted for national review.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Both the alumni and prospective employer surveys found that the respective groups felt good about graduates' preparation and performance in pedagogical content knowledge and skills. In fact, scores in these areas were among the highest. Alumni indicated that, during their program, they received between "much" and "very much" opportunity to: identify and address a variety of learning needs; design lessons; develop curricula that build on students' experiences, interests, and abilities; develop strategies for reflecting on their teaching to make instructional changes (and thus articulate the reasons for their decisions); and learn about the IEP process and other formal processes and means of obtaining help for children with special needs. The mean scores on these items (range 1 [lowest] to 5) were 4.5, 4.6, 3.3, 4.0, and 4.1.

The lowest of these ratings (working with family members to better understand students and support their learning) was cited as an area to address by the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee recommended that the general faculty address this issue; in response, the faculty voted to encourage candidates to attend family-related activities during clinical practice (parent-teacher conferences, etc.) and to establish support liaisons for recent graduates in this area. Employers reported that the unit's graduates demonstrated "strong" instructional strategies (Exhibit 1b.3.2., p. 11) and skills to design developmentally- and age-appropriate lessons (Exhibit 1b.3.2., p. 12).

Exhibits:
1b.3.1., Preparation about Learners from the Alumni Survey
1b.3.2., Pages 11 & 12 in the Prospective Employer Survey Results

1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4

below.]

Both the alumni and prospective employer surveys found that the respective groups were very satisfied with graduates' preparation and performance in pedagogical content knowledge and skills. In fact, scores in these areas were among the highest.

Alumni indicated that, during their program, they received between "much" and "very much" opportunity to:

- identify and address a variety of learning needs,

- design lessons,

- develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities,

- develop strategies for reflecting on your teaching to make instructional changes (and thus articulate the reasons for their decisions), and

- learn about the IEP process and other formal processes and means of obtaining help for children with special needs.

The mean scores on these items (range 1 [lowest] to 5) were 4.5, 4.6, 3.3, 4.0, and 4.1. The lowest of these ratings, working with family members to better understand students and support their learning, was cited as an area to address by the Assessment Committee. Here, too, the Assessment Committee recommended that the general faculty address this issue; in response, the faculty voted to encourage candidates to attend family-related activities during clinical practice (parent-teacher conferences, etc.) and to establish support liaisons for recent graduates in this area.

Employers reported that the unit's graduates demonstrated "strong" instructional strategies (page 11 of results) and skills to design developmentally- and age-appropriate lessons (page 12 of results).

Exhibits:
1b.3.1., Preparation about Learners from the Alumni Survey
1b.3.2., Pages 11 & 12 in the Prospective Employer Survey Results

1b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation

and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Key assignment and fieldwork evaluations comprise the core of the unit's assessment of candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate student learning. The results from these assessments indicate that the unit's initial and advanced candidates demonstrate proficient levels of pedagogical knowledge, and can use it for designing, teaching, and assessing lessons; all mean scores are above three ("proficient") for these areas.

The overall ratings of candidates' demonstration of pedagogical knowledge from both key assignments and clinical field experience evaluations are normally proficient (3 or higher where 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = emerging, 3 = proficient, and 4 = exemplary); the lowest ratings were that candidates demonstrated emerging knowledge of pedagogy--none of unsatisfactory pedagogy knowledge.

The picture portrayed of pedagogy skills is quite similar. Over 80% of candidates' performance planning and assessing student learning are rated as proficient or higher--both on key assignments and clinical fieldwork evaluations.

Finally, over 75% of the candidates are assessed to be effectively impacting student learning and to have proficient skills in teaching, and none were rated as being unsatisfactory during this three year period.

Exhibits:
1c.1.1., Key Assignments Demonstrating Candidates' Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
1c.1.2., Scoring Rubrics for Key Assignments
1c.1.3., Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for the Unit
1c.1.4., Sample Student Work

1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Key assignments and fieldwork evaluations also comprise the core of the unit's assessment of initial candidates' consideration of colleagues, students, and stakeholders and maintain growing, reflective practice. Candidates perform well in this area. The unit's candidates are given many opportunities to reflect on their profession, so the strong results in this area do not come as a surprise.

Candidates reflect upon their own practice throughout their program. This is assessed through key assessments during their clinical fieldwork experience and in their program portfolio. The key assessments of reflective practice find that candidates perform well in this area, with an overall mean score of 3.6. Clinical field experience evaluations (overall mean evaluation is 3.4) and portfolio reflections (overall mean rating is 3.1) both mirror this finding.

Exhibits:
1c.2.1., Key Assessments and Rubrics Demonstrating Candidates' Knowledge of Learners, Reflective Practice, Collaboration, Respect for Others, and Assessment of Student Learning for All Initial Programs
1c.2.2., Results on Candidates' Knowledge of Learners, Reflective Practice, Collaboration, Respect for

Others, and Assessment of Student Learning for All Initial Programs
1c.2.3., Samples of Student Work

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

The application for the capstone educational research seminar sequence (EDD 630/631) represents the primary point of assessment for reflective practice for advanced candidates, although they are also assessed during the educational research seminar through their final project as well.

Beginning in the fall 2009 semester, the rubric assessing respect for others used upon application to the research seminar includes assessments about fairness and about the belief that all students can learn. The final project for the educational research seminar sequence is the primary assessment of candidates' knowledge of how social contexts shape teaching and learning. This final project also requires that candidates access and understand educational research and be able to apply it in ways that affect their own practice and the larger profession.

The results of these assessments find that candidates perform well, and that the educational research seminar positively affects candidates. The mean score on reflective practice upon application to the seminar was approximately 2.9; the score from the final project assessed at the end of the seminar was approximately 3.5. Scores on both collaboration and on respect for others improved between these two points as well. Collaboration scores rose from 3.2 to about 3.5; respect for others scores rose from 3.1 to about 3.5.

These data strongly suggest that the unit's advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice, have an appreciation for the ways in which social contexts shape teaching and learning and collaborate with the larger professional community. Moreover, because the research sequence demands that candidates conduct and report on their own original research, advanced candidates complete their studies with a deep understanding of the process and utility of educational research.

Exhibits:
1c.3.1., Rubric for Personal Statement in the Application to the Educational Research Seminar
1c.3.2., Knowledge of Learners, Reflective Practice, Collaboration, Respect for Others, Facility with Educational Research, and Skill of Assessment of Student Learning for Advanced Programs
1c.3.3., Sample Student Work

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

As stated in 1b.3, both the alumni and prospective employer surveys found that the respective groups were confident about graduates' preparation and performance in pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Graduates also indicated that they had "much" opportunity to engage in reflection for instructional changes, averaging a score of 4.1 (where 1 is "very little" and 5 is "very much"). Nonetheless, given the extent to which candidates engage in reflection throughout their programs, it is surprising that they did

not indicate that they had as much opportunity to do this as they did, e.g., to understand development and learning (4.5) or addressing a variety of learning needs (4.5 as well).

Employers reported that the unit's graduates demonstrated "strong" instructional strategies (page 11 of results) and skills to design developmentally- and age-appropriate lessons (page 12 of results). All responding employers indicated that CSI graduates were at least "effective" in fostering a sense of professionalism at their schools. Employers who indicated they could assess graduates' abilities to advocate for social justice, 100% reported that CSI graduates were at least "effective" in doing so. Given the emphasis of the unit on respect for others, broadly conceived, this latter point is especially heartening. Along a similar vein, employers indicated that the graduates showed "strong" respect for the families of students and the communities in which the students live.

Exhibits:
1c.4.1., Alumni Survey Results
1c.4.2., Prospective Employer Survey Results

1c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

All of the unit's initial teacher preparation programs have been submitted for national review. The one exception to this is the unit's Undergraduate Adolescence Spanish program, which has for the past several years been under-enrolled (approximately three students per academic year). Because sufficient data were not available, this program was not submitted for national review.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be

attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Advanced candidates are assessed for their facility with assessment skills at two points in their program: in key assignments and during the educational research seminar sequence. Major concepts and theories, related to assessing students, and the application of them to practice are assessed through the key assignment for EDP 660, a case study and lesson creation/assessment derived from this. Skills of teaching assessed through this key assignment find that candidates perform very well; the overall mean rating is 3.6. The assessment of candidates' skill assessing through this key assignment is nearly as high, 3.5.

In designing and modifying this key assignment (as well as many other times not included in the key assessments), candidates do use data to inform and modify their practice. However, their abilities to do this are most validly and compellingly measured through the creation of the final project in the educational research seminar. One of the main goals of this project is to development candidates' skills at designing ways of collecting data--often by utilizing school and community resources--guided by educational and psychological theories and then making practice-relevant changes based on the results. The reflections informed by this process that are assessed through the final project (3.5) are markedly higher than those made of the same candidates through their personal statements in the applications to the educational research seminar (2.9). The candidates have an additional opportunity to consider sophisticated, data-driven changes during the Celebration of Inquiry, a culminating "mini-conference" held at the end of the educational research seminar in which all graduate candidates (both initial and advanced) share and discuss their research projects with each other and faculty.

Exhibits:
1d.2.1., Key Assignment for EDP 660
1d.2.2., Rubric of the Skill of Assessment Demonstrated through the Key Assignment for EDP 660
1d.2.3., Rubric for Final Project in the Educational Research Seminar
1d.2.4., Skill of Assessment and Reflective Practice for Advanced Programs
1d.2.5., Sample Student Work

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

Follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate that graduates are confident in their ability to help all students learn; candidates rate themselves--and are rated by employers--as being effective at helping all students learn. The response rate for the 2008-2009 Academic Year was 83.5%. The response rate for the alumni survey, sent every three years to all candidates who graduated within that time frame, was 12%. The response rate for the prospective employer survey, which is sent to all schools on Staten Island and in Brooklyn (i.e., the schools most likely to hire CSI graduates) was 2.42%.

The average respondent to the alumni survey indicated that she/he had been given between at least "much" opportunity to design lessons, study development and learning, address a variety of learning needs, motivate students, reflect to make instructional changes, and developing student assessments. They also indicated that they had been given at least "some" opportunity to develop strategies to handle student behavior, processes, and means of obtaining help for children with special needs. The results relationship in these data between working with families and job satisfaction instigated the creation of efforts to increase these opportunities (viz., in clinical practice) and to support new graduates in the field in this and other areas.

Employers reported that CSI graduates were at least "effective" overall and in many areas pertaining to student learning, e.g., working with diverse students, in urban environments, to create learning environments. Among the few areas where graduates were rated as needing improvement were working with English-language learners (ELLs) and with students with different special needs. In response, the unit has requested a full-time ELL faculty line and has revamped a middle school special education generalist program based on these results.

Exhibits:
1d.3.1., Alumni Survey Results
1d.3.2., Prospective Employer Survey Result

1d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.

Table 5
Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals

For Period:	AY 2008-2009

Program	Name of Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)	School District Leader CST	9	44

1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]

The Educational Leadership program is currently under review for national re-approval (submission 9/15/09).

1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate that the knowledge and skills of the unit's other school professionals (i.e., those in the Educational Leadership program) are exceptional. Specifically,

graduates from the Educational Leadership program indicate that they had been given at least "much" opportunity to develop the abilities to 1) weigh liability issues; 2) plan and implement school budgets and; 3) manage the recruitment, development and retention of personnel. The average respondent also indicated that she or he had been given between "some" and "much" opportunity to work with families and parents/guardians to promote student learning. In general, they felt that they were "well prepared" by the unit for the responsibilities and challenges that they face in their leadership roles. In addition, responses from colleagues and employers of the AP graduates of the Educational Leadership program report that these graduates are at least "effective" administrators who support both student learning and teacher professional development.

Exhibits:
1e.3.1., Alumni Survey Results
1e.3.2., Prospective Employer Survey Results

1e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

The Educational Leadership program is currently under review for national re-approval (submission 9/15/09).

1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student leaning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

Follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate that graduates are successfully able to create positive environments for student learning. Among the responding employers, 46.1% stated that the CSI graduates in their schools were "effective" creators of caring learning environments and 11.5% stated that the CSI graduates were "very effective" in this area. No CSI graduate was rated as "ineffective" or "very ineffective." CSI graduates were also rated at least "effective" at advocating for social justice. In addition, nearly all graduates were rated at least "effective" at caring for students, respecting students' families and communities, collaborating with families, and being knowledgeable about health and safety issues.

Alumni reported having had at least "some," but most often more than "much" opportunity to grow in ways that motivate students, work with families and parents/guardians, understand student and learning, as well as other areas related to the creation of positive learning environments.

Exhibits:
1f.2.1., Alumni Survey Results
1f.2.2., Prospective Employer Survey Results

1f.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]

1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

By the time candidates complete the program, the unit expects that they will be able to demonstrate the following dispositions: 1) reflective practice, 2) collaboration and, 3) respect for others. These three dispositions constitute Goal 3 of the unit's Conceptual Framework. The third disposition, in particular, is most closely aligned with the unit's commitment to fairness and a belief that all students can learn.

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Conceptual Framework Goal 1, Outcome C.2. (Demonstrate knowledge of recognition of a variety of characteristics of children [e.g., culture, language, family] and Goal 3, Objective C (Develop positive school climates that reflect openness, mutual respect, support, and encourage inquiry--including respecting the rights and responsibilities of individuals; cultural, familial, and linguistic diversity; and non-academic contextual factors) best operationalize how candidates develop professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidates demonstrate these objectives primarily during their fieldwork when their direct interactions with students can be observed and guided. Nonetheless, key assignments for lesson creation and assessment also reflect these dispositions.

Advanced candidates earned consistently high rubric scores on their psychological foundations key assignments pertaining to Objective 1.C. The average semesterly score for these candidates was about 3.6 (where 1 = unacceptable and 4 = exemplary).

Two assessments are made of advanced candidates' respect for others: objective-relevant rubric scores of the personal statement that is part of candidates' application to the educational research seminar and the final project for that same course sequence. Although most (about 85%) candidates achieved at least "proficient" ratings on their ability to meet this objective through their personal statements, their average scores were higher after completing the research seminar sequence; the average objective-relevant score was about 3.1 before the seminar and about 3.6 after it.

Exhibits:
1g.2.1., Key Assessments and Rubrics Pertaining to Professional Dispositions Related to Fairness and

the Belief that All Students Can Learn
1g.2.2., Results on Assessments of Objectives 1.C and 3.C for All Initial and Advanced Candidates
1g.2.3., Sample Student Work

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Although advanced candidates who have their own classes are most able to demonstrate these dispositions, assessments can be uniformly conducted of advanced candidates through their personal statements in their applications to the educational research seminar and through their final projects for that same seminar sequence. Both of these artifacts are assessed for the extent to which they demonstrate candidates' ability to engage in collaboration and how well those collaborations were used to improve candidate learning and performance. Similar to the pattern described in 1g.2., candidates demonstrated the capacity for useful collaborations through their personal statements (when 80-90% of the candidates earned at least "proficient" ratings), but better through their final project (where the mean score was about 3.5 compared to the mean at application, about 3.2).

Initial candidates are assessed primarily through the evaluations of their clinical experiences. Their performance here also earned mean scores consistently above "proficient," and with few earning "emerging" scores and none "unsatisfactory." Through their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities, these data confirm that the unit's initial candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions outlined in its Conceptual Framework.

Exhibits:
1g.3.1., Results on Assessments of Objective 3.B for All Initial and Advanced Candidates
1g.3.2., Sample Student Work

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Alumni report that they had received "much" opportunity to reflect meaningfully upon their performance and that they received "some" opportunity to work with families to help students learn. The unit has implemented means of better promoting family collaborations due to this latter finding and its relationship with job satisfaction.

Employers, in turn, rated the abilities of the CSI graduates in their schools to collaborate with students' families as at least "effective" in all but two cases.

Exhibits:
1g.4.1., Section 5 from the Alumni Survey Results
1g.4.2., Page 8 in the Survey of Prospective Employers

1g.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

Standard 1's focus on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions is reflected in the unit's ability to forge and leverage relations with faculty members across the institution in an effort to help candidates actualize the objectives outlined in the unit's conceptual framework. Nowhere is this relationship more critical than the institution's commitment to developing teachers who have superior content knowledge (CSI Goal 1, Objective A).

Because the unit is one department among many, candidates take a majority of courses through other departments. Candidates in the Undergraduate Childhood program (initial) for example, typically major in Science, Letters, and Society. This major, like all the others offered, requires that undergraduate candidates fulfill the General Education requirements. This latter set of requirements is more demanding than those offered at similar institutions; for example, candidates are required to take two Scientific Analysis courses, whereas it is typical that only one is required.

At the graduate level, candidates in either the Adolescence Sequence 1 program (advanced) or Sequence 2 (initial) take four courses in their content area offered through other departments. For Sequence 1 candidates, this amounts to slightly less than half their coursework. These examples speak to the degree of integration and collaboration between the unit and other academic departments. Moreover, it enables the unit to prepare candidates who have an exceptionally strong foundation in content knowledge.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Standard 1 is an area in which several faculty members are conducting research. A portion of this research often involves the unit's candidates as the unit of analysis, along with data provided by the unit's assessment system.

An example of this is Dr. Samuels' work in the area of professional dispositions. Specifically, Dr. Samuels, in his role as the unit's Assessment Coordinator, has used candidate data on dispositions to predict various outcomes measured during clinical practice. The intent of this line of research is to better inform the unit and its decisions regarding how and when dispositions should be measured. The results of this work will be presented in a series of white papers to be made available to the unit, institution, and its P-12 partners.

Drs. Tournaki, Lyublinskaya, and Carolan and their research on the effects of the unit's different programs (pathways) on candidates' teaching effectiveness and efficacy provide a second example of research related to Standard 1. This research, recently published in *Action in Teacher and Education*, concluded that there were no significant differences on either outcome among the three different pathways. This work exemplifies the unit's commitment to investigate how its programs relate to candidates' proficiencies, specifically those aligned with CSI Goals 2 (Engage all students) and 3 (Demonstrate professional dispositions).

CSI Goal 1, Objective C (Knowledge of learners) is reflected in the work of Dr. Arievitch, who is in contract to write a book for Cambridge University Press. The goal of this book is to develop a dialectical perspective on human development (continuing the tradition launched by Vygotsky's project that

pioneered but did not complete this work) that allows for and also requires a dialectical concept of mind. The idea developed in this book is emphasized throughout Dr. Arievitch's courses, which equip candidates with the skills needed to help all students learn.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The unit continually monitors the data produced by the key assessments. These key assessments are aligned both with the unit's CF and with state and professional standards. This alignment is described in Exhibit 2a.1.2. The Assessment Committee reviews these and other data every semester and makes recommendations to various committees based upon them. These other committees then discuss the findings as appropriate. The changes that are enacted are monitored by these committees for efficacy and further action, if needed.

The Assessment System Handbook further describes the policies and procedures that ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make improvements.

Exhibits:
2a.1.1., The Assessment System Handbook
2a.1.2., Alignment of Key Assessments with State and Professional Standards

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.

Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

Program	Admission	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion
Undergraduate Adolescence English	1. GPA 2. Rubric for	1. Minimum Overall GPA of 2.75 2. Grade of C+ or above in all Education courses 3. Rubrics for key assessments in	1. Scoring of Student Teaching Evaluation Form 2. Rubrics for Key Assessments relevant	1. Minimum GPA of 2.75 2. Rubrics for key assessments relevant to dispositions 3. Rubric for Program portfolio	1. Alumni Survey 2. Survey of Prospective

	application	Education courses 4. Rubric evaluating application to student teaching and letters of nomination from faculty	to student teaching 3. Rubric for student teaching portfolio	4. New York State Certification Subject-Area Test(s) 5. Candidate Exit Survey instrument developed by unit	Employers
Undergraduate Adolescence Mathematics					
Undergraduate Adolescence Science					
Undergraduate Adolescence Social Studies					
Undergraduate Adolescence Spanish					
Undergraduate Childhood					
Undergraduate Early Childhood					
Graduate Adolescence English (Sequence 2 Initial)	1. Undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or above (for Special Ed. 3.00 or above) or Graduate GPA of 3.00 or above 2. Application with rubric on candidate's purpose statement	1. Graduate GPA 3.00 or above 2. Rubrics for key assessments relevant to CSI goals 1,2,3 3. Review of application for clinical practice	1. Scoring of Student Teaching Evaluation Form 2. Rubrics for key assessments relevant to clinical practice 3. Rubric for Student Teaching Portfolio	1. Degree verification 2. Rubric for Program portfolio 3. Survey instrument developed by unit	
Graduate Adolescence Math (Sequence 2 Initial)					
Graduate Initial Adolescence Science (Sequence 2)					
Graduate Adolescence Social St. (Sequence 2 Initial)					
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 2 Initial)					
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 2 Initial)					
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 1 Additional Cert.)					
Graduate Adolescence (Sequence 1 Advanced)	1. Undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or above (for Special Ed. 3.00 or above) 2. Application with rubric on candidate's purpose statement	Graduate GPA of 3.00 or above	Rubric for the evaluation of educational inquiry project	1. Degree verification 2. Survey instrument developed by unit	
Graduate Adolescence Mathematics (Sequence 1 Advanced)					
Graduate Adolescence, Science (Sequence 1 Advanced)					

Graduate Adolescence, Social Studies (Sequence 1 Advanced)				
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 1 Advanced)				
Advanced Educational Leadership, Building Level (Post-Master's)	1. Undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or above (for Special Ed. 3.00 or above) 2. Application with rubric on candidate's purpose statement	Rubrics for key assessments relevant to CSI Goals 1, 2, 3	1. Rubrics of key assessments relevant to internship 2. Scoring of field experience evaluation form	1. Degree verification 2. Rubric for Program portfolio 3. Survey instrument developed by unit
Advanced Educational Leadership, District Level (Post-Master's)				

2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

Data are collected from candidates at transition points. Most of these data are collected through Tk20. These transition points serve as "gates" for our candidates: they cannot progress through a given transition point until they have met the minimal conditions delineated there. Transition points must serve as a way for us to stay on top of our candidates and their needs--not as impediments in their progress through their program.

All data except that from the cooperating teachers are collected through Tk20. Faculty can access several reports digesting various amounts of candidate data. Candidates, in turn, access the feedback from key assignments, reflections, supervisor fieldwork observation evaluations, and their progression through transition points through Tk20. All of the key assessment data are managed by the Assessment Coordinator, Dr. El Samuels, who prepares the data for interpretation by the unit. Dr. Samuels can also provide varying levels of raw data to the faculty and HEO staff for them to analyze themselves. Dr. Samuels prepares the data for presentation to the faculty, staff, and candidates in ways appropriate and informative for each audience.

The Assessment Committee is the first departmental body responsible for regularly reviewing the data. This committee, consisting of members from the unit, institution, and P-12 community, meets at least once a semester, at which time it reviews and interprets the data and initial analyses performed by Dr. Samuels. Included in this review are checking on on-going performance among the candidates and the department, monitoring the effects of changes made in the past, and discussing ways of improving the validity and utility of the assessment system in cost- and time-effective ways. The Assessment Committee is charged with the task of making recommendations to other bodies within the department (as well as to other persons and groups whose work influences the performance and support of the unit's candidates) based on their interpretation of the data.

The Assessment Committee makes its recommendations to the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) or the Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC) or other bodies as necessary. TEAC is the primary venue for stakeholders from other areas of the College to guide operations. PAC is the primary venue for stakeholders from partnering schools and the community; consequently, the membership is comprised of teachers, administrators, and community leaders.

The committees to which the Assessment Committee makes recommendations may decide to move a given proposal forward to the full department faculty for further action, it may ask the Assessment Committee for more information before acting, or it may decide that no action is necessary. If a proposal is forwarded to the full departmental faculty, the faculty will discuss the proposal and may or may not

decide that the issue requires more action. The full faculty may also request more information from either the forwarding committee or the Assessment Committee.

Any changes or actions enacted by the department are then monitored by the Director of Assessment and the Assessment Committee at future meetings. The results of this monitoring are discussed at Assessment Committee meetings, and further action may be taken depending on the data.

Exhibit:
2a.3., Assessment Handbook

2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The unit takes seriously threats that compromise the integrity of its assessment system. The following measures have been taken to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias:

Fairness
The unit makes every effort via multiple means to inform candidates of all the requirements as early in their program as possible. Materials are given to students when they inquire about applying to--and are admitted to--programs. These efforts reflect the unit's commitment to fairness and that candidates should have equal access to pertinent information.

Rubrics that are used to assess candidates' work are shared with the candidates before they are assessed so they have a clear understanding of what is expected of them. These rubrics, developed through faculty collaboration, are consistent among candidates and programs.

In addition, the same issues are assessed through different assessment tools in order to ensure accuracy and fairness. When, for example, multiple assessment measures point to a weakness in a given programmatic area, then the information is discussed and used to drive program improvement.

Accuracy
The unit ensures accuracy by verifying (through collaboration within the unit and across the institution's departments) that assessment measures are linked to the unit's conceptual framework, INTASC Standards, NBPTS, the New York State Education Department Standards, and the SPA standards.

Consistent
The graduating and the alumni surveys contain the same questions. Overall correlations between responses on the two surveys are assessed to measure consistency. The first graduating surveys were distributed in spring 2004. The first alumni surveys were distributed in spring, 2007.

Free of Bias
Assessments are governed by CF-linked rubrics that assess candidates solely based on performance relative to the rubric and not on any personal, cultural, etc. factors. An important point where bias is eliminated is entry into the Education program. Applicants' admission into a program is based solely upon objective criteria related to success as an educator. Ensuring that all applicants have an equal opportunity to programs eliminates a large source of potential bias.

Faculty assesses the writing samples of applicants for writing skills and dispositions. While samples that were rated lowly on the rubric do not keep a candidate from being admitted to the unit, they serve as an

indication of inappropriate or undesirable dispositions. However, the unit has excluded applicants on rare occasions, with the possibility of future reapplication.

Exhibits:
2a.4.1., Procedures for Ensuring that Key Assessments of Candidate Performance and Evaluations of Unit Operations Are Fair, Accurate, Consistent, and Free of Bias
2a.4.2., Data from Key Assessments Used at Entry to Programs

2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

There are several assessments in place to manage and improve the unit's operations and programs, in particular (1) the candidate exit survey, (2) candidate communication report form, (3) course instructor evaluations, and (4) annual chair evaluations of office staff.

The items that address operations and programs of the unit in the candidate exit survey are primarily in section 8 of that instrument (Exhibit 2a.5.1). Items ask graduating candidates about how well the faculty and staff advised candidates, how available they were, and how well they treated the candidates. Items also ask about the online system used to collect most key assessment data, clarity of program requirements and relevant documentation, availability of courses when needed, clarity of the candidate appeals process, and overall program and unit operations.

Candidates can also complete "candidate communication report forms." These forms are available in the unit's main office and can be submitted at any time of the year. These forms allow candidates to comment on any aspect of the unit's operations and programs. The forms are evaluated and filed by the Chair who works directly with candidates to resolve any outstanding issues. Confidentiality is maintained if requested by the candidate. Information derived from these forms is also routed to the appropriate unit committee for action.

Course instructor evaluations also provide a means through which the unit collects information about its operations and programs. Sponsored by the Student Government, these evaluations are administered at the end of every course. Consisting of a set of ten close-ended and a small number of open-ended questions, these systematic evaluations enable the unit to monitor how and how well its operations and programs service the needs of candidates. Responses can be aggregated across courses in any given program to measure, for example, a course's difficulty. This feedback enables the unit to adapt courses and programs in ways that fairly challenge candidates.

Finally, the unit's chair conducts an annual evaluation of all administrative staff. These evaluations enable the unit to assess 1) whether its staffing needs are being met and 2) the resources it needs to improve the ways in which personnel staff are utilized. For this evaluation, both the chair and staff member write a one-page review of that years' accomplishments and challenges as well as future directions for the coming year. Both people meet to discuss these reviews as well as the general contents of the evaluation. The chair then sends this evaluation to the divisional dean.

Taken together, these four measures provide the unit with the information needed to first manage, and then improve its operations and programs.

Exhibits:
2a.5.1., Candidate Exit Survey
2a.5.2., Candidate Communication Report Form
2a.5.3., Policies for Handling Student Complaints Communicated to Candidates

2a.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- **How are the data collected?**
- **From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?**
- **How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**
- **Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)**
- **In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**
- **What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**

The unit has developed a dynamic process to harvest, analyze, and interpret data that are ultimately used to drive program and unit improvement. Data are collected through an online data management system (Tk20) except for clinical evaluations made by cooperating teachers, when they are collected via paper-and-pencil instruments.

These data are collected at each of four transition points and after graduation from applicants; candidates; full- and part-time faculty; college supervisors; cooperating school-based teachers; unit graduates; and school-based administrators most likely to hire unit graduates.

The Assessment Coordinator, Dr. El Samuels, is responsible for summarizing and analyzing the data. He maintains, analyzes, and presents the data to the Assessment Committee at its meetings held at least once a semester and typically held two to three times per semester. Data are presented and discussed in whatever format best conveys the given information. Often this is tables and chrts of descriptive statistics (means, percents, etc.) with inferential statistics used to support inferences. Qualitative data (e.g., additional comments made to clinical fieldwork evaluations and surveys) are usually presented as raw data in random order or into prima facie categories. The Assessment Committee, consists of members from the unit (viz., full- and part-time faculty), the greater institution, and P-12 community and interprets the data and ultimately makes recommendations to other appropriate committees or bodies, e.g., PAC, TEAC, and the general unit faculty.

Changes implemented by the unit based on data are monitored by the Assessment Coordinator. Although some of these changes are monitored automatically through the assessment system, those that require additional data to monitor are monitored for at least one academic year or until a trend in the results can be discerned.

Although most data are collected, maintained, and accessed through Tk20, they are further analyzed

through Excel, SAS, and SPSS. All data, regardless of source, are maintained and kept secure by the Assessment Coordinator and backed up securely to a remote server.

The processes and time lines that constitute the unit's assessment system are elaborated in Exhibit 2b.1.3.

Exhibits:
2b.1.1., Tk20's HigherEd System
2b.1.2., Transition Points Tables
2b.1.3., The Assessment System

2b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

Data are disaggregated by individual programs as well as by program type: undergraduate, graduate initial programs (Sequence 2), graduate professional certification programs (Sequence 1), and the post-Master's educational leadership program. Data are also reviewed in higher aggregations (e.g., initial vs. advanced, adolescence vs. childhood, etc.).

The unit only has candidates enrolled on the main campus, including those enrolled in the alternate route programs; the unit does not offer off-campus sites or distance learning programs.

The unit formally begins collecting data upon application to an education program.

Exhibit:
2b.2., Candidate Data on Application to Education Programs

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Formal candidate complaints are submitted using the Candidate Communication Report Form and are maintained by the unit's chair and safely secured in his personal office. The chair can allow access to these complaints by responsible unit members (e.g., the Assessment Committee) for specific and discrete purposes (e.g., review them for patterns of deficiencies in unit operations), so long as permission is granted by the complainant.

Exhibit:
2b.3., Candidate Communication Report Form

2b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

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

The unit has institutionalized a set of practices that regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. As explained further in the Assessment System (Exhibit 2c.1), the Assessment Coordinator prepares data summaries for the Assessment Committee that create actionable recommendations for other bodies in the unit. The effects of any implemented changes are also monitored through the assessment system.

Exhibit:
2c.1., the Assessment System

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

The data-driven changes that have occurred over the past three years are summarized in the Summary of Major Data-Driven Changes Made to the Unit and Its Programs (Exhibit 2c.2). For example, a set of advisers to support the transition from pre- to in-service practice was created based on results from the alumni and candidate exit surveys that suggested that graduates of initial programs could benefit from this support. In addition, results from both candidate complaints and the candidate exit survey led to moving the SLS office into the Education building to increase and improve candidate advisement and facilitate communication between SLS and the unit. Finally, scores on subscales of the content-specific state licensure exams led the unit and its institutional collaborators to add a science requirement to the Undergraduate Initial Childhood and Early Childhood programs.

Exhibit:
2c.2., Summary of Major Data-Driven Changes Made to the Unit and Its Programs

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

Through Tk20, faculty has secure access to candidates' individual transcripts and performance on the key assessments. Also from Tk20, they can access aggregated reports on candidate performance on the key assessments (as well as other information about candidates that may help guide decisions). A list of the many of the aggregated reports available there is given in Exhibit 2c.3.2. These aggregated reports include

- Aggregate Data for Transition Point Templates, which aggregates data entered in transition point templates. For each program's transition points, the report will show the number of students who have completed/not completed each step. The report also breaks down who has completed each step by major, ethnicity, and level.

- Aggregate Report on Coursework Assessments for a Given Instructor's Courses, which displays aggregated data on coursework assessments performed in the courses of the user running the report.This report displays the total number and total percent of persons receiving each rating for each criterion on the coursework assessments performed in the courses of the user running the report.

- Report on Field Experience Binder/Portfolio Attachments by Standards, which shows comprehensive standard-related data from field experience binders, broken down by student. The report provides a link for any attachments to the binder.

- Report on Survey Form, which displays detailed results of each item on the survey form for recipients who completed the survey.

In addition, the general faculty is informed of summaries of the discussions at meetings, through announcements, etc., especially of the Assessment Committee. Finally, the Assessment Analyst often provides information for specific inquiries about candidate, course, program, and unit performance.

Exhibits:
2c.3.1., Tk20's Login Page
2c.3.2., Lists of Some Reports Available Through Tk20
2c.3.3., Minutes of the Assessment Committee, AY 06-07 through Fall 09

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

The primary vehicle for the dissemination of assessment data is the Assessment Committee. Representatives from the unit, the general College community, and outside stakeholders attend this committee's general meetings. Reports from this committee are shared with:

1. The Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC), which is chaired by the Director of Fieldwork and is the main venue for teachers, principals, community members, and other stakeholders outside of the College to communicate about issues surrounding teacher education.

2. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC), which is chaired by the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, the division with which the unit is affiliated. This committee is the primary venue at which faculty and staff from across the College communicate about issues surrounding teacher education.

3. The general unit faculty.

PAC and TEAC play import roles in steering the unit's operations and programs to better serve candidates. Recommendations made by either of these committees are considered seriously by the unit when it votes to make changes.

Exhibits:
2c.4.1., Assessment System Handbook
2c.4.2., Relevant Minutes of PAC, AY 2006-2007 through Fall 2009
2c.4.3., Relevant Minutes of TEAC, AY 2006-2007 through Fall 2009
2c.4.4., Relevant Minutes of the General Unit Faculty, AY 2006-2007 through fall 2009

2c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

The unit's assessment system has become an exemplar within the institution. As other departments adapt

to the requirements of external accrediting agencies, the unit has become a leader in the institution's efforts to promote a "culture of assessment." These efforts have required the unit's faculty to engage others across the institution as they too address the challenges and opportunities afforded by emerging assessment requirements. For example, Drs. Samuels and Carolan were keynote speakers at the College's annual Day of Assessment. Their talk focused on the challenges to harvesting key assessments from various departments across the institution. Efforts such as this are reflective of the unit's commitment to work with stakeholders to ensure that the institution moves toward a more seamless and efficient system that best enables decisions to be data-driven.

Another example has been faculty members' participation on institution-wide committees that address assessment. One such committee is the College's Assessment Committee, which is charged with helping departments develop and refine assessment procedures. Dr. Shulman's participation in this committee has provided an avenue through which the unit receives feedback about the evolution of its assessment system.

A final example of this leadership role is the sharing of rubrics and other standardized instruments that are used to evaluate candidate work. As other departments move toward the use of rubrics, faculty external to the unit have solicited guidance from the unit's faculty. In 2008, for example, the unit's representative on the institution's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee spoke to the committee on the development and utility of rubrics.

Through these efforts the unit has been able to receive input from colleagues across the institution. The engagement induced by these activities has been mutually beneficial and has contributed to the institution's "culture of assessment."

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The data generated from the clinical experience evaluations, candidate exit surveys, alumni surveys, and prospective employer surveys have been analyzed in detail. Scores obtained from the various clinical experience instruments have been assessed for inter-rater reliability and convergent and divergent validity. Perhaps the most interesting finding here, so far, has been that candidate and supervisor evaluations of the candidates' performance in clinical experiences are highly correlated and the two cooperating teacher evaluations were also highly correlated, but these two groups' evaluations were not nearly as strongly correlated.

Tk20 now allows the unit to track candidate performance on the applications, through key assignments, into clinical experience evaluations, and out to the candidate exit survey. Within-candidate longitudinal data of this type allows the unit to monitor the reliability of the various instruments as well as deeper trends in candidate performance. There is not yet complete start-to-finish data available, but results so far indicate that candidates are assessed rather consistently throughout their program and that clinical experience and candidate exit reports point to consistent issues within the candidates.

Finally, although the four-point scales used to quantify most key assessments are sufficient to mark candidate progress as meeting, exceeding, or strongly exceeding standards and objectives, it does not allow for the variation needed for more sophisticated analyses of candidate performance or for strong predictions of candidate success based on early assessments (and thus early interventions). Simply allowing ratings to be made out to a few decimals did not adequately increase the variance. The Assessment Coordinator, in consultation with the Assessment Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, is exploring ways of increasing the variance while maintaining rating comprehensibility, ease of use, and security.

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

The unit works with a number of entities to both ensure compliance with NYSED guidelines (Exhibit 3a.1.1) and provide candidates with a range of rewarding field and clinical experiences. Field experiences are present throughout all initial certification programs. New York State requires a minimum of 100 hours of field experience before clinical practice. The unit has divided the 100 hours among the pre-student teaching courses in all initial programs, beginning with observations in foundations courses, and progressing through individual, small group, and whole group instruction in the methods courses. By the time teacher candidates undertake their 15 weeks of student teaching, they have had a broad range of meaningful experiences in a variety of schools.

Collaboration, accountability, and practices associated with professional learning characterize the unit's field experiences and clinical practice. The unit is connected to its partners through collaboration with the New York City Department of Education's (NYCDOE) Office of Student Teaching (Exhibit 3a.1.2), local private and parochial schools, the CUNY Discovery Institute, and colleagues at other institutions. The majority of the schools and school leaders in collaboration with the unit are from geographical districts 31, 20 and 21 covering Staten Island and parts of Brooklyn.

The unit also has a Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC), chaired by the Director of Fieldwork, whose members are drawn from the Education Department (Chairperson, Deputy Chair, Program Coordinators, Director of Fieldwork, NCATE Coordinator, a teacher candidate), from the College, and from the schools (principals, teachers). The whole committee meets for a minimum of twice per year, once each semester. Communication is maintained through email, phone, and mail. PAC is charged with helping the unit to achieve its goals and objectives through better planning and collaboration among stakeholders. These meetings have resulted in the use of model schools and teachers for our candidates in the field; addressing the changing curriculum preparation needs of the City's schools; hiring experts as adjunct faculty members in the Department of Education; and gaining feedback on programmatic changes in the preparation of teacher candidates. In addition to PAC, the Director of Fieldwork corresponds with P-12 personnel throughout the year.

During student teaching, all teacher candidates are evaluated jointly by the College supervisor and cooperating teacher ("school-based faculty") who regularly communicate. At the end of a clinical practice, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates complete a written final evaluation of the candidates' performances based on meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the unit's conceptual framework and developed throughout the candidates' programs.

Exhibits:
3a.1.1., NYSED Guidelines for Clinical Experiences
3a.1.2., NYC DOE's Office of Student Teaching

3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

The partners cited in 3a.1. continue to play key roles in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences in a number of ways. The Director of Fieldwork and school partners are in regular communication about ways to strengthen and enhance the fieldwork experiences.

Beginning with the social and psychological foundations, the instructors and Director of Fieldwork work with the schools and community partners to create fieldwork experiences that integrate with coursework. For example, several sections of the introductory Social Foundations courses have performed "community walks" with local civic leaders in an effort to get a better sense of the schools' social contexts.

In the methods courses for the Childhood programs, each partner school works with the instructor assigned to their school to arrange the candidates' observations to their mutual benefits. For example, candidates in EDE 301, Literacy Development and Language Acquisition in Elementary Education, may work with struggling students on decoding during their fieldwork hours. Candidates in Adolescence Education are spending fieldwork hours at a local high school where they work with in-coming freshmen in a program designed to support students approaching standards.

The unit's Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC) serves as a formal venue for outside stakeholders to meet with the unit to discuss data and recommend changes. One change that resulted from PAC's input was that candidates in clinical practice were strongly advised to participate in parent/teacher conferences in order to become more comfortable addressing the challenges associated with this critical issue.

Another example is the PAC's ability to alert the unit of curricular changes that need to be addressed in the unit's courses. In AY 2007-2008, the unit was alerted early to a state-wide change in math instruction, allowing the unit to preempt this change through coursework and field experiences.

Leadership program alumni often serve both as mentors for internships of that program as well as sources of information to guide the content and practice of that program and other unit programs. These alumni also offer their schools as sites for fieldwork for teacher candidates in other programs; consequently, they also influence the fieldwork of those programs.

Finally, the NYCDOE's Office of Student Teaching published a handbook for student teachers, cooperating teachers, and principals to provide comprehensive information about student teaching in New York City. This handbook outlines the obligations and responsibilities of those involved with candidates' clinical practice. In addition, this office works collaboratively with local universities and New York City public schools to provide aspiring teachers with a dynamic field placement as well as support and guidance through the final stages of the teacher certification process.

Exhibit:
3a.2.1., NYCDOE's Office of Student Teaching Handbook

3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

The unit and its P-12 school partners both benefit from an equal partnership in regards to the process in which candidates are placed for field experiences, clinical practice and internships. Representatives from the New York City Department of Education work with the unit's Director of Fieldwork, Dr. Deirdre Armitage, in a collaborative effort to select sites for clinical practice, both on Staten Island and in Brooklyn. The sites are selected based on criteria established by the unit's faculty and support the unit's conceptual framework. Each semester, the Director of Fieldwork reviews evaluations of fieldwork sites by the College supervisor and the teaching candidate, and uses these data to develop and refine placements.

Facilitated by the unit's Director of Fieldwork, the unit and the local school district select sites for clinical practice, both on Staten Island and in select parts of Brooklyn. Sites are selected based on criteria established by the unit's faculty and support the unit's conceptual framework. Each semester, the Director of Fieldwork reviews evaluations of fieldwork sites by the College supervisor and the teaching candidate, and uses these data to develop and refine placements.

All components of fieldwork, from observation to clinical practice, are planned in a collaborative manner with the unit and local schools. The unit and the district developed a process for the logistical and procedural aspects of fieldwork placements. The process enables candidates to identify early in the semester which schools are available for observation. A network of partner schools receives observers on a regular basis. The Director of Fieldwork compiles names of candidates for each school and emails the list to the appropriate administrator. Candidates are directed to contact each school in a manner previously arranged with the Director of Fieldwork.

Sites for clinical practice for initial programs are negotiated by the Director of Fieldwork. Schools that are long-time collaborators continue to host student teachers as long as the school continues to meet the guidelines set forth by the unit. Frequent communication between the unit and these sites also ensures that any changes to improve candidates' experiences can be made swiftly and smoothly. Each semester, the Director determines the number of student-teachers that each site will receive based on the site's capacity to host, their needs in terms of special language skills, and the unit's ability to supervise. The Director meets in small groups with all student-teaching applicants to discuss placements. The candidate provides a ranked list of predetermined sites and is matched with one of his/her choices. In some instances, candidates have previous experience in a particular school through prior fieldwork or a program such as The Teacher Education Honors Academy program and wish to return, with the school's support, to that school as a student-teacher.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit and its school partners share expertise and resources in a number of ways in order to support learning in field experiences and clinical practice. The unit has designed its field experiences to provide candidates with the opportunity to participate in a variety of school experiences that help the continual development of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Observations during the foundations courses introduce candidates to the myriad issues in education from hidden curriculum, political agendas in schools, and parental involvement (or lack thereof) to standardized testing, labeling students, and cultural contexts for student behavior. For instance, one assignment asks candidates to observe a class for gender bias. After observing student-teacher interactions and coding for certain behaviors, candidates write a report and analysis of their data. These observations and interactions early in candidates' programs provide a context for learning that cannot be matched simply by reading and discussing in class. During their fieldwork for the methods courses candidates help teachers, tutor individuals, deliver

lessons to groups of students or to whole classes, sit in on or hold conferences with children, develop lessons, grade work, etc. Examples of assignments include preparing and teaching a mini-lesson to a group of elementary-age children on musical rhythm and tempo.

During clinical practice, the cooperating teacher views the candidate almost as a co-teacher and relinquishes some classroom control to the candidate. During the final two weeks the candidate assumes the majority of the responsibility for the classroom. In the adolescence programs, candidates assume responsibility for one period of instruction per day. To gain confidence in dealing with families, student-teachers are encouraged to attend parent/teacher conferences and experience other interactions with parents. To become acquainted with the non-instructional tasks of teachers, candidates in clinical practice and the leadership program help in the lunchroom or schoolyard, shadow a dean, and participate in school-wide activities. Required assignments ensure that candidates reflect on these experiences and think deeply about their roles as teachers and leaders in school. In most partner schools, principals personally encourage candidates to attend regularly scheduled professional development.

Exhibit:
3a.4.1., Relevant Course Syllabi

3a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

The unit has established firm entry and exit requirements for clinical practice and uses a variety of means to ensure that these requirements are fulfilled. Undergraduate candidates must apply for entry to student teaching by a specific deadline date during the semester preceding the experience. Applicants must meet all of the following requirements:

1) Three letters of recommendation from full-time Education faculty, or if an intermediate/adolescence candidate, may have one of the letters from a full-time faculty member in their subject areas;
2) Successful completion of required courses;
3) Cumulative GPA of at least 2.75 and a C+ in every education course;
4) Completion of 100 hours of fieldwork and;
5) Interview with the Program Coordinator.

Exit requirements from clinical practice include:
1) Satisfactory evaluations by College supervisor and cooperating teacher and
2) Successful completion of the student teaching seminar, internship seminar, or practicum in Special Education.

Special Education candidates who maintain a 3.0 GPA take Practicum in Special Education (EDP 630) after the completion of 18 credits in the Special Education Master's program. Exit criteria are successful completion of 40 days with Special Education students evidenced by fieldwork time sheet records, a

practicum log recording experiences and reflections for each placement (grades 1-3 and 4-6), and completion of a practicum portfolio.

Alternate route graduate candidates (Sequence 2) are eligible for internships if they have completed at least half of their course requirements (21 credits or seven courses), including their core courses. A candidate must be in good standing, maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0, and submit his/her application to the Program Coordinator that includes a written statement by the candidate as to his or her readiness to teach. Candidates exit their internships after one year of successful teaching and successful completion of the internship.

Educational Leadership candidates follow a cohort model and complete their internships in the summer following their first full year of coursework. A complete description of their field experience entry and exit requirements can be found in their handbook.

Exhibits:
3b.1.1., Transition Points Tables
3b.1.2., Fieldwork Requirements from Student Guide
3b.1.3 - 6., Fieldwork Handbooks
3b.1.7., Graduate Fieldwork Pamphlet

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)	Total Number of Hours
Undergraduate Early Childhood	• 25 observation hours before EDC 350 and • 150 targeted field experience hours through EDC 3505 observation hours in EDC 360	350 clinical experience hours through full time student teaching throughout one semester	530
Undergraduate Childhood	• 30 observation hours in foundations courses • 10 hours of 1-on-1 assessment and literacy instruction • at least 60 hours of small and whole-group field experiences in math, language arts, social studies, science, art, and music	400 clinical experience hours through full time student teaching throughout one semester	500
Undergraduate Adolescence	• 30 observation hours in foundations courses • 35 hours each (70 total) in their content area curriculum and pedagogy	400 clinical experience hours through full time student teaching throughout one semester	500

	courses		
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 2 Initial)	20 observation hours in foundations courses 15 hours each in social studies, reading, math, and science of 1-on-1, small- or whole-group instruction 20 of observation of students with special needs through EDP 660	Either 400 hours of full-time student teaching or 1 full year of mentored teaching practicum	500
Graduate Adolescence (Sequence 2 Initial)	30 observation hours in foundations courses 20 hours each in their content area curriculum course 30 hours in their content area pedagogy course 20 observation hours of students with special needs through EDP 660	Either 400 hours of full-time student teaching or 1 full year of mentored teaching practicum	500
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 2 Initial)	20 observation hours in foundations courses 15 hours each (60 total) in social studies, reading, math, and science of 1-on-1, small- or whole-group instruction 20 of observation in EDP 612, Foundations of Special Education 20 hours each (60 total) of observation in special education settings in language arts and social studies, assessment, and classroom management	Either 400 hours of full-time student teaching or 1 full year of mentored teaching practicum	560
Graduate Special Education (Sequence 1 Advanced)	40 observation hours in foundations courses 20 hours each (60 total) of observation in special education settings in language arts and social studies, assessment, and classroom management	40 days (or 160 hours) of a practicum experience with students with special needs	260
Educational Leadership (Post-Master's Advanced)	A minimum of 300 hours of field experience completing site-based projects under the supervision of College faculty	200 hour, full-time internship in a New York City Pupil Program or New York City Summer School Site, performed during semester IV of the program	500
Graduate Childhood (Sequence 1 Advanced)	A minimum of 20 hours of field experience (through EDP 660, Teaching Student with Special Needs in the General Education Classroom)	Not applicable	20
Graduate Adolescence (Sequence 1 Advanced)	A minimum of 20 hours of field experience (through EDP 660, Teaching Student with Special Needs in the General Education Classroom)	Not applicable	20

3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

The unit makes a concerted effort within and across programs to ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards during candidates' field and clinical experiences. The unit's emphasis on intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility is reflected in the syllabi of all courses, and in the fieldwork assignments associated with those courses. Field experiences utilize content knowledge gained from liberal arts and subject area courses (CSI Goal 1: Knowledge of Subject Matter) and develop exemplary pedagogical and professional practices (CSI Goal 2: Engage All Students).

Most importantly, candidates reflect, based on knowledge that they have acquired during their courses, on how they would use these experiences to inform their own teaching practices within the context of the teaching profession (CSI Goal 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions). Specific course assignments, designated by the unit as "key assignments," demonstrate competency of all CSI goals and are clearly outlined in every syllabus. Evaluation instruments that are used in the field, such as the student teaching evaluation form used by College supervisors, cooperating teachers, and the teacher candidate, also reflect the conceptual framework.

The CSI goals and objectives outlined in the unit's conceptual framework are the performance measures for the fieldwork experience. The unit firmly believes that the consistent use of these instruments provides evidence that candidates' field and clinical experiences contribute to the development of the proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework and state and professional standards.

Exhibits:
3b.3.1., Matrix of Courses that Meet CSI Goals
3b.3.2., Clinical Experience Evaluation Form

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

Candidates use technology in their teaching and learning throughout the initial and advanced Education programs. Although there is no course on Technology in Education that is required for all candidates, technology is built into the majority of courses for initial certification through assignments that require the use and integration of technology. For example, candidates in initial programs must demonstrate proficiency on a communication and technology key assignment. Moreover, faculty use email lists and Blackboard to enhance class discussions and to distribute information. Candidates create PowerPoint productions for leading discussions and oral presentations in class. With the mathematics lab and the newly renovated Early Childhood/Literacy Center, faculty and candidates in mathematics and other areas model how to use the Internet, video, Smart Board, and CD and DVD technologies in their instruction. During fieldwork, candidates use video and audio tape recordings of teaching sessions for analysis and self-evaluation.

Teacher candidates in all programs are required to show competence in using technology in the classroom in both their field experiences and in their student teaching. In addition, candidates must include examples of their use of technology in the field in their program portfolios. They are encouraged to use technology in a variety of ways with students (i.e. Internet research, class newspapers, using Websites to enhance learning, and PowerPoint presentations, blogs, Wikis, podcasts). All fieldwork and student teaching sites are equipped with computers, Smart Boards, and Internet connections. Student teachers have used technology available in other parts of the school building, such as the library, in addition to computers in the classroom.

Exhibits:
3b.4.1., Communication and Technology Key Assignment
3b.4.2., Portfolio Examples of Technology Used as an Instructional Tool

3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

The criteria used to select school-based clinical faculty (referred to by the unit as the "cooperating teacher") are made clear to prospective school-based clinical faculty and the candidates themselves prior to the clinical experience. The cooperating teacher must be a classroom-based educator who agrees to mentor a student teacher in her/his classroom. Cooperating teachers are required to be experienced, exemplary educators, certified in their areas of instruction. They must have attained their master's degrees, or be near completion, and have taught for a minimum of three years. These guidelines are in accordance with those set by the City's Department of Education. They are not only excellent in their classrooms, but must have the disposition necessary to share the task of planning, delivering, and assessing instruction in conjunction with a student teacher. School administrators select cooperating teachers based on the criteria mentioned above. Cooperating teachers receive a written description of these expectations and the Student Teaching Handbook prior to placement and they are discussed with the College supervisor.

The criteria are implemented through a consistent and clear process. First, the criteria for cooperating teachers are discussed at regular meetings between the Director of Fieldwork and school administrators. They are documented and handed to each school supervisor prior to the placement of field experience candidates or student teachers. College supervisors are also aware of the criteria for cooperating teachers and if they suspect that a teacher who does not meet the requirements has been assigned as a mentor to a candidate, they contact the Director of Fieldwork immediately, who tries to rectify the situation directly with the school administrator.

Exhibits:
3b.5.1., NYC Department of Education's Recommendations for Cooperating Teachers
3b.5.2., Cooperating Teacher Expectations
3b.5.3., Student Teaching/Practicum Handbook

3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

School-based faculty members, i.e., the cooperating teachers, are adequately prepared by the unit and their school for their role as clinical supervisors. Prior to assuming the role of clinical supervisor, each prospect meets with the Director of Fieldwork to review the Cooperating Teacher Expectations and Student Teaching Handbook. At this time, prospective school-based clinical supervisors are asked to complete a Cooperating Teacher Data form that provides the unit with evidence regarding prospect's qualifications. Assuming the prospect meets the qualifications established by both the unit and the New York City Department of Education, the Director of Fieldwork collaborates with an administrator from the cooperating teacher's school to ensure that the performance parameters are clear and executable.

The unit often relies on cooperating teachers who have been successful mentors with previous candidates. Despite these past successes, the unit regularly collects and analyzes data derived from its Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form, which candidates complete at the end of their clinical

experience. These data are regularly reviewed by the Director of Fieldwork and form the basis of an ongoing conversation between the unit and the school-based clinical faculty members. These conversations help further the development of school-based faculty members and better prepare them for the challenges associated with their mentoring roles. The unit believes that this iterative process ensures that cooperating teachers are prepared for their critical role.

Exhibits:
3b.6.1., Unit's Criteria for School-Based Clinical Faculty
3b.6.2., Student Teaching/Practicum Handbook
3b.6.3., Cooperating Teacher Data
3b.6.4., Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

The unit has devised a system through which clinical faculty provide regular and continuous support for its candidates. Moreover, at various points throughout this process, the unit collects data to ensure that the process is beneficial to its participants. The general model is one that provides opportunities for increased collaboration between participants. Candidates form collaborative working relationships with cooperating teachers who model inquiry, reflective planning, teaching, and assessment practices. In this way, fieldwork continues to be the grounds on which the theory and practice of teaching becomes meaningful. During clinical field experience, supervisors and cooperating teachers share the responsibility of assessing each candidate's performance. Toward this end, cooperating teachers, supervisors, and the candidate engage in frequent onsite discussion focused on capitalizing on the strengths of the candidate as well as noting weaknesses that must be addressed. Part of this communication is recorded through the clinical experience evaluations completed by each of these people.

During clinical field experiences, the supervisor meets with the candidate throughout the semester and observes the candidate teaching a lesson for a minimum of four times (two observations in each placement.) The College supervisors record the dates and times of their visits and provide evidence of the candidate's growth during the semester. Among a number of responsibilities, the clinical faculty supervisor: 1) advises teacher candidates with respect to circumstances or considerations concerning their roles as student teachers in the school; 2) encourages and supports a mentor relationship between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers and; 3) establishes a working relationship with other site personnel.

Exhibit:
3b.7.1., Student Teaching Evaluation Form

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

The unit's sole program for other school professionals is in Educational Leadership, a cohort-based model that requires candidates to be proficient in the collection and analysis of data. Because school leaders, particularly now in New York City's public schools, are often charged with the responsibility of making data-based decisions, the unit's program in Educational Leadership takes seriously its role in preparing school leaders to make good decisions based on the sound collection and analysis of data. This importance is reflected in a key assignment on which candidates must demonstrate proficiency. (Exhibit 3b.8.1.) Results of candidates' performance on this key assignment are presented in the subsequent

exhibit (3b.8.2).

Exhibit:
3b.8.1., Educational Leadership Data Analysis Assignment
3b.8.2., Educational Leadership Data Analysis Results

3b.9. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

On average, the unit has approximately 100 candidates eligible for clinical practice each semester (although this number varies widely from semester to semester). Eighty-five percent, on average, successfully complete clinical practice.

More detailed data on the average number of candidates eligible for clinical practice each semester/year are presented in the exhibit noted below. Also included in this table is the average percentage of candidates who successfully complete clinical practice.

Exhibits:
3c.1., Table of Candidates Eligible for and Completing Clinical Practice

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

Candidates, clinical supervisors, and school-based faculty play critical roles in the assessment of candidate performance during clinical experience. This intense, collaborative approach provides the candidate with multiple opportunities to reflect and adapt as new situations emerge. This model for fieldwork involves increased levels of interaction among participants. Candidates form collaborative working relationships with school-based faculty who model inquiry, reflective planning, teaching, and assessment practices. In this way, fieldwork continues to be the grounds on which the theory and practice of teaching becomes meaningful. During student-teaching, clinical supervisors, and school-based faculty share the responsibility of assessing each candidate's performance. Toward this end, school-based faculty, clinical supervisors, and the candidate engage in frequent onsite discussion focused on capitalizing on the strengths of the candidate as well as noting weaknesses that must be addressed.

During the Competency Level of fieldwork, or student teaching, the clinical supervisor meets with the candidate throughout the semester and observes the candidate teaching a lesson for a minimum of four times (two observations in each placement.) The clinical supervisors record the dates and times of their

visits and provide evidence of the candidate's growth during the semester. Specifically the clinical supervisor:

- Advises teacher candidates with respect to circumstances or considerations concerning their roles as student teachers in the school;

- Encourages and supports a mentor relationship between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers;

- Establishes a working relationship with other site personnel;

- Provides informal feedback to candidates on a regular basis through conferencing, email, phone conversations, and written comments;

- Provides formal feedback to candidates through written evaluations of observations on a minimum of four occasions. These evaluation forms reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the unit expects candidates to have achieved over the course of their programs;

- Prepares a summative evaluation of the candidate's strengths and areas for improvement.

School-based faculty members work very closely with teacher candidates during student teaching. Specifically, they:

- Provide opportunities for candidates to observe and participate in a variety of instructional situations;

- Model various instructional strategies; include candidates in such activities as planning, assessment, monitoring, and debriefing;

- Assign instructional tasks to candidates on a gradually increasing basis of responsibility and difficulty;
- Provides feedback to candidates on a regular basis through conferencing and written comments;

- Contact the clinical supervisor if a candidate needs special assistance;

- Prepare a narrative evaluation of the candidates' strengths and areas for improvement at the various stages of the student-teaching experience.

Because these roles are well-defined, each participant enters the relationship with a clear set of expectations that are reinforced through continuous conversation about how well the candidate is performing during her/his clinical experience.

Exhibit:
3c.2., Student-Teaching Evaluation Form

3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

Time for reflection is incorporated into each course that requires a set number of observation hours. Moreover, during the clinical experience, each candidate is registered in a Student Teaching Seminar, a course that has been explicitly designed as a forum through which candidates can reflect on their clinical practice. Occurring once a week during the semester in which the candidate is completing her/his clinical experience, the Student Teaching Seminar is a valuable opportunity for candidates to share, reflect, and adapt instructional strategies in consultation with peers. It is during this time that candidates also work on their program portfolios, another formal means through which reflection and feedback occur. This portfolio includes a professional development reflection key assignment. Moreover, candidates complete a self-evaluation form that is shared with others. These are two examples of the structured activities that occur in the Student Teaching Seminar that promote reflection and require feedback.

Also, during clinical practice candidates write lesson plans in preparation for teaching, so that the school-based faculty member or the clinical supervisor can see what is planned. Lesson plans end with a reflection, written once the lesson has concluded, about the experience of teaching the lesson. These plans and reflections are regularly shared with the school-based faculty member and the clinical supervisor. This is another means through which reflection and feedback are encouraged.

Exhibits:
3c.3.1., Sample Syllabi from Student Teaching Seminars
3c.3.2., Program Portfolio Handbook
3c.3.3., Professional Development Reflection Key Assignment
3c.3.4., Candidate Self-Evaluation Form

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice. More specifically, during the introductory-level foundations courses, candidates begin by observing. Then, they move on to interact with students in small groups, large groups, and finally whole classes. The faculty has assignments and assessments in place for each of these settings.

During the developing level of fieldwork, candidates deliver instruction targeting a specific objective. At the end of the lesson, the candidate assesses student learning and writes a reflection about the interaction that includes "next steps." Formative and summative evaluations are conducted during clinical fieldwork. Conferences among College supervisors, cooperating teachers, and candidates serve to provide feedback to the candidate. College supervisors, cooperating teachers, and candidates utilize an evaluation form developed directly from the conceptual framework that uses a rubric to describe the level of competency reached by candidates in a variety of areas. The form asks for evidence supporting the competency level reached, which can be descriptive or physical. The form is completed for each lesson that is observed by the supervisor, and, at the end of each placement, by the cooperating teacher, teacher candidate, and supervisor.

One of the areas assessed is "impact on student learning" in which the observer is asked to note the effectiveness of the lesson and to cite evidence supporting it. Candidates in the field also use such tools as running records, retellings, assessment of prior knowledge (pre-test), and assessment of knowledge after intervention (post-test). They collect student work and analyze it with colleagues in the student teaching seminar. All lesson plans prepared by candidates in all programs include a section on student

assessment, which requires candidates to plan ahead for assessment, and for supervisors and cooperating teachers to evaluate their assessment skills. Examples of these lesson plans are provided in Exhibit 3c.4.2.

Exhibits:
3c.4.1., Data from Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Clinical Practice Evaluations
3c.4.2., Sample Candidate Lesson Plans

3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

The unit requires that its candidates demonstrate competency on a key assignment that assesses their ability to collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning. This key assignment is completed during clinical practice while enrolled in the Student Teaching Seminar. This assignment requires candidates to explore different ways of assessing student performance--ranging from objective, qualitative assessments to valid quantitative assessments. Candidates then compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various methods.

Exhibit:
3c.5., Assessment of Learning Assignment for Reflection and Analysis Key Assignment

3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

The unit has ensured that all candidates have field experiences and clinical practice that requires them to work with a diverse range of students. At the undergraduate, level attention to Special Education is built into a number of courses. In particular, the introductory Psychological Foundations courses have field assignments that pertain to students with exceptionalities. In methods courses, teacher candidates are expected to provide evidence in their written planning and lesson implementation during fieldwork and student teaching of affirmation and accommodation of difference. The Early Childhood program requires assignments dealing with Special Education in three required courses, EDC 215, 217, and often 350 as well.

All graduate programs (initial and advanced) require candidates to take the course Teaching Students with Special Needs in the General Education Classroom (EDP 660). During this course, candidates plan instruction for students with exceptionalities (INTASC Standard 7), adapt instructional strategies (INTASC Standard 3), and assess learning (INTASC Standard 8).

Moreover, New York State mandates that fieldwork for initial certification include experiences in Title I schools, private schools, Special Education settings, and with students who are English language learners. The Director of Fieldwork keeps a record of candidate placements and ensures that they have all of these experiences through fieldwork and student teaching. Through the collaborative efforts of the Director and Coordinator of Fieldwork, Local Instructional Supervisors, and principals, most of the partner schools used by the unit for fieldwork and student teaching are both Title I racially diverse (no more than half of the school is dominated by one racial/ethnic group), and includes children with exceptionalities and English language learners. The unit makes an effort to use schools that also have a diverse staff. Demographic profiles are gathered from the NYC Department of Education's Website on a regular basis. All schools that are used for fieldwork are coeducational.

Further, candidates in initial programs are required to take an introductory course in Social Foundations, which includes fieldwork hours and an assignment on diversity.

Exhibits:
3c.6.1., Course Syllabus for EDP 660
3c.6.2., Catalog Description of Social Foundations Courses
3c.6.3., Data on Classroom Diversity

3c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

Since the unit's initial visit in 2005, the unit has made significant progress in clarifying the purposes and improving the quality and consistency of its field and clinical experiences. Much of this progress can be attributed to the efforts of the unit's Director of Fieldwork, Dr. Deirdre Armitage. Her position, created shortly before the initial visit, reflects the unit's and institution's commitment to field-based teacher preparation.

Specifically, under the guidance of Dr. Armitage the unit has divided field experiences in all initial programs into three levels: 1) Introductory, (2) Developing, and; (3) Competency. These distinctions have enabled the unit's faculty members to design course experiences and assignments that better match the aims and intentions of field experiences. Dr. Armitage's role as a conduit among unit faculty members has ensured that its candidates' course experiences are aligned with the goals of each level of field experiences.

In addition to providing a measure of clarity to the objectives of field experiences, Dr. Armitage has been able to develop and nurture relationships with a number of P-12 schools. The importance of this cannot be overstated as it is critical that the unit has access to a range of schools so that its candidates have diverse field and clinical experiences. Over the past five years, Dr. Armitage has been able to strengthen collaborative partnerships with school fieldwork sites and work with the unit's faculty on implementing a consistent, comprehensive, exemplary fieldwork program for teacher candidates. The unit recognizes Dr. Armitage's central role in the unit's teacher preparation efforts as she is active in all facets of the unit's operations.

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Standard 3 is an area in which key assessment data from the unit's assessment system has been used in an effort to identify ways in which field and clinical experiences can be better designed and administered. The intent of this line of research, under the direction of the unit's Assessment Coordinator, Dr. El Samuels, is to ultimately better align coursework, and field and clinical experiences to the realities of P-12 teaching in urban schools.

This line of research germinated during meetings with the unit's Assessment Committee. For example,

the Committee was concerned that exit and alumni surveys revealed that parent/teacher interactions were a cause of concern for new and recent graduates. Further analysis and interpretation strongly suggested that this was an under-appreciated area in which candidates were struggling. Because the unit firmly contends that developing productive relationships with parents/guardians is essential to helping all students learn, the Assessment Committee recommended that this topic be addressed by the unit's Curriculum Committees, Partnership Advisory Committee, and Director of Fieldwork.

Through consultation with these different entities, the unit was able to identify a key assignment that is to be completed by candidates that deals with issues related to parent/teacher interaction. Moreover, by working closely with its P-12 partners, the unit was able to secure permission from school leaders and school-based faculty for its candidates to participate in parent/teacher conferences. Lastly, the unit's Assessment Committee has advised Dr. Samuels to closely monitor this issue and report back when more recent data become available.

This research example speaks to the unit's commitment to examine its own practices and modify those practices in ways that are informed by data.

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

Because an overwhelming majority of candidates are likely to teach in New York City's public schools, the unit makes a concerted effort to ensure that they develop and demonstrate proficiencies that will enable them to teach in increasingly diverse settings. The unit's CF clearly reflects the proficiencies that our candidates are expected to develop during their programs. Its three goals are:

1. Gain Content and Pedagogical Knowledge;

2. Engage All Students; and

3. Demonstrate Professional Dispositions.

Goals 2 and 3 in particular, demonstrate our commitment to preparing our candidates to work in a diversity of settings with diverse colleagues and students. CSI Goals are aligned with the standards of other professional organizations. The knowledge, skills, and dispositions noted above that candidates are

expected to acquire during their education program are clearly articulated in the unit's CF brochure, which is distributed in every education course at the beginning of each semester and discussed by the faculty. Additionally, the same information is included in all of the program handbooks. Finally, a summary of the unit's conceptual framework is included in all syllabi.

The unit's curriculum and field experiences are explicitly designed to help candidates to understand the importance of diversity and this is demonstrated in a number of courses. For example, all undergraduate candidates have to take a course in pluralism and diversity and have to complete specific assignments within courses and demonstrate their awareness of diversity. Moreover, all methods courses offered by the unit address how to create learning experiences and assess learners in ways that meet their diverse needs. Candidates are prepared to work in schools where the population of students is diverse or contains a high minority and/or low SES population. Candidates must perform a minimum of ten hours of observation in a Title I school. In addition, the preponderance of student-teaching/Special Education pracitca (roughly 90%) are completed in Title I schools.

Exhibits:
4a.1.1., Conceptual Framework
4a.1.2., Page 60 Pluralism and Diversity Requirement in Undergraduate Catalogue
4a.1.3., Proficiencies Related to Diversity that Candidates Are Expected to Develop
4a.1.4., Matrix of Diversity Components in Required Courses

4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- **awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and**
- **the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?**

There is a number of required courses and experiences that enable candidates to develop both an awareness of the importance of diversity and the knowledge skills and dispositions necessary to adapt instruction for diverse populations. For example, all undergraduate candidates have to take a course in pluralism and diversity and complete specific assignments within courses and must demonstrate their awareness of diversity.

Once candidates enter the Education sequence, the courses in Social Foundations provide a cross-disciplinary understanding of the challenges and opportunities afforded by diverse learning settings. Because these Social Foundations courses (e.g., EDE 200 or EDS 201 at the undergraduate level and EDD 602 at the graduate level) are sequenced at or near the beginning of the curriculum, the unit is able to establish the importance of diversity. For example, the Classroom Observation Guide, the key assignment for the early Childhood program meeting CSI Objective 1C, Knowledge of Learners, equires candidates to survey the entire classroom setting and assess how each part of the environment reflects specific student's physical, cognitive, or language development. In a time when the utility of Social Foundations courses has come into question, the unit proudly stands by its commitment to require that all initial and advanced candidates take at least one course in this area. The unit contends that these courses are critical in terms of candidates' developing a knowledge of learners (CSI Goal 1, Objective C) and respect for others (CSI Goal 3, Objective C).

All of our methods courses address how to create learning experiences and assess learners in ways that

meet their diverse needs. It is during this sequence of courses that candidates acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to adapt for diverse populations. Candidates are specifically prepared to work in schools where the population of students is diverse or contains a high minority and/or low SES population. For example, the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment that is common to all initial certification programs, challenges candidates to meet the learning needs of diverse students. Those factors that candidates must consider include, among others, the different linguistic and cultural backgrounds of students in Staten Island and in Brooklyn.

All of the unit's methods courses address how to adapt teaching and learning styles to meet the cultural needs of students. Candidates directly experience schools where the population of students is diverse or contains a high minority and/or low SES population.

The unit is firmly committed to developing candidates that adapt instruction in ways that match the complexities of the urban schools in which they are likely to work. As a reflection of this commitment, key assessments across programs address INTASC Standard 3 (adaptation of instruction for all students) and INTASC Standard 4 (use of multiple instructional strategies).

Exhibits:
4a.2.1., Pluralism and Diversity Courses Social Foundations Catalogue Descriptions Methods Course Syllabi
4a.2.2., Adapting Instructional Strategies Key Assignment

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

Initial candidates are assessed for their proficiencies relating to diversity through the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment and through the clinical experience evaluations. A detailed description of the the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment is presented in Exhibit 4a.3.1.

Candidates' performance on the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment found that at most 3% of a given group of candidates only achieved emerging levels of competency and that none were found unsatisfactory (Exhibit 4a.3.2).

The results of the clinical experience evaluations from cooperating teachers and supervisors indicate that only a small percent (approximately 7%) of candidates performed at emerging levels of competency and that none were found unsatisfactory (Exhibit 4a.3.3).

Advanced candidates are assessed in this area through the personal statement included in the application to the educational research seminar, which is transition point #2. This assessment found that all candidates were at least "proficient" with working with diverse students (data presented in Exhibit 4a.3.4).

Taken together, data from these assessments indicate that on the whole the unit is successfully developing candidates' proficiencies related to diversity.

Exhibits:
4a.3.1., The Adapting Instructional Strategies Key Assignment
4a.3.2., Data on Candidates' Facility with Adapting Instruction
4a.3.3., Data on Clinical Experience Evaluations of Candidates' Knowledge of Learners

4a.3.4., Data on Advanced Candidates' Proficiencies with Diversity

4a.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?

The primary means through which candidates interact with higher education faculty from diverse groups is through formal coursework offered by the unit or institution. Because candidates are for the most part also enrolled in coursework offered by other departments, candidates are afforded the opportunity to interact with a broader subset of the institution's increasingly diverse faculty.

In addition, the institution offers a range of opportunities outside of formal coursework for candidates to interact with faculty from diverse groups. For example, the institution hosts a series titled "World on Wednesday." This weekly lecture series provides a forum through which the institution's international faculty members engage the campus community about their research. These well-attended events expose candidates to a range of research topics from the perspective of a scholar whose training and expertise were acquired outside the United States.

Also, candidates' field and clinical experiences are more than likely to involve meaningful interaction with school-based faculty from backgrounds that are different than their own. Because candidates' field hours are distributed over several courses and semesters, the unit is able to stagger the placement of candidates in ways that ensure they encounter a range of school settings. Although the unit does not track the race/sex of its school-based faculty, the unit does make sure that candidates' field and clinical experiences are performed in schools that vary in terms of their demographic distributions. This variation likely ensures that candidates interact with school-based faculty from diverse groups.

4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

The institution's faculty has a wide array of knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse populations. For example, several of the unit's faculty members were born and lived in countries outside of the U.S. Others have taught and made presentations abroad, and/or taught for a variety of diverse Colleges. Further, publications by faculty attest to our commitment in diversity. Approaching all members of the school community through this framework allows the community to honor the contributions of all, regardless of racial, cultural, or educational background.

Knowledge of the historical and social foundations of Special Education and the impact of the inclusion movement on teacher preparation has also become an active focus of the unit. Special Education faculty offer their knowledge and experience to general education candidates through a number of courses, e.g., Teaching Students with Special Needs in General Education Classroom (EDP 660), Issues in Bilingualism in Special Education and Inclusive Classrooms (EDP 675), Perspectives on Normalization

and Integration in Special Education (EDP 685).

The institution's commitment to keeping the community involved in issues of disability is further documented by its Willowbrook Annual Memorial Conference. Given that CSI is located on the old campus of the Willowbrook Institution for Developmental Disabilities, the conference is dedicated to past Willowbrook residents. In a variety of symposia, distinguished speakers, scholars, practitioners, and parents who work in the field of education are invited to share their knowledge and experiences. The unit's faculty members often participate in the conference and a number of the unit's candidates have attended.

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

Table 8
Faculty Demographics

	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs n (%)	All Faculty in the Institution n (%)	School-based faculty n (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	n/a	n/a	0	1 (.3%)	n/a
Asian	n/a	n/a	2 (3%)	46 (13.0%)	n/a
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	n/a	n/a	1 (1.5%)	11 (3.1%)	n/a
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	n/a	n/a	0	0 (0%)	n/a
Hispanic or Latino	n/a	n/a	3 (4.5%)	16 (4.6%)	n/a
White, non-Hispanic	n/a	n/a	58 (91%)	279 (79.0%)	n/a
Two or more races	n/a	n/a	0	0 (0%)	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	0	0 (0%)	n/a
Race/ethnicity Unknown	n/a	n/a	0	0 (0%)	n/a
Total	n/a	n/a	64	353	n/a
Female	n/a	n/a	37 (58%)	150 (42.5%)	n/a
Male	n/a	n/a	27 (42%)	203 (57.5%)	n/a
Total	n/a	n/a	64	353	n/a

4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The unit and institution have made it a priority to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. Specifically, in the past five years, six new faculty members were hired to either replace those who vacated existing lines or in response to new lines that were awarded in response to enrollment demands.

The hiring of new faculty members is done under the strict oversight of the College's Director of the Office of Diversity and Compliance (ODC), who reports to the President of the college and serves as the College's Chief Diversity Officer. The Director, Mr. Kenichi Iwama, Esq., is responsible for ensuring compliance with university and college policy, and federal, state, and municipal laws pertaining to equal employment, affirmative action, and diversity. The ODC has led several initiatives to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. First, Mr. Iwama meets with all department chairs to ensure that job searches are

performed in accordance with the policies and laws that guide employment practices. He also meets with each search committee's ODC designee, the person who is charged with maintaining a record of prospective employee's qualifications and background. In addition, Mr. Iwama's office has explicitly reached out to historically Black colleges to advertise the College's faculty vacancies. Third, his office also maintains a minority applicant database that targets qualified candidates from under-represented groups. Finally, the ODC engages minority caucuses in a number of professional discipline-based associations to expand the College's outreach and efforts to attain inclusive excellence.

The Department's and College's efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty during the past decade have resulted in a more diverse and balanced faculty; nevertheless challenges persist. The progress and obstacles in this area are summarized in the College's Middle States Periodic Review.

Exhibits:
4b.4.1., ODS
4b.4.2., Middle States Periodic Report

4b.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

Since the unit is completely embedded in the larger institution, the unit leverages the diversity present in the greater student body to provide its candidates with valuable opportunities to interact with students from diverse groups. There are several ways through which this is accomplished. The primary means through which this is accomplished is through coursework that the unit's candidates take with students enrolled in programs offered by other departments. Because these departments and programs have demographic distributions that more closely reflect the institution's diversity, the unit's candidates are able to engage diverse others through coursework.

The institution's Office of Student Life provides a second opportunity through which candidates interact with others from diverse groups. Reporting directly to the Office of Vice President for Student Affairs, Student Life's goal is to enhance the students' education by providing a variety of co-curricular opportunities designed to facilitate and encourage student responsibility for their own intellectual, social, emotional, spiritual, and cultural identity. As such, this office hosts a range of events and activities that provide the unit's candidates with numerous opportunities to interact with others from backgrounds different than their own.

Exhibits:
4c.1., Office of Student Life

4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation

programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.

Table 9
Candidate Demographics

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)	All Students in the Institution n (%)	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	19 (2.3%)	6 (2.4%)	35 (0.3%)	1,107 (0.2%)
Asian	56 (6.9%)	11 (4.5%)	1172 (11.4%)	25,071 (5.7%)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	52 (6.4%)	13 (5.3%)	1171 (11.4%)	42,914 (9.7%)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	12 (1.5%)	2 (0.8%)	24 (0.2%)	182 (~0.0%)
Hispanic or Latino	108 (13.3%)	22 (8.9%)	1646 (16.0%)	53,550 (12.1%)
White, non-Hispanic	536 (66.1%)	168 (68.0%)	6250 (60.7%)	344,319 (77.6%)
Two or more races	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11,780 (2.7%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18,355 (4.1%)
Race/ethnicity unknown	28 (3.5%)	25 (10.1%)	3562 (25.7%)	Not reported
Total	811	247	10296	443,728
Female	713 (87.9%)	206 (88.8%)	8156 (58.9%)	229,243 (51.7%)
Male	98 (12.1%)	26 (11.2%)	5702 (41.1%)	214,485 (48.3%)
Total	811	247	13858	443,728

4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

To retain candidates from historically under-represented groups, the institution offers a number of programs that have been successful in helping the unit in its efforts to re-balance its distribution of demographic traits. First, a number of faculty teach CORE 100 as a means of recruitment into the unit. CORE 100 is a mandatory introductory first-year seminar that is writing intensive. Because the course is required of all first-year students, the unit is able to use this as a means through which it can introduce prospects to the unit's offerings and pathways into the teaching profession.

Second, the Office of Disability Services (ODS) provides a critical set of services to help recruit and retain students with exceptionalities. The Director and staff of the ODS work with faculty members to provide accommodations and services. Services that are offered include: readers, alternative testing, priority registration, academic counseling, and one-on-one tutoring. In addition, the ODS advocates for its students and is interested in campus accessibility issues.

A third effort that has helped recruit and retain students from diverse groups is the institution's laudable Veterans Center. This center is dedicated to providing the support needed to help our servicemen and women adjust to college life. The Center provides information for veterans and dependents of eligible veterans about the benefits and resources available on and off campus. These are just three of the means through which the unit recruits and retains a diverse pool of candidates.

Fourth, is the institution's Black Male Initiative Program (BMI). This program, led by Debra Evans-Greene, was designed by The City University of New York to engage successful minority students in the recruitment and retention of other minority students, especially males, at the college and high school levels.

Exhibits:
4c.3.1., CORE 100

4c.3.2., Office of Disability Services
4c.3.3., Veterans Center
4c.3.4., BMI

4c.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit ensures that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice in a number of ways. First, the unit makes certain that candidates' field experiences and clinical practice are conducted in diverse settings. More specifically, New York State Education Department mandates that fieldwork for initial certification include experiences in Title I schools, private schools, Special Education settings, and with students who are English language learners. The Coordinator of Fieldwork keeps a record of candidate placements and ensures that they have all of these experiences through fieldwork and student teaching. Through the collaborative efforts of the Director and Coordinator of Fieldwork, and P-12 administrators and principals, most of the partner schools (over 90%) used by the unit for fieldwork and student teaching are both Title I (a large portion of children receive free or reduced lunches), racially diverse (no more than half of the school is dominated by one ethnic group), and includes children with exceptionalities and English language learners. The unit makes an effort to use schools that also have a diverse staff. Demographic profiles are gathered from the NYC Department of Education's Website on a regular basis to review this criterion. All schools that are used for fieldwork are coeducational.

Further, all candidates are required to take a course in Social Foundations, which includes fieldwork hours and an assignment on diversity. As candidates enter their methods courses, they also are asked to develop lessons that attend to the needs of diverse learners. Finally, during clinical practice, candidates complete the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment. This key assessment demonstrates the application of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions as they relate to diversity in the context of their clinical practice. Example syllabi from these courses are provided in the exhibits noted below.

Exhibits:
4d.1.1., Sample Social Foundations syllabus
4d.1.2., Sample Methods course syllabus
4d.1.3., Sample Student teaching seminar syllabus

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not

clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

Name of school	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	White, non-Hispanic	Two or more races	Other	Race / ethnicity unknown	Students receiving free / reduced price lunch	English language learners	Students with disabilities
NYC DoE Geographic District 31 (Richmond County, NY, 2007-08)	242 (~0.0%)	4705 (8.0%)	9315 (16.1%)	Not reported	12,982 (22.5%)	32,028 (55.4%)	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	27,703 (47.9%)	3602 (6.2%)	Not reported

4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

The unit ensures that candidates use feedback to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups through the Student Teaching and Practicum Evaluation Form (Exhibit 4d.3.1., item 9). This form is used by the Clinical Supervisor to evaluate the lesson she/he has observed. The form becomes the basis of a formative evaluation conference between the clinical supervisor and candidate. This dialogue is designed to drive improvement in subsequent lessons that are to be observed. The unit has ensured that this feedback has been put to use by the candidate as the clinical supervisor in follow-up observations employs the same evaluation form. By using the same observation form across different times, the candidate and supervisor are able to evaluate the areas in which progress has been made. Candidates also use feedback from peers to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups. These exchanges occur during the Student Teaching Seminar, which is taken concurrently while one is in clinical practice.

Candidates also receive feedback on the Adapting Instructional Strategies key assignment that informs them of how well they were able to consider student needs, backgrounds, etc. Candidates in advanced programs receive feedback through the Case Study and Lesson Plan key assignment administered through EDP 660, Teaching Students with Special Needs in the General Education Classroom.

Leadership candidates receive feedback through their summer internship when they work very closely with an established, experience administrator.

Exhibits:
4d.3.1., Student Teaching and Practicum Evaluation Form (item 9)
4d.3.2., Adapting Instructional Strategies Key Assignment
4d.3.3., Case Study and Lesson Plan Key Assignment

4d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

Because of the unit's role in preparing teachers for New York City's public schools, the unit takes seriously its approach to ensuring that candidates are prepared for the challenges and opportunities afforded by diverse learning settings. This approach consists of three components.

First, the unit's programs have curricula in which diversity is infused throughout. For example, candidates in initial programs take a course in Social Foundations at the beginning of their program. The course descriptions for these offerings explicitly reflect an emphasis on race, class, gender, ability, immigration, and language acquisition (see, e.g., EDS 201 or EDD 602). Also, all initial and advanced graduate candidates take a course (EDP 660) that prepares them to provide for the individual special needs of students with learning and behavioral differences who are integrated into general education programs.

Not only is this commitment reflected in the courses that candidates are required to take, but also in their placement for fieldwork and clinical practice. Fieldwork hours are structured so that candidates complete them in a range of schools with varied demographic characteristics. Moreover, over 90% of the schools used as sites for clinical practice have Title 1 status.

Third, in addition to ensuring that curricular, fieldwork, and clinical experiences address issues related to diversity, the unit also collects and analyzes data derived from these experiences to ensure that its candidates are fully prepared to meet the challenges of diverse urban communities, schools and classrooms. Data about these experiences are provided by a number of key assessments.

Taken together, these three components affirm the unit's contention that its candidates are well-prepared to address issues related to diversity. The unit feels strongly that this is an area in which it has approached "target level."

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The unit's beliefs in fairness and that all students can learn is reflected in the research agendas of several faculty members. An example of this is Dr. Helen Mele-Robinson's work in the area of cultural competence. This line of work, for which she is currently seeking external funding, examines how the concept of cultural competence can be employed in a manner that helps prospective Early Childhood educators better serve the diverse populations of urban students that they are likely to encounter. The first phase of this work finds Dr. Mele-Robinson collecting and reporting on the research literature that has been published in this area. The ultimate aim of this work is to increase the cultural competence of Early Childhood teacher candidates so that they also employ a range of instructional strategies that attend to the cultural variation within their own classrooms.

Research being conducted by Dr. Elisabeth Johnson focuses on the ways young people and their teacher negotiated popular culture text meanings in high school, with specific attention to considering the ways participant negotiations intersected with their raced, classed, aged, and school status positions, e.g., Black, White, poor, working class, middle class, teen, adult, student, teacher. She argues that these moments of text meaning negotiation are moments when young people and their teachers are practicing

"performative politics," i.e., countering and remaking categories of race, class, age, and school status, in ways typically portrayed simplistically or completely ignored in literature on popular culture in the classroom. A manuscript borne out of this line of research is currently under review at the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*.

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

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

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)]

Table 11
Faculty Qualification Summary

FacultyInfo_3139_900_29435.xls
See **Attachments** panel below.

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

Those professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees are nonetheless exceptionally qualified for their teaching assignments. Because all full-time faculty members have earned doctoral degrees, only those serving as part-time adjuncts would be in the pool of those who have not earned terminal degrees. Of those 40 persons serving as part-time adjunct faculty in the fall 2009 semester, six have earned doctoral degrees. Thus, the remaining 34 do not hold terminal degrees.

Therefore, the unit relies on a combination of factors to assess their expertise. First, the institution requires that part-time faculty members possess a master's degree. All part-time faculty members meet this requirement, with several having more than one master's degree, or a master's degree plus 30 additional graduate credits. The unit also asks that these part-time faculty members be professionally active in their areas of research and or teaching by demonstrating that they have been active members in professional associations. Third, the unit expects that part-time adjuncts, particularly those teaching

introductory and advanced teaching methods courses, possess an exemplary record of teaching as demonstrated by formal school-based evaluations. The combination of these three factors ensures the unit that those professional education faculty who do not hold terminal degrees are experts in their fields and qualified to teach the unit's candidates.

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

New York State requires that all teachers be licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise, and that all teachers possess a master's degree by the end of their third year of teaching. Therefore, all school-based faculty members (cooperating teachers) in New York City possess or are completing their master's degrees. Cooperating teachers complete and sign a "Cooperating Teacher Selection Form" prior to being assigned a student teacher. The form contains the following information: degree(s), undergraduate major(s)/minor(s), current teaching assignment, number of years in education, additional training, relevant experience, areas of interest, and/or qualifications. These qualifications are then verified by the Director of Fieldwork who reviews the information that has been submitted with the school's principal.

Educational Leadership interns complete their full-time summer internships at sites where principals and the Educational Leadership Program Supervisor choose collaboratively the experienced licensed mentor supervisors.

Exhibit:
5a.3., Cooperating Teacher Selection Form

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

Clinical faculty members from higher education have recent professional experiences in schools at the levels that they supervise. Most Clinical Supervisors are either full-time faculty members or adjuncts who are recently retired public school teachers or administrators. Examples from the former group include Drs. Bazna and DeSimone, who are both full-time faculty members who also supervise clinical practice. Among the department's adjuncts, Ms. Rosenberg and Ms. Greenspun, both of whom are recently retired principals with a range of experiences, also serve as Clinical Supervisors. These two well-qualified adjuncts reflect the department's commitment to providing its candidates with support from those who have recent experience in the school settings in which candidates complete their clinical experiences. The department firmly believes that full-time faculty members should also have ongoing experiences in the P-12 schools. Thus, the department's chair, when consulting full-time faculty members about the next year's teaching schedules, encourages full-time faculty to supervise student teachers and mentor intern candidates.

5a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html
Table 11 Faculty Qualification Summary

See **Attachments** panel below.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

Instruction by professional education faculty closely reflects the goals outlined by the unit's conceptual framework. All education courses include a summary of our conceptual framework and also key assessments addressing CSI Goals. CSI Goals are clearly aligned with other professional standards. Also, candidates demonstrate awareness of the conceptual framework through their exhibits and reflections in their program portfolios.

For example, CSI Goal 1 of the conceptual framework, Gain Content Knowledge and Develop Pedagogy, is reflected in the faculty's commitment to collaboratively working with the other academic departments (e.g., Mathematics, History, etc.) to ensure that candidates acquire content knowledge through coursework that matches the content standards set forth by the New York State Department of Education.

CSI Goal 2, Engage All Students, is also reflected in instruction provided by the unit's professional education faculty. For example, faculty members address the multiple ways in which diversity influences the teaching-learning process (Exhibit 5b.1.1). Among the issues addressed are: (1) developmental stage and age, (2) typical and atypical development, 3) racial and ethnic diversity, 4) gender issues, 5) language diversity, 6) socioeconomic and geographic factors, and (7) students with exceptionalities. The faculty who teach social and psychological foundations courses address all of these issues.

Goal 3, the Demonstration of Professional Dispositions, is encouraged by all faculty members in the unit and is formally assessed through a number of key assessments in courses. CSI Goal 3 is aligned with INTASC Standards 9 and 10 and data of candidates meeting those standards are presented (Exhibit 5b.1.2). Further, encouragement of reflection is demonstrated by the fact that candidates have to include a written reflection statement, evaluated separately by the instructor, for each assignment they want to include in their program portfolio.

Moreover, instruction by professional education faculty reflects current research and developments across a number of fields. A small sample of this instruction is provided in Exhibit 5b.1.3, which includes syllabi from recent courses that cover material that is at the forefront of research trends.

Exhibits:
5b.1.1., List of Evidence on Diversity in Education Courses
5b.1.2., Candidate Dispositions Data
5b.1.3., Sample Syllabi with Current Research

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions in a number of ways. The primary means through which these traits are developed in candidates is through modeling them in their own professional roles as faculty members. The modeling of these behaviors is not lost on the unit's candidates. Similar to how faculty members present and publish their work in ways that require one to respond to the critical feedback other experts, initial candidates also prepare portfolios for presentation. Each exhibit includes a reflection signed by a

faculty member. The exhibits that constitute the portfolio provide a valuable means through which candidates engage in reflection.

The unit also expects its candidates to engage in critical thinking and problem solving through the capstone research sequence (EDD 630/631). It is during this experience that students propose and complete a research project that not only requires them to demonstrate an understanding of basic research design, but also asks that they think deeply about how their work can be used to confront a problem that is of significance for teachers and/or students in P-12 schools. The dispositions that faculty members display as active members of the professional community are mirrored in the candidates' presentations of both their portfolios and research projects. In regard to the latter, candidates present their research at the unit's "Celebration of Educational Research." The dispositions that the unit seeks to develop, including respect and transparency, are on display as candidates' discuss their work before a critical audience of peers and faculty members. Activities such as these enable the unit to encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.

Exhibits:
5b.2.1., Program Portfolio Handbook
5b.2.2., Sample Portfolios
5b.2.3., Celebration Brochure

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?

Faculty members model a variety of instructional strategies and assessments. Not only does this provide candidates with multiple ways to interact with and engage course materials, it also provides them with strategies and examples of assessment tools and procedures that can be employed in their own P-12 classrooms. Faculty members are encouraged to use a variety of teaching styles that accommodate different learning styles. Although some faculty members prefer primarily constructivist methods, which in themselves address different learning styles, other faculty members prefer elements of the Socratic Method and class questioning and discussion. Examples of specific instructional strategies are the following: class discussions, lecture, collaborative student projects, videos, technology, e.g., PowerPoint presentations, discussion boards, research and Website creation on the Internet, role plays, and simulations. These varied instructional strategies not only attend to candidates' different learning styles, they also provide examples that candidates' can try and adapt in their own P-12 classrooms.

This variation in instructional strategies mirrors the different types of assessments that the unit's faculty employ within any given program. Faculty members assess candidates' performance through multiple assessment tools, at each of the four transition points in the programs. More specifically, faculty members assess candidates in their courses through key assignments, which address relevant standards as well as other activities such as examinations, research papers, class presentations, projects, class participation, and attendance. Assessment data from the four transition points and from course key assessments are entered in our Education Database, analyzed and discussed by our Assessment Committee. The committee shares information and provides recommendations for program improvement to the Chair. The Chair shares the information with the faculty, TEAC, and PAC. By modeling these strategies and assessment tools, faculty members reflect the unit's commitment to CSI's Goal 1, Objective C (Knowledge of Pedagogy) and Goal 2, Objective D (Assessment Skill).

5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?

The unit's faculty members incorporate technology into instruction in a number of ways with varying

amounts of frequency depending on the content and objectives of each course. Regardless, the unit has made much progress in this area due to a number of developments. First, the institution has allocated a number of resources to assist faculty members with the incorporation of technology into instruction. Not only has the institution, through its Office of Information Technology, increased the availability and quality of hardware and software, it has also made resources and professional development opportunities available through its Center for Excellence in Learning Technology (CELT). CELT is a library-based service that provides state-of-the-art equipment, software, and support for faculty at CSI. It is the mission of CELT to make technology accessible to faculty for easy, effective integration into their classes.

Second, faculty members hired within the past few years have brought with them knowledge of technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK) that has positively influenced the instructional practices of less technologically savvy colleagues. These practices include the incorporation of Geographical Information Systems technology into Social Foundation courses (EDD 602), the use of voice-over Internet protocol (e.g. Skype) technologies in hybrid courses (e.g. EDD 642), and Smart Board usage across a number of courses (e.g., EDE 303). These are just a sample of the ways in which the faculty incorporates the use of technology into instruction.

A third way in which faculty members incorporate technology into their own instruction is by soliciting and encouraging the exchange of best P-12 practices and adopting them to suit the needs and interests and their own post-secondary classrooms. In this manner, the unit does not rely solely on the expertise of its own faculty members, but rather uses the technological expertise and know-how of current advanced candidates who often are ahead of the curve when it comes to technology in the classroom. The unit is firmly committed to the idea that its candidates, especially those currently employed in schools, have much to offer, particularly in the area of technology, and it would be wise to harness this expertise.

Exhibits:
5b.4.1., CELT
5b.4.2., Sample Syllabi

5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?

Unit faculty members systematically engage in the assessment of their own teaching in a number of ways. First, all candidates complete the Student Government-sponsored anonymous evaluation of faculty performance each semester. Each faculty member reviews the results individually and with the department chair and uses them to improve their performance. Further, peer reviews are an important opportunity for self-assessment. Peer reviews include a planning conference in which faculty members discuss their own strengths and weaknesses, and a post-conference, which includes the faculty member assessing her/his own effectiveness. This process applies to both full- and part-time faculty members. Finally, informal assessment takes place in discussions with candidates and on self-made evaluation forms that numerous faculty members distribute to their classes. Together, these three means provide faculty members with a sufficient number of avenues to engage in the assessment of their own teaching.

Exhibits:
5b.5.1., Student Evaluation Forms
5b.5.2., Samples of Peer Observation Reports
5b.5.3., Supplementary Course Evaluation Forms

5b.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty

teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The institution and unit expect faculty members to develop and maintain a level of scholarly production that is consistent with the institution's Carnegie classification as a large, master's degree-granting institution. This level of production is dependent on the discipline and field within which one has been trained. Therefore, the types of work are varied based on this dimension. Moreover, because the unit is a Department of Education populated by faculty members trained in the a number of disciplines, the types of scholarly work that are encouraged and produced reflect the expectations of the various subfields and disciplines that constitute the larger the field of education. Scholarly work within the unit includes, but is not limited to: books, monographs, scholarly journal articles, articles for popular outlets, and children's music. A sample of faculty's curriculum vitae demonstrates these varied types. Regardless of the varied nature of the scholarly work produced by the unit, scholarship potential and achievement is one of the major criteria in the hiring, reappointment, and promotion of full-time faculty members. This process ensures that the types of scholarly work are aligned with the unit's and institution's expectations for frequency, quality, and relevancy. This process is described in Exhibit 5c.1.2.

Exhibits:
5c.1.1., Sample vitae
5c.1.2., CUNY Bylaws on Recruitment, Reappointments and Promotions

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

One-hundred percent of the unit's full-time faculty members are engaged in scholarship activities. These scholarship activities reflect the unit's commitment to intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility. Moreover, these varied scholarship activities meet, or, in most cases, exceed the expectations set forth by the institution's and unit's mission. For example, full-time faculty members, regardless of rank, are expected to be productive in terms of their scholarship. This includes traditional research and publication as well as systematic studies of pedagogy and the application of current research to new settings. This scholarship is submitted for professional review and evaluation and is published in both scholarly and popular outlets.

The policies and procedures outlined in CUNY's Bylaws dictate that faculty members uphold this commitment. These Bylaws also state that non full-time faculty, including University-based adjuncts and supervisors of clinical instruction, need not develop and maintain a record of scholarly activities. However, a number of non-full-time faculty do, in fact, engage in scholarship activities including conference participation, action-based research in P-12 schools, or leadership roles in professional associations.

A sample of full-time faculty members' scholarly activities is provided in the exhibits noted below. These exhibits reflect the interests and expertise of faculty whose scholarship is directly tied to teaching and learning. Others, however, are involved in scholarship and advocacy that informs educational policy, including areas such school organization, charter schools, and teacher recruitment and development. The quality and range of the faculty's research interests and scholarly products demonstrate the unit's commitment to the larger research community, indicative of the professional dispositions that are expected of the unit's faculty and encouraged in a number of formal and informal means.

Exhibits:
5c.2.1 - 6., Samples of Faculty Publications

5c.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

The unit and institution expect that its faculty members perform a number of different services that contribute to the unit's and institution's operations and support the efforts to collaboratively work with the larger community that they serve. In particular, unit faculty members reflect the conceptual framework's commitment to professional responsibility by providing service to their programs, department, college, and university. Much of this service involves work on a number of committees. These committees include those at the unit-level such as the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum, Appeals, searches for new faculty and administrators, and others at institution-level committee work, including General Education, Admissions, and Assessment. Because of the institution's governance structure, faculty members are deeply engaged in a wide range of service activities that are essential to the unit's and institution's vitality. These service responsibilities are outlined in Exhibits 5d.1.1, the College of Staten Island's Governance Plan, and 5d.1.2, Faculty Handbook.

Exhibits:
5d.1.1., College of Staten Island's Governance Plan
5d.1.2., Faculty Handbook, p. 38

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

In addition to the service activities outlined in the institution's Governance Plan, the unit's faculty members also provide a number of services related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the larger profession. This expectation applies to all of the unit's full-time faculty members and the unit is proud to report that 100% of its full-time faculty uphold this commitment.

For example, faculty members have led professional development activities in local P-12 schools in order to share best practices and positively shape teachers' instructional practices. In addition, for the past several years the unit has hosted a summer workshop sponsored by Texas Instruments, designed to increase and improve the use of technologies in science and mathematics instruction. The unit's faculty has also been involved in the resurrection of the Teachers on Sabbatical program. This partnership with the New York City Department of Education (DOE) required faculty members to develop new courses that satisfy the requirements established by the DOE. Faculty members have also been engaged in service activities such as the development of new charter schools and strengthening the relationship to its partnership high school, the CSI High School for International Studies.

All full-time faculty members actively participate in professional associations, particularly those most closely related to the member's specialty. At the international level, the unit has a small number of members who have participated in the editorial boards of prestigious international journals and have been invited to present their work at international conferences. The unit's commitment to service, not only at the levels of the unit and institution, but also to the larger P-12 education community, is indicative of the professional dispositions that are valued and re-enforced across its policies and procedures.

Exhibits:
5d.2.1., Texas Instruments Workshop
5d.2.2., Teachers on Sabbatical
5d.2.3., John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School
5d.2.4., CSI High School for International Studies
5d.2.5., Teachers College Record, Editorial Board

5d.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?

Full-time faculty members are evaluated both formally and informally, contingent on their position and rank. Formal means of reviewing all faculty members below the rank of full professor include student evaluations completed at the end of courses, annual evaluations by the chair, and a review by the unit's Appointments Committee (non-tenured faculty only). Informal means of faculty evaluation include peer observations and regular conversions among faculty within a given discipline (e.g., Mathematics, Social Foundations, etc.). Also, the unit regularly reviews graduate and alumni survey results to identify broad

issues related to the unit's quality and relevance of instruction. These informal means are primarily formative and disconnected from issues of promotion or retention.

All formal evaluations are governed by the CUNY Bylaws and the PSC-CUNY contract and described in the Faculty Handbook. Evaluation results generated through course evaluations are distributed to all unit faculty members and discussed during reappointment and annual conferences. All unit teaching evaluations for reappointment and promotion are discussed with the College administration and chairs at Personnel and Budget (P & B) meetings. Where weaknesses are noted, P & B recommends a plan for the faculty member in question. The unit's chair, often in consultation with the unit's Appointments Committee, recommends another faculty member to work with the faculty member on an ongoing basis. These formal faculty evaluations, as governed by the university's Bylaws and the PSC-CUNY's contract (Exhibits 5e.1.1-2 below), are regular, systematic, and comprehensive. These characteristics are consistent across instructors in different positions and ranks.

The formal evaluation of the unit's part-time faculty, though slightly different from the process described above is equally rigorous and comprehensive. As described in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 5e.1.3.), full-time faculty observe part-time faculty teaching a class at least once a semester. Section 18.9 of the Agreement between the City University of New York and the PSC/CUNY describes procedures for observations. The unit's chair schedules post-observation conferences for part-time faculty to review written observation reports. Observation reports and post-observation conference reports, initialed by faculty, go into their personal files. After ten semesters of service teaching observations are no longer required for part-time faculty but may be held at either their request or the request of department chairs. Part-time faculty are reappointed or not reappointed by department appointments committees, subject to the ratification of the P & B. Letters of reappointment and non-reappointment are sent by the Senior Vice President.

The unit does not employ any graduate teaching assistants.

Exhibits:
5e.1.1., CUNY Bylaws
5e.1.2., PSC-CUNY Contract
5e.1.3., Faculty Handbook

5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.)

Evidence on how well the unit's full- and part-time faculty members perform on evaluations is provided by two different means. First, course evaluations completed by candidates at the end of each course suggest that faculty members are performing as well or even better than colleagues teaching courses offered by other departments. In general, recent data suggest that at the aggregate level, the unit is providing course-based educational experiences that are rigorous, beneficial and enjoyable. Second, exit surveys from recent graduates indicate candidates' satisfaction with faculty members' performance. Specifically, candidates report that faculty (full- and part-time) enabled candidates to evaluate and reflect on one's practice to improve instruction, knew about the realities of the classroom, and were available to meet outside of class.

Together these data confirm the unit's contention that it provides an educational experience that prepares and enhances teachers for the challenges of teaching in P-12 schools.

Exhibits:

5e.2.1., Course Evaluations Spring 2009
5e.2.2., Exit Survey Data Analysis

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

Faculty evaluations are a key instrument through which full- and part-time faculty members improve their teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation of unit faculty is ongoing and integrates professional development into the process. It begins in the fall when the chair requests that each tenured faculty member choose a peer with whom he or she has a common pedagogical interest (non-tenured faculty are assigned a member of the unit's Appointment Committee). The unit's structure of interactive programs allows faculty from different programs to choose to work together, which often provides additional pedagogical enrichment and professional development by providing a different perspective on one's teaching.

All faculty members meet first in planning conferences in which they choose either a mutual focus of interest or two different ones. They discuss the classes to be observed, give input, and share ideas. The goal of the observation process is for it to be a learning process for both faculty members. The post-conferences are discussions of the focus areas. The narrative written peer observation reports reflect this process. The full-time faculty peer observations and new adjunct evaluations take place in the fall.

The chair also meets with all non-tenured faculty members in the fall for their annual reappointment conferences. Teaching observations and evaluations are a major focus of the oral conferences and formal annual evaluations. Throughout the rest of the year, the chair meets with the entire faculty regarding their annual evaluations where a discussion of peer and student evaluations is central. The continuous dialogue between the chair and faculty members ensures that the performance and record of faculty members is moving in a direction that is consistent with the unit's conceptual framework tenets of intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility.

Exhibits:
5e.3.1., Peer Observation Report Form
5e.3.2., Annual Evaluation Forms

5e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?

Professional development is closely related to the needs of faculty members as identified by the unit's evaluations. This first occurs by correctly identifying the area in which a faculty member needs assistance. As described earlier, this identification is a collaborative process between the chair and the faculty member informed by: 1) course evaluations, 2) peer observations of one's teaching, 3) external

reviews of one's scholarship by others in one's field, 4) feedback from the unit's appointments or promotions committees and, 5) informal reports to the chair from current candidates.

These varied sources of information then enable the chair and faculty member to target a limited number of areas that may benefit from professional development. The chair may elect to share with the faculty member what these sources of information suggest and then develop a plan through which one can address these issues. If one's instructional approach is inappropriate for a given course and its students, the chair may suggest that the faculty member observe and discuss alternatives offered by other faculty members within the unit or across the institution. The chair may also advise faculty members to pursue more promising lines of research by suggesting potential collaborators from outside the institution whose work may help one to develop a more ambitious and fruitful body of scholarship. These types of professional development activities are tightly coupled to the needs identified in the unit's evaluation of faculty members. However, these activities are also, by definition, developmental in nature as the emphasis is on the improvement of one's teaching, scholarship, and/or service; the intent is by no means solely remedial. This emphasis is respectful of the value that the unit places on intellectual autonomy and professional responsibility.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?

A number of professional development activities are offered to faculty members related to performance assessment, technology, and emerging practices. First, in the area of performance assessment, the unit's "brown bag" seminars have proven to be a valuable forum through which topics relevant to teaching and learning are explored. A recent topic, facilitated by Dr. David Allen, explored the components of portfolios, an exit requirement for all initial candidates. The seminars that focused on this topic provided Dr. Allen with a platform through which he shared his expertise with colleagues. The intent of this particular series of seminars was to inform a larger conversation about the ways in which the unit can improve the portfolio process and contents. Brown bag seminars such as this exemplify the unit's commitment to embodying the professional dispositions that it expects of its candidates.

Second, the institution's Office of Information Technology (OIT) regularly offers an array of professional development activities related to the faculty's use of technology in instruction. The OIT provides training to faculty/staff and students in a variety of applications. Campus-wide classes are conducted during the summer and in late fall/early winter. Departmental training is also available by request and is geared towards specific needs. A recent example of this is the OIT's workshop on SmartBoard technologies, which are present in a majority of the institution's classrooms.

Third, the institution also offers its faculty the opportunity to participate in numerous professional development activities related to diversity. One such vehicle is provided through the institution's Pluralism & Diversity Program. The Pluralism & Diversity Program is intended, through workshops and other events, to introduce students to many interesting aspects of our diverse campus community and to offer support on various issues. Faculty members participate in this program by developing or attending events and programs that represent ethnic, religious, and cultural topics. The goal of such participation is to celebrate the institution's diversity while at the same time encouraging a unified campus.

Active participation in these professional development activities reflects the unit's faculty's commitment to CSI Goal 3, the Demonstration of Professional Dispositions.

Exhibits:
5f.2.1., OIT professional development
5f.2.2., Pluralism and Diversity Program

5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

Full-time faculty members (tenured and non-tenured) regularly participate in professional development activities on and off campus. In addition to the on campus activities noted in 5f.1, participation in professional development is extensive and includes a range of activities. Among these are active involvement in professional associations, presentations at regional and national conferences, and reviewer activities for journals and academic presses. It is expected that as part of their responsibilities as faculty members that they keep abreast of developments in their field and adapt these developments into their own classroom instruction.

Moreover, a number of faculty members work closely with P-12 schools to enhance their own professional development. These activities include the development and implementation of topic-specific workshops, memberships on charter school boards, and ad hoc mentoring of recent graduates who are in their first few years of teaching. These activities help faculty members to enhance content knowledge and pedagogy, engage students in P-12 classrooms, and polish their professional dispositions. These activities, in turn, strongly encourage faculty members to reflect the objectives outlined in the unit's conceptual framework.

Although not formally required, adjunct faculty, all of whom are part-time, also participate in activities such as those noted above. The unit does not employ graduate teaching assistants.

5f.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

The unit ensures that faculty model best professional practices in teaching through its evaluation process. This systematic process helps faculty assess their own effectiveness related to candidate performance; it also reflects the unit's commitment to CSI Goal 3. Three characteristics constitute this process.

First, the faculty evaluation process is collaborative. Faculty members partner with others to help reflect upon one's instruction. This peer evaluation model involves a pre-conference during which an observation focal point is identified. Following the class meeting that has been observed, the observer and instructor meet to de-brief the lesson that was observed. A written report is generated and reviewed.

Second, this process is formative in nature and is designed to validate or ensure that the instructors' goals are being met. Moreover, the intent of this process is not to make normative distinctions about what works and what does not, but rather to help faculty members improve instruction. These areas for improvement, mutually identified through the peer observation process, become the basis for future

observations.

This speaks to the fact that the process is iterative. The unit believes that faculty evaluation should be ongoing and entrenched in the ways in which courses are developed, taught, and assessed. Although all faculty are contractually required to be observed (except full professors), the unit has de-emphasized this mandate in an effort to focus more intently on the ways in which the process benefits candidates, faculty, and the overall unit. Therefore, the observation and conferencing process is one that most faculty members regularly do without external oversight.

These three traits constitute a model of professional development that improves faculty members' ability to engage all students (CSI Goal 2) and demonstrates the professional dispositions the unit expects of its own candidates (CSI Goal 3).

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The three traits identified in the above response are core components of the model advocated by Dr. Susan Sullivan in her work in the area of supervision. This work is reflected in her book, Supervision That Improves Teaching (Corwin Press, 2008, 3rd Ed.). This widely used book is a practical guide that helps school leaders to create a dynamic process that facilitates dialogue related to teaching and learning. During Dr. Sullivan's tenure as chair of the unit, the evaluation model informed by her research became the basis of the unit's faculty evaluation process. This model continues to be the focus of her research.

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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

According to the Governance Plan and the Bylaws of the City University of New York, the Department of Education has the responsibility and authority to plan, deliver, and oversee the educational program and policies of the Department (herein referred to as the "unit"). The Department of Education is part of the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, one of institution's two divisions. The faculty of the Department of Education elects the chairperson who serves as the head of the Education unit for three years. The duties of the chairperson are delineated in the Governance Plan and CUNY Bylaws. The chair has the option to appoint a deputy to assist with some administrative duties.

The chair also appoints program coordinators who then manage specific programs. These program coordinators assist with admissions, advisement, and scheduling; their work evolves around the vertical

integration of courses and experiences within a program. The chair also appoints discipline chairs whose responsibilities include overseeing curricular coherence within a given discipline (e.g., Educational Psychology) and the hiring and evaluation of adjuncts. Because the unit's programs cut across numerous disciplines, the discipline chairs' roles are critical in fostering horizontal integration of disciplinary expertise and insight.

In addition to these appointed positions, the unit also has two committees that design and develop curricular changes: the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. Each member of the unit is assigned by the chair to one of these committees. These bodies are charged with vetting and proposing changes to courses and programs. Changes that are approved by either committee at its monthly meetings are then sent to the unit's faculty for approval. From there, the proposals move to the institution's Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committees. One member represents these college-wide bodies from each of the College's 18 departments. Chaired by the Deans, these monthly meetings provide an opportunity for others to approve or reject the proposal emanating from other departments. This process is reflective of the unit's complete integration into the larger institution. If a proposal successfully exits the College's Curriculum Committees, it then moves onto the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Assuming passage, the proposal is then sent to CUNY's Central Administrative Office for final approval. Programmatic changes are also sent to the NYSED for approval. This entire process (a schematic is provided in Exhibit 6a.1.4) ensures that even the most minor curricular change affecting any component of candidates' programs is done in a way that is in accordance with the College's standards and NYSED guidelines.

Exhibits:
6a.1.1., CUNY Bylaws Section 9.3, Duties of the Department Chairperson
6a.1.2., Duties of the Department
6a.1.3., Description of the College Curriculum Office
6a.1.4., Curriculum Process Flow Chart

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

Information about the institution's education programs and its admissions policies is available on the College's Website, which has links to each department. Through the site candidates can download information about any program, applications, and can complete a prospective student survey. Further, information is also contained in the College's graduate and undergraduate catalogues. The undergraduate catalogue describes the programs' requirements and application process, including the "Criteria for Entry into the Education Sequences."

The admissions process is also described in the graduate catalogue, which distinguishes between the Traditional Route (Sequence 1) programs leading to advanced certification (what New York State refers to as "professional certification"), and Alternate Route (Sequence 2) programs leading to initial certification. Finally, program handbooks also describe admission practices. The admissions policy for the unit's sole other school professionals program, Educational Leadership, is also noted in the graduate catalogue and program handbook. The undergraduate and graduate and catalogues and handbooks for each program are provided in the exhibits below.

The unit ensures that print materials describing admission policies are clear and consistent by adhering to the institution's process for making catalogue changes or additions. This multilayered process is coordinated by the institution's Curriculum Office and is described in Exhibit 6a.2.4, below.

Exhibits:
6a.2.1., Undergraduate & Graduate Catalogues
6a.2.2., College Admissions Page
6a.2.3., Program Handbooks
6a.2.4., Curriculum Office flowchart

6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

The annual academic calendar is made available in several ways. It is published each semester in the Schedule of Classes and may be found on the College's Website. The Website also provides a real-time mechanism for updated announcements to the College and its constituent communities. The calendar informs students and faculty of important deadlines for dropping and adding classes, filing for graduation, and other relevant information. The College undergraduate and graduate catalogues and the Website are accurate in describing degree requirements, grading policies, resources, and support services available.

These materials are reviewed yearly by program coordinators for accuracy and clarity and are corrected prior to reprinting. The materials, including grading policies, are also regularly reviewed by the Registrar's Office, the body that is formally charged with overseeing the accuracy and timeliness of this information. Moreover, any changes to the calendar and catalogue have to be approved by CUNY's Central Office. Neither the unit nor institution can make changes without this approval.

Exhibits:
6a.3.1., Academic & Events Calendars
6a.3.2., Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogues
6a.3.3., Academic and Grading Policies

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

Advisement for undergraduates who have not yet declared a major occurs in a College-wide Advisement Office. Once students have declared a major, they are assigned an advisor from their academic major (which is outside the unit given that undergraduates do not major in Education). Nevertheless, the unit assigns faculty members, in addition to the Program Coordinators, to be available for advisement to undergraduate candidates should they seek consultation with an Education faculty member. All graduate candidates are assigned a faculty advisor from the unit. All faculty members schedule at least three office hours per week to be available for advisement.

The Division of Student Affairs (Exhibit 6a.4.2) is concerned with all aspects of student life at the College and provides a comprehensive program of support services that includes academic, personal, and career counseling; individualized or small group tutoring in most academic subjects; services for students with disabilities, e.g., registration assistance, readers, interpreters, arrangements with instructors to provide modified instruction, and examination procedures; and extracurricular activities.

Exhibits:
6a.4.1., Office of Academic Advisement
6a.4.2., Division of Student Affairs
6a.4.3., List of Program Coordinators

6a.4.4., Unit Policies on Candidate Counseling and Advisement

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

There are numerous opportunities for collaboration between the unit's and institution's faculty and the larger professional community they both serve. On the individual program level, program coordinators and the Director of Fieldwork interact with cooperating teachers and school administrators on a regular basis to monitor and assist those participating in field-based experiences. In the Educational Leadership Program, school personnel participate in the selection of applicants. At the unit level, the Partnership Advisory Committee, (PAC) which includes unit faculty, P-12 practitioners from local schools and candidates meets once per semester to discuss program design, implementation, and management. These discussions lead to proposals that are funneled to the unit's Curriculum Committees for action. In addition, the unit's Assessment Committee also includes a number of P-12 practitioners, a faculty member from another local college, as well as an individual from the college's Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The participation of members of the professional community is critical to the unit's ability to prepare candidates for the shifting realities of P-12 urban schools. Their participation centers on their insider ability to inform the unit of the factors that shape teaching and learning in local schools. These accounts enable the unit to better focus its programs and evaluations on issues that matter most to urban schools' students, parents, teachers, and administrators.

Exhibits:
6a.5.1., Select Minutes of PAC, AY 2006-2007 through fall 2009
6a.5.2., Select Minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees, AY 2006-2007 through fall 2009
6a.5.3., Select Minutes of the Assessment Committee, AY 2006-2007 through fall 2009

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The primary means through which the unit collaborates with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators is the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC). The unit's teacher education efforts are overseen by TEAC, which meets monthly and is chaired by the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences. Faculty in English, History, Mathematics, Physics, Sociology, and Spanish, as well as Education, comprise TEAC's membership, allowing an ongoing dialogue across departments and between divisions that enriches the curriculum and establishes connections between liberal arts, sciences and professional preparation coursework in which the unit's candidates are enrolled.

A second means through which the unit collaborates with other academic units is through The Teacher Education Honors Academy. Under the direction of Dr. Jane Coffee of the Mathematics Department, this program is designed to attract and prepare exceptional undergraduate candidates to teach mathematics or science in New York City's Title I schools. In addition, this program also provides candidates with opportunities to do research in mathematics or science with CUNY faculty. Once candidates attain junior status, they are eligible to become Robert Noyce Scholars, receiving full scholarships and stipends in the amount of $11,000 per year. This program has required the unit to work closely with colleagues in the Mathematics and Science departments in order to design a sequence of courses that serves the needs of this cohort-based model.

These two examples reflect the unit's and institution's commitment to teacher education as an institution-wide effort.

Exhibits:
6a.6.1., Select TEAC Minutes and Membership
6a.6.2., The Teacher Education Honors Academy

6a.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

The unit's budget, while reflective of the ongoing financial constraints generic to higher education, is sufficient to provide quality education programs for its candidates. Both CUNY and the institution have a history of support for the unit and its mission of preparing excellent teachers. The institution has been responsive to the unit's requests for full- and part-time faculty and Higher Education Officer (referred to as HEOs, non-teaching instructional staff) lines, and supplementing travel funds for faculty presentations. In general, the unit finds the budget adequate to carry out its mission, while recognizing that additional support in all areas would be welcomed.

The Budget Committee, an appointed committee of the College Council, works with the administration to formulate the College's budget request to CUNY and to advise the President on priorities for expenditures and the allocation of funds. The Office of Academic Affairs receives its allocation from the President and then works with the Budget and Lines Committees of the College Personnel and Budget Committee to determine an equitable distribution to each Academic Division. The Deans for each Division then allocate funds for "Other Than Personnel Services" (OTPS), faculty travel, and college assistants. The deans consider the number of students served, and the number of faculty in each department when making allocations. More detailed information about the College's budget can be found in Exhibit 6b.1.1.

The unit's budget is proportional to other units on the campus, particularly those with a clinical component (e.g., Nursing). The unit's faculty members believe that they are treated fairly in the allocation of the institution's limited resources. The process for making budgetary requests and for allocating the actual budget to departments involves many levels of consultation throughout the College (Exhibit 6b.1.2., Comparison of Unit's Budget to That of Other Departments).

Exhibits:
6b.1.1., College Budget Information
6b.1.2., Comparison of Unit's Budget to That of Other Departments

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs

offered?

The unit's faculty believe that the budget adequately supports all programs for the preparation of professional educators. The current administration has been very supportive in the unit's efforts to decrease its dependence on part-time faculty and staff. Moreover, the administration has made significant investments to provide the unit and other academic departments with an administrative support structure that recognizes the challenges of the current competitive climate in higher education. These investments include the development of two new offices: Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Susan Holak and, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, Dr. E. K. Park. These positions reflect the institution's agenda to increase enrollment, improve instruction and assessment, and support faculty research. Moreover, with President Morales' experience in and commitment to P-12 education, the unit is confident that it will receive the budget support that is necessary to continue to develop new programs that serve the needs of its P-12 constituents.

There have been no significant changes to the budget over the past few years that have in any way affected the quality of the programs that the unit offers.

6b.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?

The workload of the institution's and unit's members encompasses the many professional duties and responsibilities inherent in their roles as teacher-scholars. The duties and responsibilities include teaching, scholarship, and service. These workload policies are collectively negotiated between the union representing the faculty, the Professional Staff Congress (PSC-CUNY) and The City University of New York's Board of Trustees. In addition, these workload policies and expectations are clearly outlined in the institution's Faculty Handbook. To summarize:

- Faculty members teach a maximum of 21 credits per year (6c.1. Faculty Workload from CUNY Bylaws). Since a large number of courses require fieldwork, most of the faculty members, with the assistance of the Unit's Director of Fieldwork, are in close collaboration with P-12 schools.

- Faculty members are also expected to regularly present scholarly papers at conferences, publish their work in scholarly journals, and in some cases write books. For some of the unit's faculty members, this research stems from collaborative work in P-12 schools.

- Finally, faculty members are engaged in service at multiple levels: the programs, department, college and university. All faculty members also advise students in the program with which they are primarily affiliated. The number of advisees varies by program as certain programs require more assistance due to their curricular complexity (e.g., Graduate Adolescence Sequence 2). With the advent of phone registration several years ago, faculty members spend less time completing

paperwork and focus on academic advisement through individual meetings or regular correspondence via email.

Exhibits:
6c.1.1., College of Staten Island's Faculty Handbook
6c.1.2., Faculty Workload from CUNY's Bylaws

6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?

Faculty workloads are contractually limited to 10.5 credit hours a semester; when faculty members teach exclusively in graduate programs their teaching load is limited by New York State Education Department regulations to nine credit hours per term. Given the opportunities for research and program leadership, many faculty members teach fewer than 21 credits a year. For example, new faculty members get three credits of release time per semester for five years so that they can devote more time to their scholarly work. Supervisors of clinical practice do not exceed eight candidates in any one semester.

Faculty members are awarded one-half credit hour for each candidate they supervise in clinical practice. Although this is less than the two-thirds credit hour that is recommended by NCATE, the unit and institution contend that this is a fair arrangement given that 1) placements are in relative close proximity to the institution and 2) placements are clustered in schools.

Exhibit:
6c.2., Table of 2008-2009 Faculty Workloads for Teaching and Clinical Supervision

6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

Faculty workloads enable faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty are contractually limited to 10.5 credit hours a semester (or 21 credit hours a year), unless the faculty member teaches only graduate courses; then the teaching load is limited to nine credit hours a semester. Faculty members are granted course load reductions for both research and program leadership responsibilities. For example all new, full-time, tenure-track faculty members are contractually allotted credit hours of release time to be taken within the first five years of their employment to enable them to devote more time to their scholarship and to help them in being successful with the CUNY-wide seven-year tenure clock, which effectively requires all new faculty to achieve the status for tenure in only six years. Most take a one-course release time each semester for two years. Faculty are also eligible for PSU/CUNY Research Grants and internal CSI-funded grants which result in reassigned time and allow faculty to engage in research, develop new courses, or explore alternative modes of course delivery. The workloads, particularly for junior faculty working toward tenure, permit faculty members to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service.

The same can be said for class size. Class sizes for those courses offered by the unit at the undergraduate level are capped at 35, with most methods classes averaging around 15 students. The unit's courses at the graduate level are typically capped at 30, with a number of them capped at 20 (e.g., EDD 630/631, the capstone research sequence). Similar to the undergraduate methods courses, the methods courses at the gradate level typically have about 15 students. The unit, along with the institution, is committed to providing a personalized educational experience that closely attends to students' needs and the course

cap sizes reflect this commitment.

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

The unit ensures that its part-time faculty members contribute to the integrity, coherence, and quality of its programs by incorporating them into all facets of the unit's program development, evaluation, and re-design. This contribution, however, is contingent on a critical mass of full-time faculty members responsible for each program and their ability to engage and involve the unit's stable, quality pool of part-time faculty. Each faculty member (both full- and part-time) is assigned to a program in which she/he usually teaches. Under the leadership of program coordinators, faculty members are responsible for admissions, assessment decisions, advisement, and curricular and systemic improvements.

Full-time faculty members who serve as discipline chairs oversee the part-time (adjunct) faculty members who teach in their disciplines (e.g., Psychological Foundations, Social Foundations, etc.) and work with all adjuncts who teach in the same program. This work takes place in the program meetings that all adjunct faculty members are invited to attend. All adjunct faculty hires are also reviewed and ratified first by the unit's Appointments Committee and then by the College's Personnel and Budget Committee (P & B). The chairperson and/or the program coordinator meet individually with each new adjunct faculty member when the person is initially employed. They share information with the faculty member, such as the conceptual framework, department's evaluation procedures, expectations, etc., to ensure program coherence and integrity. If the adjunct faculty member is hired to supervise clinical practice, the Director of Fieldwork also meets with full- and part-time faculty members regarding specific responsibilities related to clinical practice. This continual interaction among full- and part-time faculty ensures that the unit's programs are implemented, evaluated, and re-designed in ways that consider and value the perspectives of the unit's entire faculty.

6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

The unit has an adequate number of support personnel, currently employing three full-time Higher Education Officers (HEOs), who handle critical administrative tasks. First is the Director of Fieldwork, Dr. Deirdre Armitage, who establishes and maintains connections with P-12 schools in which candidates do their clinical practice.

The second, Ms. Diane Brescia, coordinates the candidate placements for fieldwork in the undergraduate programs for Childhood and Adolescence Education and also administers the Traditional Route graduate programs in Childhood and Adolescence Education (Sequence 1). Ms. Brescia also manages the Alternate Route graduate programs in Childhood and Adolescence Education (Sequence 2), including the labor-intensive task of evaluating the transcripts of applicants for content-area knowledge.

The third HEO is the unit's Assessment Coordinator, Dr. El Samuels, who is charged with overseeing the collection, analysis and dissemination of assessment-related data. The unit is also well-served by three secretaries who work full-time and three College assistants who work part-time, each of whom has designated responsibilities. In addition, the unit also employs several students who are compensated though federal work-study programs to help with the various tasks.

To ensure that the unit has an adequate number of personnel, candidates are asked a set of questions on the exiting survey that relate to this issue. These data (presented in Exhibit 6c.5) are reviewed each year by the chair and the unit's Assessment Committee to verify that the unit has a sufficient number of

support personnel to provide high-quality service to its candidates. Analyses of recent years' data suggest that the unit has a sufficient number of support personnel to administer its various programs.

Exhibit:
6c.5., Section 8 in the Candidate Exit Survey Results

6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

The institution provides a range of supports for the professional development of its faculty. Moreover, in recent years the institution has made it a priority to better support the teaching and scholarship of faculty members. This has resulted in an increase in the number of faculty members who present at regional and national conferences.

Moreover, the institution has substantially increased its direct financial support to faculty (described in Exhibit 6c.6). Last academic year a significant number of faculty members were supported by a combination of Provost's scholarships (12 in total, one to a member of the unit), Dean's scholarships (10), Provost's fellowship leaves (4), and additional fellowship leaves granted by the President (40). All said some 66 faculty members (22% of the institution's total tenure-track faculty) received some type of assistance for their professional development. This combination of scholarships and leaves enables faculty members to advance their research agendas and develop more effective means to integrate these agendas into courses and programs.

Exhibit:
6c.6., CSI Internal Grant Opportunities

6c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

The unit believes that its current physical resources are adequate to support teaching and learning. Nonetheless, despite the faculty's general satisfaction with the status of its physical resources, the institution's administration recognizes that it must continually invest in the maintenance of existing resources as well as the development and/or acquisition of new ones.

As evidence of the latter, the institution is currently involved in updating its master plan, which serves as a blueprint for the institution's future physical resources. This process assesses current and projected needs of the institution's classrooms, offices, library, technology infrastructure, and general facilities. Moreover, this process is directly attached to the institution's strategic planning process, which focuses more on the institution's mission and goals. The institution is firmly committed to keeping these planning processes as transparent as possible so that all stakeholders can be fully engaged. In this spirit,

the institution is developing Websites with moderated discussion boards for both processes so that the unit's faculty and candidates can participate directly in the conversations that shape the contents and direction of both processes.

In addition to these ongoing processes, the unit is supported by the institution's Office of Campus Planning and Facilities Management, led by James Pepe, Assistant Vice President for Campus Planning and Facilities. Working closely with Mr. Pepe's office, the unit is able to ensure the adequacy of its physical resources. The unit is also supported by the institution's Office of Information Technology (OIT), directed by Dr. Michael Kress. Dr. Kress' office ensures that faculty and candidates have access to the hardware and software that best support teaching and learning.

Exhibits:
6d.1.1., Web Site for the Campus Planning and Facilities Management
6d.1.2., Email String about Master Plan Report and Web Site
6d.1.3., Floor-Plan of the Education Building
6d.1.4., Office of Technology Systems Web Page
6d.1.5., Library Home Page
6d.1.6., Description of General College Facilities

6d.2. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

6e. Unit resources including technology

6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

The unit takes careful measure to ensure that resources are allocated across programs in a manner that is equitable and also ensures that candidates meet standards in their fields of study. As outlined in the University's Bylaws, the unit's Chair has the responsibility for directing resources across its programs. These Other than Personnel (OTP) funds however, are ultimately allocated by the Dean of the Humanities and Social Sciences, the division with which the unit is officially affiliated. The process through which these funds are allocated is governed by the institution's governance structure.

To ensure that a given program has an adequate number of qualified faculty members, the Chair regularly consults with Program Coordinators to assess the areas in which more instructional support is necessary. The unit's Assessment Committee also reviews exit and alumni survey data to identify shortcomings in candidates' programmatic experiences. These two sources of information guide the unit in its faculty recruitment efforts. Information generated by these two sources is presented to the unit's faculty for consultation. Then the unit's chair, representing the unit on the institution's Promotions and Budgets Committee (P & B), requests faculty lines in areas in which there is a current or projected need.

This process, which involves both unit and candidate input, also demonstrates the unit's full integration with the larger institution. This thorough and deliberate process ensures that resources, particularly in the form of faculty members, are allocated in ways that enable the unit's candidates to meet standards.

Exhibit:
6e.1., The College of Staten Island Governance Plan

6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

Throughout the year, the institution provides many opportunities for faculty development in the areas of computer literacy, information literacy and the use of multimedia technologies to enhance instruction. Workshops are provided through the library and the Office of Information Technology to empower faculty to incorporate a wide range of technology into their teaching. The institution's excellent facilities support the creation of websites, utilization of Blackboard software in classes, and the development of distance education through video conferencing, and multimedia classrooms. The Center for Excellence in Learning Technologies (CELT)and its mini-grants program enables faculty to develop projects to enhance their pedagogy with technology related to their individual curricula. The funding for these grants is made available through the Technology Fee Committee of the College and require that both a progress and final report be submitted.

In addition, a number of items on the exit and alumni surveys gauge candidates' perceptions on how well the unit has incorporated information technologies into its courses and programs. Recent descriptive analyses suggest that both candidates and faculty have access to appropriate technologies, adequate opportunities to learn new technologies, and are proficient in using them in their instruction.

Finally, back-end analyses of the unit's Tk20 platform confirm that 100% of current full- and part-time faculty have accessed the system (Exhibit 6e.2.2). Such usage is critical given the platform's role in the collection of key assessment data.

Exhibits:
6e.2.1., CELT
6e.2.2., Sample Items from Exit and Alumni Surveys
6e.2.2., Faculty Data on Tk20 Usage

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

Shortly before the unit's focused visit in December 2007, the unit was afforded the opportunity to hire an Assessment Coordinator. The acquisition of this Higher Education Officer (HEO), Dr. El Samuels, was a boost to the unit's efforts in addressing its AFIs. Under the guidance of Dr. Samuels, the unit has made much progress in its assessment practices.

In particular, Dr. Samuels oversees the collection and analysis of student data submitted through Tk20 (Exhibit 6e.3.1, Tk20's Login Page). The adoption of Tk20 starting in fall 2007 was a significant development in the unit's efforts to more systematically collect data about candidates' backgrounds, proficiencies, and experiences. After much debate within the unit and across the institution, it was decided that the candidates would be required to purchase their own Tk20 account. By mandating this resource, the unit has ensured that its candidates have access to a common technological platform that better enables the unit to monitor and intervene on behalf of candidates as they progress across the programs' transition points.

The institution has also made a significant investment by recently creating the Office of the Associate

Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Susan Holak, who reports to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This office serves all segments of the College of Staten Island community including faculty, staff, administrators, and students. It is engaged with the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information required for both planning and the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The unit's assessment system works in close collaboration with Dr. Holak's office to refine and disseminate best practices in the area of assessment across the College.

Exhibits:
6e.3.1., Tk20's Login Page
6e.3.2., Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

The mission of the library is to provide effective access to information resources and services that support and strengthen teaching, learning, and research by acquiring, organizing, preserving, and making accessible educational and scholarly materials in a variety of formats. As described in the library's Annual Report, the Department of the library consists of a Chief Librarian, 14 full-time librarians and ten adjunct librarians, all of whom hold faculty rank. Forty-three support staff members serve in clerical and public service functions. The library is home for a study center for the campus, a broad collection of books and journals, computer facilities and online services, and databases that serve as point-of-access for informational resources beyond the walls of the library, two instructional facilities for the teaching of information retrieval and information literacy, media distribution services in support of instruction, and a faculty development center for the integration of technology into pedagogy.

The library also houses the Center for Excellence in Learning Technologies (CELT), expanded archives facility, distance learning classroom, microform room, digital learning laboratory, Media Services center, and circulating book and print journal collections. The library's collection includes 240,000 books, 68,000 e-books, 44,000 periodicals accessible online, 800 print journal subscriptions, 3,000 videos and films, and over 5,000 sound recordings. The library's home page directs students to a total of 164 online resources such as two versions of ERIC, Education Abstracts FullText, SAGE Education journals, PsycInfo, PsycArticles, Sociological Abstracts, JSTOR, Project Muse, Academic Search Premier; as well as access to the Mental Measurements Yearbook and Exceptional Child.

Over 70 computer workstations and five networked printers are available throughout the library. Two additional, specially equipped workstations are available for students with disabilities. Students also have access to 20 laptops in the library which connect to the library server via the wireless network.

The CSI library considers the ongoing task of collection development among its highest priorities, and accordingly appoints a librarian liaison to every academic department of the College. Reciprocally, it asks the respective departments to name a library liaison of its own. The relationship thus established leads to at least one formal meeting once a semester, more if necessary, and a continuing dialogue assuring the strength and expansion of library resources in support of the discipline's research and curriculum activities. This arrangement helps ensure that library and curricular resources are sufficient and current.

Exhibits:
6e.4.1., Library Home Page
6e.4.2., 2008-2009 Library Annual Report
6e.4.3., Education Resources Research Guide

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

The accessibility of resources through electronic means is overseen by the Office of Technology Systems, which advances and supports the use of technology at the College and directs the Office of Information Technology (OIT). OIT administers 20 general purpose computer laboratories. There are also 23 specialized computing laboratories operated in conjunction with academic departments for student use. There is one such lab in Building 3S. There are approximately 2,500 microcomputers on campus, connected through a high-speed LAN. There are 45 classrooms, two conference rooms, and two portable units equipped to run multimedia presentations from a central location. One of the conference rooms is equipped for two-way videoconferencing. The College is currently expanding its CSI Unplugged wireless network, which permits access to email and the Internet in the library, Campus Center, and academic buildings. Faculty members and candidates benefit from the classrooms equipped with the media system that operates through the library.

OIT builds and maintains the entire infrastructure that makes email and other types of electronic communication possible on campus. It also offers assistance, training, and is available to consult on issues concerning technology. For example, the OIT staff has been involved in the development of the unit's Education Database. They collaborated with York College's OIT, and faculty members from both Colleges, in adopting their database to our requirements.

Equipment in the computer laboratories and faculty offices is updated and replaced under the auspices of OIT. The Vice President for Technology Systems in consultation with the Technology Fee Committee oversees the process of keeping technology current. Faculty computers are currently being replaced on a scheduled basis (every five years). Candidates also have daily access to a computer lab in the education building, which is also overseen by OIT.

Exhibit:
6e.5., OIT Web Page

6e.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Online Exhibit Room: http://edept.csi.cuny.edu/~ncate/accreditation/exhibits/exhibit_list.html

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

The unit is exceptionally pleased with its ability to work with departments and offices across the institution. These mutually beneficial relationships, established over time, are evident in a number of initiatives that have helped, or will help, candidates to meet standards.

For example, The Teacher Education Honors Academy, directed by Dr. Jane Coffee of the Mathematics Department, demonstrates the unit's ability to coordinate course offerings in a way that targets the unique needs and aspirations of candidates in this selective program. Moreover, because this program is directed by someone external to the unit, it has had to work closely with Dr. Coffee to ensure that its

curriculum is aligned with the unit's objectives and patterned in a logical sequence.

In addition, several of the unit's faculty members have been actively involved in the institution's strategic planning process. This participation ensures that the unit's current and projected needs (e.g., classroom space) are considered when a plan is ultimately put forth for faculty approval. This participation also reflects the unit's commitment to being involved in all aspects of the institution's governance. By doing so, the unit's faculty ensures that resources are made available to candidates.

Finally, another interdepartmental relationship that has shown to be mutually beneficial has been with the institution's library. Under the direction of Ms. Wilma Jones, the unit and its library have begun to re-establish a Curriculum Materials Center that will provide candidates with access to a range of curricular materials (e.g., software, textbooks, literature, etc.). The unit's faculty has embraced this project and is eager to see it move forward.

These examples illustrate the ways in which the unit's faculty has engaged departments and offices across the institution to help candidates meet standards.

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Standard 6 is an area in which the institution is investing many resources in an effort to determine if its structures and resources are aligned with its vision and mission. A key component of this effort is the strategic planning process that is currently underway. The process, which involves faculty within the unit and from across the institution, as well as numerous other stakeholders, consists of four distinct phases.

First, in the fall of 2008, a number of committees discussed and endorsed the need for a new strategic plan. This was followed in the spring of 2009 with consultation and consensus regarding the entire process and the degree to which the process would be shaped by committee involvement. In the fall of 2009 the process entered the third phase in which the plan is to be developed and ultimately approved by various bodies the following semester. Drs. Ken Gold, Deborah DeSimone, and Christopher Hale have represented the unit during this current phase. Fourth, is the maintenance phase in which each unit within the institution will be asked to align its own strategic plan with that of the institution. The unit's faculty has and will continue to be actively involved in an effort to ensure that the process and its outcomes are data-driven and ultimately corroborate the vision and mission of the unit.

Inherent in this entire process is the collection (e.g., focus groups and surveys) and analysis of data that will be used to inform decisions about the institution's future allocation of resources. This process also mirrors the institution's commitment to using the research experience and expertise of its faculty to inform and monitor the entire process.