

# Iowa State Board of Education

## Executive Summary

May 9, 2024



**Agenda Item:** Drake University Educator Preparation Program Approval Report

**State Board Priority:** High quality educators and leaders

**State Board Role/Authority:** The State Board of Education sets standards and approves practitioner preparation programs based on those standards. Iowa Code section 256.7(3) and 281 Iowa Administrative rule chapter 79.

**Presenter(s):** Maryam Rod Szabo, Administrative Consultant  
Bureau of Community Colleges and Postsecondary Readiness

**Attachment(s):** One

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the State Board award full approval to Drake University Educator Preparation Programs through the next review scheduled for the 2030-2031 academic year.

**Background:** Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa, offers traditional teacher preparation, administrator preparation and professional school counseling programs. Recently the State Board approved their teacher intern preparation program. The Drake University education department has provided evidence that all programs are in compliance with Iowa Administrative Code chapter 79. Additionally, they have demonstrated compliance with the Bureau of Educational Examiners requirements for each endorsement offered through the institution.



Department of Education

# **Educator Preparation Program Approval Report**

Drake University

Site Visit: October 8-12, 2023

Presented to the Iowa State Board of Education: May 9, 2024

Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146  
State of Iowa

**State Board of Education**  
Brooke Axiotis, Des Moines  
Cindy Dietz, Cedar Rapids  
Cassandra Halls, Carlisle  
Brian J. Kane, Dubuque  
Mary Meisterling, Cedar Rapids  
Nathan Peterson, Iowa City  
John Robbins, Iowa Falls  
Sophia Van Houten, student member, Ida Grove

**Administration**

McKenzie Snow, Director and Executive Officer of  
the State Board of Education

**Division of Higher Education**  
Vacant, Division Administrator

**Bureau of Community Colleges and Postsecondary Readiness**

Jeremy Varner, Bureau Chief  
Amy Gieseke, Section Chief  
Maryam Rod Szabo, Administrative Consultant  
Stephanie TeKippe, Education Program  
Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, sex, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C.§§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.). If you have questions or complaints related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E. 14th Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number: 515-281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, John C. Kluczynski Federal Building, 230 S. Dearborn Street, 37th Floor, Chicago, IL 60604-7204, telephone number: 312-730-1560, FAX number: 312-730-1576, TDD number: 800-877-8339, email: OCR.Chicago@ed.gov

**Contents**

**Program.....4**

**Recommendation .....4**

**Drake University Overview .....5**

**Education Preparation Program (EPP) Overview .....6**

Program Trends.....9

Site Visit Fast Facts .....12

Site Visit Overview.....14

Continuous Improvement.....17

**Full Initial Site Visit Report with Institution Responses.....20**

**Review Team Members**

Dr. Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education  
 Dr. Stephanie TeKippe, Iowa Department of Education  
 Ms. Joanne Tubbs, Iowa Department of Education  
 Dr. Kelly Faga, Iowa Department of Education  
 Dr. Robin Dada, University of Northern Iowa  
 Ms. Heather Donoho, Iowa State University  
 Dr. Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College  
 Dr. Dan Strohmyer, Buena Vista University  
 Dr. Amy Schumann, Grand View University  
 Dr. Melissa McAninch, Central College  
 Dr. Matthew Beimers, Dordt University  
 Dr. Tim Gilson, University of Northern Iowa  
 Mr. Jim Stichter, University of Northern Iowa  
 Dr. Erin Lane, University of Iowa  
 Ms. Dana Oswald, William Penn University  
 Dr. Kelly Chaney, Morningside University  
 Dr. Mark McDermott, University of Iowa  
 Mr. Joel Carter, Emmaus Bible College  
 Dr. Michele Swanson, University of Northern Iowa  
 Dr. Will Coghill-Behrends, University of Iowa  
 Dr. Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College  
 Dr. Chad Biermeier, University of Dubuque  
 Dr. Brittany Garling, Buena Vista University

**Recommendation to the Board**

Program	Recommendation
Teacher Preparation Program	Approval
Administrative Preparation Program	Approval
Professional School Counseling Program	Approval

**Program Representative(s)**

Dr. Ryan Wise, Dean, Drake University School of Education  
 Dr. Catherine Gillespie, Professor and Associate Dean, Drake University School of Education

## Drake University Overview

Source: U.S. Department of Education Scorecard, Drake University

### General Information

Type: Private Non-Profit Institution of Higher Education  
 Size: Medium  
 Location: City  
 Awards Offered: Bachelor’s, Master’s, Doctoral and Graduate/Professional Certificates

### Cost

Avg. Annual Cost: \$29,098 (midpoint for 4-yr schools is \$18,902/year)

### Acceptance Rate, Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rate

Acceptance Rate: 69%  
 Enrollment: 2,857 undergraduate students  
 Retention Rate: 85% (% of students returning after the first year)  
 Graduation Rate: 79% (midpoint for 4-yr schools is 58%)

### Student and Faculty Ratio

Student-to-Faculty Ratio: 11:1

### Diversity

Socio-Econ. Diversity: 21% (% received a federal Pell grant (low income intent))  
 Stud. & Fac. Diversity: See Table 1

Table 1: Drake University Student and Faculty Race/Ethnicity

	Am. Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Non-resident alien	Two or more races	Unknown	White
Students	0%	5%	6%	7%	0%	4%	5%	0%	73%
Faculty	1%	6%	3%	4%	0%	3%	2%	1%	79%

## Education Preparation Program (EPP) Overview

Sources: U.S. Department of Education Scorecard, Drake University; Drake University Institutional Report; 2023 Annual Report

### Programs and Endorsements Offered

Awards Offered: Bachelor's, Master's, Doctoral, Graduate/Professional Certificate

Main Campus: Des Moines, IA

Alternative Paths: Teacher Intern Preparation Program (approved in March 2024)

Online Programs: Gifted and Talented; English as a Second Language; Master of Science in Education

### Education Programs

Elementary Education

Secondary Education

Professional School Counseling

Administration

Teacher Intern

### Endorsements Offered

PK-K: Teacher\*, Prekindergarten-Kindergarten Classroom\*

K-6: Teacher Elementary Classroom\*

K-8: Art\*, English/Language Arts\*, French\*, German\*, Japanese\*, Spanish\*, Mathematics, Music\*, Reading, Science (Basic), History, Social Studies\*, Professional School Counselor\*, Instructional Strategist 1: Mild & Moderate\*, Computer Science, STEM

5-8: Algebra for H.S. Credit, Middle School Language Arts\*, Middle School Mathematics\*, Middle School Science\*, Middle School Social Studies, STEM

5-12: Art\*, English/Language Arts\*, French\*, German\*, Japanese\*, Spanish\*, Journalism, Mathematics\*, Music\*, Reading, Biological Science\*, Chemistry\*, Earth Science\*, Basic Science\*, Physics\*, American Government, American History, Psychology, Sociology, World History, Speech, Professional School Counselor\*, All Science\*, All Social Science\*, Social Sciences – Basic\*, Work Experience Coordinator, Instructional Strategist 1: Mild & Moderate\*, Computer Science

K-12: English as a Second Language, Reading Specialist, Instructional Strategist II: BD/LD\*, Instructional Strategist II: ID\*, STEM

PK-12: Talented & Gifted\*, Superintendent & AEA Administrator, Principal/PK-12 Special Education Supervisor

All: Special Education

\*Designates a 2023-24 Iowa teacher shortage area

## Partnerships

Drake's educator preparation program partners with the following:

- K-12 school districts
- Des Moines Area Community College
- Prairie Lakes Area Education Agency (AEA)
- Iowa State Education Association (ISEA)
- Iowa Department of Education
- Wallace Foundation; Iowa Mathematics and Science Education Partnership; National Science Foundation, Iowa Space Grant Consortium

## Program Initiatives

Drake University initiatives reported from the 2023 Annual Report:

- Added three computer science endorsements and will be graduating their first initial licensure student with the K-12 computer specialist endorsement in May. Drake established a partnership with Prairie Lakes AEA whereby students can start coursework toward the computer science endorsement, and finish it at Drake.
- Increased candidate exposure to diversity through hiring diverse faculty.
- Hosts the emerging educator's conference along with ISEA, and the Iowa Department of Education. Nearly 150 people attended in 2023.
- Hosted 35 Des Moines Public School (DMPS) high school students from their Dream to Teach program, whose mission is to encourage students from diverse backgrounds to consider a career in teaching.
- Reinvigorated the Wanda Everage Academic Success symposium in summer of 2022, which supports students of color in developing a pathway to success in high school and beyond.
- Expanded the alternative contract program with DMPS, the Building Leaders in Urban Education (BLUE) program to 80 teachers in DMPS this year. They will all earn a master's degree in culturally responsive pedagogy.
- Added a Teacher Intern licensure program, which provides an alternative pathway to licensure for those with a bachelor's degree. Drake university's alternative program leads to a Master's degree and teaching license.

## Program Diversity

Drake Educator Diverse Clinical Experiences:

- Drake University supports candidates' diversity exposure through "multiple settings", "diverse groups" and "diverse learning needs."
- There is no school in the greater Des Moines area that does not include students from a variety of races, ethnicities and home languages as well as a variety of learning needs. Drake places secondary students in different placements for Foundations and Methods.
- For elementary education candidates, the program ensures they are placed in lower and upper elementary schools by sending them to a variety of schools in addition to their Foundations placements.
- The science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) sequence placements occur at Hubbell elementary in Des Moines and all the elementary reading placements happen at Madison elementary in Des Moines. Elementary math methods and



elementary science method students are placed throughout the greater Des Moines area including Des Moines, Ankeny and schools affiliated with the Catholic Diocese of Des Moines.

- Students can make specific requests for placements, and they receive a variety of placements in multiple settings with diverse groups of students who have diverse learning needs.
- The education unit at Drake University has an advisory committee consisting of students from diverse backgrounds, race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status that can inform the college's practice in supporting and preparing candidates to work with diverse students in K-12 schools.

### **Program Checkpoints**

#### **Acceptance to Teacher Education**

- Pass beginning level InTASC
- 2.5 or higher grade point average (GPA) for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduate students
- two references
- pass background check
- review by the faculty committee

#### **Admission to Student Teaching**

- Pass developing level InTASC
- 2.5 or higher GPA for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduate students
- two references
- review by the faculty committee

#### **Completion of Student Teaching**

- Pass proficient level InTASC
- 2.5 or higher GPA for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduate students
- Successful student teaching and culminating portfolio reviewed by faculty

#### **Program Completion**

- Meet all degree and endorsement requirements
- Pass a background check

## Program Trends

A series of tables below provides an overview of program trends.

### Program Enrollment

Table 2: Drake University Education Enrollment

Semester	# FTE Candidates	# Graduates
Fall 2017	260	62
Fall 2018	302	82
Fall 2019	221	58
Fall 2020	238	65
Fall 2021	213	76

Source: Title II Reports

### Program Completers

Table 3: Drake University Teacher Program Completers

Academic Year	Elementary Only	Secondary Only	Combined K-6 and 7-12	Total
2017-18	32	28	7	67
2018-19	15	24	16	55
2019-20	22	30	5	57
2020-21	29	28	10	67
2021-22	38	38	0	76

Source: Annual Reports

Table 4: Drake University Administrator Program Completers

Academic Year	Principal	Superintendent	Total
2017-18	18	4	22
2018-19	39	3	42
2019-20	77	13	90
2020-21	38	5	43
2021-22	21	8	29

Source: Annual Reports

Table 5: Drake University Professional School Counseling Program Completers

Academic Year	Counseling
2017-18	21
2018-19	9
2019-20	38
2020-21	17
2021-22	11

**Placement Rates**

Table 6: Drake University Teacher Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Teaching Jobs	# Grad School
2017-18	67	52	5
2018-19	55	41	7
2019-20	57	37	4
2020-21	67	36	3
2021-22	76	63	2

Source: Annual Reports

Table 7: Drake University Administrator Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Administrator Jobs	# Grad School	# Other Area in Education
2017-18	22	42	7	-
2018-19	42	30	4	-
2019-20	90	59	-	27
2020-21	43	35	3	1
2021-22	29	29	-	-

Source: Annual Reports

Table 8: Drake University Professional School Counselor Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Counselor Jobs	# Grad School	# Other Area in Education
2017-18	21	6	3	-
2018-19	9	5	4	-

2019-20	38	21	-	16
2020-21	17	17	-	-
2021-22	11	9	-	-

Source: Annual Reports

**Clinical Faculty, Adjunct and Cooperating Teacher Totals**

Table 9: Drake University Clinical Faculty, Adjuncts and Cooperating Teachers

Academic Year	# FT Faculty	# Adjunct Faculty	# Cooperating Teachers	# Candidates in a Supervised Clinical Experience
2017-18	4	6	Not tracked	74
2018-19	2	8	142	76
2019-20	5	15	116	73
2020-21	3	9	103	60
2021-22	5	15	116	73

Source: Title II Reports

## Site Visit Fast Facts

### Summary

The information below provides a summary of the most recent review and outcomes.

Duration:	November 3, 2021 (self-study) – May 9, 2024 (State Board)
Reviewers:	21
Pages of Content:	284 pages
Links to Evidence:	580+ links
Stakeholder Input:	270 stakeholder responses (surveys (216), interviews (47), classroom visits (7))
Outcomes	
Strengths:	20
Recommendations:	28
Concerns:	9

### Self-Study and Institutional Report

Self-Study Meeting:	November 3, 2021
Department Meetings:	June 2, July 12, August 11, Oct. 6, Nov. 10, Dec. 9, 2022; Aug. 11, Oct. 6, Nov. 10, Dec. 9, 2023; Jan. 12, 2024
Institutional Report:	284 pages, 580+ links (evidence)

### Preliminary Review (PR)

Preliminary Review: June 25, 2023

Review Team:	Three Iowa Department of Education (DE) program consultants, 18 chairs and faculty from Iowa educator preparation programs (9 site visit volunteers and 9 state panel volunteers), including: University of Iowa (3), Buena Vista University (2), Central College, Iowa State University, Dordt University, University of Dubuque, Emmaus Bible College, Northwestern College, William Penn University, Morningside University & University of Northern Iowa (4)
--------------	--

Preliminary Report: August 21, 2023

31 pages including 193 questions

Program Response: September 15, 2023

126 pages, 369 links (additional evidence) and program responses for supplementary information or clarification

Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions table included multiple links of evidence

### Stakeholder Input

Surveys: 10-12 questions per survey

Includes short response, Likert scale and open-ended questions

Responses: 216 responses from the following stakeholders:

**Teacher Preparation:** Advisory Committee (5), adjuncts (5), alumni (51), candidates (30), college supervisors (5), cooperating teachers (12), content area faculty (11)

**Administrator Preparation:** Advisory Committee (included above), adjuncts (4), alumni (16), candidates (21), supervisors/mentors (31)

**Professional School Counselor Preparation:** Advisory Committee (included above), adjuncts (3), alumni (8), candidates (4), supervisors/mentors (10)

### Meetings and Site Visit

Meetings: Educator preparation team meetings with the Educator Preparation Program (EPP):

August 21; August 28; September 18; October 4; December 19, 2023; January 18, 2024

Site Visit: Review team: Two Department program consultants, 10 chairs and faculty from Iowa EPPs, including:

University of Iowa, Buena Vista University, Central College, Grand View University, Iowa State University, Northwestern College, University of Northern Iowa (3), Dordt University

Three and a half days on-site:

47 interviews held with administration, chair, faculty, staff and stakeholders including seven classroom visits (approximately 20 students per class)

179 curriculum exhibits (course syllabi) reviewed (Bureau of Educational Examiners and Department review team)

20+ student files (sampling of candidates in varying programs and academic year classifications)

133 pages of notes on the site visit team notetaking worksheet including evidence and comments for each substandard

Three out-brief meetings held to share preliminary findings (department chair, administration and unit faculty)

## Site Visit Overview

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the Iowa State Board of Education (State Board) grant full approval for Drake University's educator preparation programs.

Drake University's education unit has demonstrated compliance with state requirements for offering high-quality preparation programs. They effectively addressed initial concerns or presented detailed plans for resolution in the coming months including a clear timeline and strategy. The unit responded promptly and devised an action plan to implement recommendations.

It is important to note that recommendations are intended solely for the program's continuous enhancement and often surpass basic standards, there is no immediate action necessary beyond a thoughtful response. Concerns will be revisited annually over the next three years following program approval. Additionally, the recommendations and concerns identified in this review will be reevaluated during the subsequent site visit cycle as part of our commitment to continuous improvement.

### Governance and Resources Standard

The Governance and Resources standard is considered met.

Drake University and the education unit have a clear governance structure. The unit holds primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs. Recently, in 2021, the conceptual framework was updated. While different programs may have their own specific goals, they all align with the mission and vision of the department.

Teacher preparation courses adhere to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, administrator preparation program courses align with the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) program recognition standards, and the professional school counseling program courses align with the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards. The newly developed Teacher Intern preparation program aligns with both InTASC and Iowa Teaching standards.

The unit demonstrated ongoing collaboration amongst faculty and staff within the programs and department administration. All programs within the education department have faculty/chair representatives attending regular meetings and participating in committees; therefore, ensuring representation of different programs within the university. Adequate resources, including professional development opportunities and support staff, are available to the unit. Online and blended courses are designed consistently to assist candidates in utilizing resources effectively.

Despite facing challenges such as high faculty turnover due to retirements and position changes, as well as lower enrollments in 2021-2022, compared to previous years, the program is taking proactive steps for sustainability. Recent hires to fill vacant positions include a veteran faculty member in a visiting professor role and a newly hired professional with experience as a principal in PK-12. The unit is currently in the process of hiring a third full-time faculty member for the program's future success.

The site visit team provided additional recommendations for program consideration. The unit provided responses and has considered both recommendations.

### **Diversity Standard**

The Diversity standard is considered met.

The Drake education unit is dedicated to actively recruiting and retaining a diverse range of candidates and faculty members. Alongside institutional policies, the unit sponsors multiple programs with the goal of enhancing outreach to diverse candidates from the Des Moines Area Community College and Des Moines Public Schools.

At Drake, there is a mentoring group specifically designed to support students of color and a wide array of professional development opportunities for both faculty and students. During interviews, faculty members demonstrated their inclusive understanding of diversity and discussed efforts to transition from passive allyship to concrete actions. For instance, the unit is revising syllabi and professionalism standards to minimize cultural bias as much as possible.

Candidates expressed feeling well-supported and acknowledged receiving opportunities and resources to engage effectively with diverse students in PK-12 schools. A recurring theme highlighted by both candidates and faculty members was the need for additional support in culturally responsive and trauma-informed teaching before commencing student teaching. Responding to this feedback, the unit is incorporating this important topic into the curriculum. Furthermore, there are plans to conduct a thorough review of the curriculum to ensure that a broad spectrum of diverse topics is integrated throughout the programs.

### **Faculty Standard**

The Faculty standard is considered met.

Upon review of the Institutional Report (IR), faculty curriculum vitae and completion of the forty-hour PK-12 co-teaching requirement during a course of five years, there were questions related to the alignment of teaching assignments with faculty's knowledge, skills and preparation and completion of the forty-hour collaborative partnership. The unit provided evidence of faculty qualifications during the site visit. The faculty review process is very clear for the full-time faculty members. However, the unit's process to assess alignment and record part-time faculty member's forty hours was not consistent nor formalized. The unit developed an annual evaluative tool for assessment of all adjunct faculty members.

### **Assessment Standard**

The Assessment standard is considered met.

The site visit team determined the unit lacked a formal assessment system for the School of Education (SoE) through review of the assessment evidence provided in the IR and preliminary review responses in addition to faculty, administration and staff interviews. The SoE was required to develop a clearly defined assessment plan for programs and candidates that included a timeline for the collection, analysis, review, revision and dissemination of assessment data. The development and implementation of the assessment plan was required



to ensure consistent oversight and maintenance of quality across all programs. In collaboration with the institution assessment director, the dean, associate dean and program chairs developed templates that provide a timeline for when and how candidate assessment data are collected and who is responsible for each phase of the assessment system, including aggregation, analysis, evaluation, program improvement discussions and sharing with stakeholders. Additionally, these templates allow programs to track aggregate candidate results, as well as program improvements made in response to the data described in both templates.

### **Clinical Practice Standard**

The Clinical standard is considered met.

There was not a concern in this standard. Candidates, in a variety of classes, shared their appreciation for the support and accommodations from the teacher preparation placement coordinator. The site visit team members were able to review the record of candidate's placements, required communication and assessments during these experiences.

In review of the administrator clinical experiences, the team determined that the course embedded clinicals (Clinical I & II) and field-based learning experiences (FBLE) provide candidates with rich and diverse experiences for feedback and learning. Additionally, the review team found evidence in interviews with current candidates and instructors that faculty provide rich learning experiences, timely feedback and a high level of care and support for candidates in the program.

The candidates in the Professional School Counseling preparation program and their respective mentors shared that candidates are well prepared to be responsive to the current needs of students in the school counseling profession. Recommendations were provided for the unit's consideration regarding communication with supervisors and mentors. The unit is implementing additional training and communication to ensure candidates are supported to meet program requirements.

### **Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard**

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions (KSD) standard is considered met.

There were no concerns in this standard. Differentiated readings for each secondary content area, as evidenced in the KSD chart, was particularly remarkable. The team found a well-articulated curriculum map with InTASC standards embedded in courses at three developmental levels. A recommendation was provided to increase the visibility of InTASC standards for the candidates. The unit provided the requested updates and is committed to additional program and curriculum improvement through the improved data collection process, analysis and documentation of unit assessment.

The administrator preparation program had several concerns related to a formalized assessment process for the program and part-time faculty. The assessment director at Drake supported the unit in developing a formalized assessment process and timeline to improve consistency. The program faculty and unit are committed to adding inter-rater reliability and regular reviews of candidate assessment tools to ensure validity of the measurements and methods.

The professional school counseling candidates reported they are well prepared to be responsive to the current needs of students in the PK-12 school counseling profession. The unit accepted the site visit team's recommendations to add the Iowa and CACREP standard alignment to course syllabi.

## Continuous Improvement

Previous site visit concerns (2016-17) and correlations with the recent visit (2023-24)

### Previous Site Visit Concerns and Correlations to Recent Review

#### 1. Governance

##### 2016-17 Site Visit Concerns

1. 79.10(3) The team finds a defined conceptual framework informing the teacher and counselor programs. The team finds no evidence that a conceptual framework is in place to inform curriculum planning and decision making in the educational leadership programs.
2. 79.10(5) The team does not find evidence that members of the advisory council are providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement on a semiannual basis. Minutes of the advisory committee since 2011 indicate meetings are not held semi-annually, and only include the departments of teaching and learning, and leadership. There are minutes for one counselor advisory meeting, but it is not dated. Meetings of the International Advisory Committee indicate a focus on capital campaign for the new building.

##### 2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None

The prior site visit concerns for this standard were not identified as concerns in the latest review. The advisory committee is inclusive of attentive stakeholders and the unit shared evidence of both meetings and utilizing advisory board feedback. Conceptual frameworks exist for different programs and there are shared values and program-specific values that are represented in their preparation programs. The site visit team recommended utilizing a consistent syllabi template that includes the alignment of the newer conceptual framework within each course.

#### 2. Faculty

##### 2016-17 Site Visit Concerns

1. 79.12(2) The team finds that only one professional school counseling faculty member has knowledge, preparation and experience in professional school counseling. Faculty without this knowledge, preparation and experience are not qualified to teach courses with professional school counseling concepts.
2. 79.12(2) The team finds evidence that faculty members are teaching courses for endorsements in which they do not have sufficient knowledge, preparation and experience. In particular, faculty who teach elementary science methods are prepared and experienced only as secondary level science educators.
3. 79.12(2) The team finds evidence that the knowledge, experience and preparation of supervisors of student teachers is not aligned with that of the student teaching setting. For example, a supervisor who has no preparation or experience at the elementary level is supervising an elementary education student teacher.

4. 79.12(5)c The team finds no evidence that all professional school counseling and educational leadership faculty engage in and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in PK-12 schools.

5. 79.12(5)c The team finds no evidence that all faculty members preparing teachers are meeting the Iowa Code requirement of engaging in at least 40 hours of team teaching at the appropriate grade level during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

**2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None**

The unit provided evidence of faculty members' continuous collaboration and engagement in the PK-12 setting. All faculty curriculum vitae were reviewed and the unit provided evidence that faculty members have related experience, knowledge and preparation aligned with teaching responsibilities.

**4. Assessment**

**2016-17 Site Visit Concerns**

1. 79.13(all): The team finds evidence of a lack of a coherent assessment system to ensure appropriate collection, analysis and dissemination of data for the educational leadership programs of study.

**2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None**

The educator leadership program has developed their assessment system. The administrator preparation program faculty utilize multiple sources of data to assess the program/course/candidate aggregate and disaggregated data to improve program and candidate performance. During this visit, recommendations and concerns in the education leadership program were related to needing a formal process for inter-rater reliability. The professional school counseling program had evidence of regular (semi-annual) assessment to improve programs. The teacher preparation program faculty utilized candidate assessment data within the small program/endorsement areas taught; however, each program had their own process of utilizing the data. As a result, from the most recent review, the unit was required to build additional formalized processes to provide consistency for all the preparation programs. The university assessment coordinator had a useful model utilized for institutional assessment and provided support to the unit to build a unit-wide assessment system. While there were some concerns related to the same standard, the unit exhibited improvement to their prior assessment system and process while providing responses to the most recent concerns.

**5. Teacher Clinical**

**2016-17 Site Visit Concerns**

1. 79.14(7)b: The team finds evidence candidates are not consistently placed in appropriate clinical experiences. In particular, a candidate earning endorsements in journalism (secondary level) and ESL (K-12) was placed for student teaching only at the secondary level. When the placement coordinator was asked about the required ESL elementary placement, she replied it was only required if the candidate planned to teach in Iowa. Since the requirement is a program completion requirement, this practice is a violation of this standard.

**2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None**

The placement coordinator provides exemplary support and experiences for all the candidates in the related field and grade levels that are required. Additionally, she ensures candidates have diverse experiences in a variety of classrooms, settings and grade levels prior to their final year of their program and student teaching. Candidates receive appropriate pre-student teaching clinical experiences and student teaching placements. Supervisors provide ongoing feedback to the candidates.

**6. Administrator Clinical**

**2016-17 Site Visit Concerns**

1. 79.16(6) The team finds no evidence that required contracts are in place for all schools / districts in which administrator candidates are placed for clinical experiences.

**2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None**

The unit has contracts with all the districts where clinical placements take place. For the teacher intern preparation program and administrator preparation program, additional mentoring and support is communicated and provided by the district mentor in addition to the college supervisor.

**7. Administrator Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions**

**2016-17 Site Visit Concerns**

1. 79.17(1-5): The team finds no evidence of a clear alignment of standards in curriculum, coursework, assessments and clinical experiences.

**2023-24 Site Visit Correlation: None**

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard was met. The assignments and assessments were aligned with the unit and InTASC standards. The candidates successfully articulated the skills and knowledge indicating this alignment but many could not articulate the specific standards they are being assessed on. It was recommended that the unit include a clear alignment of InTASC standards in all syllabi and develop a unified syllabi template to ensure shared components are available in all courses. It was recommended that the unit review the alignment for all syllabi and ensure there is no gap in the assignments and assessments provided in each course and the related InTASC standards that the course would cover. The unit will update the syllabi as they teach the courses in the next semesters.

## Full Initial Site Visit Report with Institution Responses

### Drake University

Team Report

Preliminary Review: July 25, 2023

Site Visit: October 8, 2023 through October 12, 2023

Final Report: March 6, 2023

Presented to the State Board of Education on: May 9, 2024

Iowa Department of Education

#### Site Visit Team Members:

Dr. Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education  
Dr. Stephanie TeKippe, Iowa Department of Education  
Dr. Kelly Faga, Iowa Department of Education  
Dr. Robin Dada, University of Northern Iowa  
Ms. Heather Donoho, Iowa State University  
Dr. Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College  
Dr. Dan Strohmyer, Buena Vista University  
Dr. Amy Schumann, Grand View University  
Dr. Melissa McAninch, Central College  
Dr. Matthew Beimers, Dordt University  
Dr. Tim Gilson, University of Northern Iowa  
Mr. Jim Stichter, University of Northern Iowa  
Dr. Erin Lane, University of Iowa

#### Acknowledgements

Team members would like to express their gratitude to the Drake University community for their hospitality and assistance in facilitating the team's work. The tasks associated with the review process necessitate intense focus by reviewers during a concentrated period of time. Everyone we encountered graciously responded to our questions and requests for materials. We interacted with a wide variety of individuals who demonstrated enthusiasm, professionalism and dedication to this program.

The team expresses its appreciation for the work of all involved with a special thank you to those whose roles were integral in the success of this visit, particularly Ms. Zoey Perrigo, Dr. Catherine Gillespie, and Dr. Ryan Wise.

## **GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES STANDARD**

**281—79.10(256)** *Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.10(1)** *A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.*

**79.10(2)** *The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.*

**79.10(3)** *The unit's conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.*

**79.10(4)** *The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with NELP standards.*

**79.10(5)** *The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.*

**79.10(6)** *When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.*

**79.10(7)** *The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:*

a. *Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;*

b. *Resources to support professional development opportunities;*

c. *Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;*

d. *Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and*

e. *Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.*

**79.10(8)** *The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.*

**79.10(9)** *The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.*

**79.10(10)** *Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.*

### **Initial Team Findings - Governance and Resources**

#### **Commendations/Strengths**

- The unit engages the School of Education (SOE) Council, comprised of department heads, two faculty from each department and two staff members, to provide input and advice to the leadership.

- The Dean meets with a diverse undergraduate student advisory committee, representing different levels in the program, to gather feedback about programs and recommendations for activities and community engagements.
- The Great College Survey is used to identify strengths and areas for improvement in the School of Education. SOE reports that resources at the leadership level are adequate to provide quality preparation programs.

## Recommendations

**1. 79.10(4)** Through conversations with candidates, the team determined a lack of clarity related to InTASC standards and the link between assignments exists in a few syllabi. Through the course/syllabi review it is apparent that students either meet InTASC standards through remediation or through the initial submission of assessment instruments. The team recommends providing unified syllabi for courses, and alignment of InTASC standards and course activities.

### Program Response

With administrative support from the Departmental Administrative Assistant and a student worker, the department will review syllabi of courses with InTASC standards, discuss how course activities aligned with InTASC standards, and identify any gaps that may exist. If gaps are identified, instructors of those courses will be asked to clarify the link between the standard and the course activities.

**2. 79.10(6)** The science courses are taught in SOE rather than in the science department. Candidates shared a concern regarding heavy focus on methods rather than content knowledge. It is recommended that the unit engage in a collaborative review of content and courses to expand expertise and access to laboratory experiences aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards.

### Program Response

Thank you for this recommendation. Science courses in the elementary education program are taught in the SOE. Secondary students who are preparing to become science teachers take content courses in the appropriate department of Arts and Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, or Environmental Science). The science courses that are taught to our elementary education students were specifically designed to include both content and pedagogy. Because the science content courses are taught within the SOE, we can perfectly align the content to the Next Generation Science Standards. That is, the science content within the courses is specifically chosen to help preservice elementary teachers learn the science needed to implement each of the elementary-level Next Generation Science Standards. When elementary education students took science courses outside of education, they received content but no pedagogy, which made it difficult for them to connect their learning with their eventual students' learning. Furthermore, the content they learned in the science departments was not necessarily related to the Next Generation Science Standards. Thus, the inclusion of these courses within the SOE allows for better preparation of our preservice elementary teachers both in alignment to the Next Generation Science Standards and in increased engagement with the pedagogy required to teach the Next Generation Science Standards as intended. That said, moving forward the unit will explore opportunities to expand access to content knowledge and access to laboratory experiences.

## Concerns

None

---

## Sources of Information

Interviews with:

Assessment Director, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean/Chair of School of Education, Associate Dean), Department Chair (Teaching and Learning), Dean of Admissions, Director, Institutional Research and Academic Assessment, Institutional Research, SOE Budget Manager, Candidates, Alumni

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Surveys, Program opening presentation

---



## DIVERSITY STANDARD

**281—79.11(256) Diversity standard.** *The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.11(1)** *The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.*

**79.11(2)** *The institution's and unit's plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.*

### Initial Team Findings - Diversity

#### Commendations/Strengths

- The unit engages in practices to promote and support diversity on campus and within the larger Des Moines Community. Several examples of these efforts include:
- 3D program
- Dream to Teach
- Outreach to DMACC
- Wanda Everage Academic Success Symposium
- Students of Color Mentoring Group and the Anti-Oppressive Pedagogy Community of Practice for faculty and students.
- Initiatives with Des Moines Public Schools strive to recruit diverse teachers and school leaders in the community, such as the BLUE and BLUE Doc program.
- Each faculty member could provide an inclusive definition of “diversity” and spoke about efforts to move from passive allyship to action, such as reviewing syllabi and professionalism standards to remove culture bias as much as possible.
- Faculty offices and shared spaces in the university buildings were welcoming, accessible and inclusive, with representation highlighted from commonly marginalized groups.
- In candidate interviews, undergraduate students reported feeling supported and communicated with regularly regarding diversity opportunities on campus.
- Candidates have access to a robust curriculum library that includes diverse titles and opportunities within classes to gain experiences working with English learners and other children of diverse backgrounds.

#### Recommendations

**1. 79.11(1)** The team found evidence in the IR, review of syllabi and interviews with faculty members that several topics of diversity are covered informally throughout courses during teachable moments. Several faculty members stated that they wished there was a specific course dedicated to the topic of culturally responsive teaching prior to student teaching. In student teacher interviews and review of survey responses, candidates repeatedly stated that more training in trauma-informed, culturally responsive practices would have made them feel more confident and successful in their placements. The team recommends that the unit

consider adding more culturally responsive pedagogy into coursework and/or student teaching seminars.

### **Program Response**

This is a great recommendation, and we will include as much trauma-informed, culturally responsive teaching content as possible because this is material that we collectively value in the SOE. This recommendation will also inform the upcoming DEI analysis of our curriculum, which focuses on how diversity topics are spiraled throughout our program.

**2. 79.11(2)** The team found evidence that candidates are placed in a variety of districts (rural, suburban and urban) for their practicum and student teaching experiences. However, multiple students reported that having more mentors from diverse backgrounds would be advantageous. The team recommends diversifying the pool of mentors to provide culturally responsive feedback and support.

### **Program Response**

Unfortunately, teachers and leaders from diverse backgrounds in Iowa are disappointingly uncommon. According to the most recent Iowa Department of Education Condition of Education report, only three percent of teachers and less than four percent of principals in Iowa public schools identify as a racial or ethnic minority. However, this is another great recommendation, and we are committed to ensuring our candidates have access to diverse faculty, mentors, and experiences during their time at Drake.

### **Concerns**

None

---

Sources of Information

Interviews with:

Unit Faculty, Director of Advising, Library Director, Student Teacher Focus Group, Field Placement Coordinator

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Student Records, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation, Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

---

## FACULTY STANDARD

**281—79.12(256) Faculty standard.** *Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.12(1)** *The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.*

**79.12(2)** *The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member's preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.*

**79.12(3)** *The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.*

**79.12(4)** *The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.*

**79.12(5)** *Faculty members collaborate with:*

a. *Colleagues in the unit;*

b. *Colleagues across the institution;*

c. *Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.*

### Initial Team Findings - Faculty

#### Recommendation

**1. 79.12(4)** The unit has a strong culture of professional development and scholarship. The expectation of professional development for the unit is high and the team recommends that the unit communicate professional development funding priorities to faculty members for differing budget situations.

#### Program Response

The Dean will annually communicate the professional development funding priorities at the beginning of each academic year at the first faculty meeting. In addition, the Dean will provide additional written and verbal communication regarding any changes made during the academic year.

#### Concern

**1. 79.12(3):** The unit has a strong policy for evaluating full-time faculty but lacks the same accountability for part-time/adjunct faculty and university supervisors. The unit is required to create, communicate, and execute guidelines for assessing and supporting adjunct instructors to maintain program integrity and quality.

#### Program Response

The Dean and Associate Dean of the Drake School of Education have developed a part-time (adjunct) faculty activity report, available for review at <https://forms.gle/rG6BfE8RJdFGAQaqZ>, which is based upon our strong evaluation policy for full-time faculty. This new report and

process was approved by the department chairs during the February 2024 SOE Council meeting. This activity report will be administered on an annual basis and reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean while chairs and the Dean will continue to monitor course evaluation data. If there are concerns observed in the part-time (adjunct) faculty activity reports or course evaluations, program chairs will work with their part-time (adjunct) faculty members to remediate.

---

### **Sources of Information**

Interviews with:

Unit Faculty, Adjunct/Part-time Faculty, and University Supervisors

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Faculty CV's, Emails provided by Associate Dean Program opening presentation

---

## **ASSESSMENT STANDARD**

**281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard.** *The unit's assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.13(1)** *The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.*

**79.13(2)** *The assessment system is based on unit standards.*

**79.13(3)** *The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.*

**79.13(4)** *Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:*

a. *Entrance into the program. If a unit chooses to use a preprofessional skills test from a nationally recognized testing service for admission into the program, the unit must report passing rates and remediation measures annually to the department.*

b. *Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.*

c. *Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).*

d. *Program completion (for teacher education, this includes testing described in Iowa Code section 256.16; see subrule 79.15(5) for required teacher candidate assessment).*

**79.13(5)** *Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:*

a. *Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.*

b. *Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.*

c. *Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.*

d. *Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.*

e. *Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.*

f. *Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.*

g. *Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.*

**79.13(6)** *Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:*

a. *Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.*

b. *The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.*

c. *Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.*

d. *Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.*

e. *The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle.*

**79.13(7)** *The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.*

**79.13(8)** *The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.*

**79.13(9)** *The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.*

## **Initial Team Findings - Assessment**

### **Commendations/Strengths**

- The team found evidence in the institutional report (IR), the opening presentation and faculty interviews that the School Counseling Program Committee collaborated to review and revise the candidate disposition assessment to ensure fairness in measuring candidate performance. Additionally, they review candidates' assessment from the diversity, equity and inclusion lens.
- The team found evidence in the IR, opening presentation, program lead and faculty interviews that the school counseling program utilizes program and candidate assessment for continuous program improvement and candidate improvement two times in an academic year.

### **Recommendation**

**1. 79.13(8)** The team found evidence of assessment efforts being made in all programs at the program level. The team recommends that the SOE unit utilize the University Assessment Director or assessment expertise and resources to support the development of a formal SOE assessment system. This system should include program and candidate assessment with a timeline for collection, analysis, review, revision, and dissemination. This will ensure that the unit maintains oversight and consistency across programs.

### **Program Response**

The Dean and Associate Dean met with the University Assessment Director in December 2023 and again in January 2024 to address the team's concerns regarding our assessment system, including the specific items described above.

### **Concern**

**1. 79.13(1)** Through the review of the IR, preliminary review (PR) responses, syllabi, opening presentation, and discussions with key stakeholders, such as the university Assessment Director, Dean, Associate Dean, Teaching & Learning Chair, program leads, and faculty, the team discovered evidence of the unit's expectation for program and candidate assessment. However, the team also identified varying approaches to oversight, data collection, review, analysis and revision of program and candidate assessment by the program leads. To address this, the team requires the unit develop a formal assessment system for the School of Education (SOE). This system should include clearly defined assessment plans for both programs and candidates, along with a timeline for the collection, analysis, review, revision, and dissemination of assessment data. Implementing such a system will ensure consistent oversight and maintain quality across all programs.

### **Program Response**

Clearly defined assessments for both programs and candidates  
Each program (Teacher Preparation, Education Administration, and Professional School Counseling) is now employing a series of Drake School of Education templates to record the candidate and program assessments more clearly and consistently. The candidate assessment plan timelines are articulated in Template 1 with details linked in the headers (first

row) to candidate assessment. Template 2 displays the results of the work completed in Template 1 by providing a place for programs to record their program assessment process by evaluating the aggregate and analyzed candidate assessment for program improvement and sharing with stakeholders.

Template 1 provides a timeline for when and how candidate assessment data are collected and who is responsible for each phase of the assessment system, including aggregation, analysis, evaluation, program improvement discussions, and sharing with stakeholders.

Template 2 allows programs to track aggregate candidate results, as well as program improvements made in response to the data described in both templates.

More detail about each program's use of these templates is available for review by clicking on the active links for each template.

### Template 1

SOE Timeline for Data Collection, Aggregation, Analysis, Evaluation, Program Improvement, and Sharing with Stakeholders (Blank Example – Click on the Template 1 link above for more detail by program)

	<b>Candidate Assessment Data Source 1 (link this header to the collected data)</b>	<b>Candidate Assessment Data Source 2 (link this header to the collected data)</b>	<b>Candidate Assessment Data Source 3 (link this header to the collected data)</b>	<b>Candidate Assessment Data Source 4 (link this header to the collected data)</b>
<b>Data Collection (Include details about who is responsible for this task)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed
<b>Aggregation of Data (Include details about who is responsible for this task)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed

<b>Analysis of Data (Include details about who is responsible for this task)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed
<b>Evaluation of Data (Include details about who is responsible for this task – program or dept.?)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed
<b>Aggregated data used to make program improvements (Include details about who is responsible for this task – program or dept.?)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed
<b>Sharing with Stakeholders (Include details about who is responsible for this task- program lead or dept. chair?)</b>	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed	Include date (month) when this will be accomplished every semester or every year and how the data will be accessed

Template 2

## SOE Annual Program Assessment Report Template

Program: (Blank example – Click on the Template 2 link above for more detail on each program)



Program Standard	Assessed in	Assessment	Target	Results	Program Changes	Notes/ Follow Up Reflection
<b>List Program Standards in this column</b>	Describe where/when this standard is evaluated in this column. Include as many data points as are utilized.	Provide details about the candidate assessment (paper, test, survey item, etc.) in this column	Report the pass or success target that the program is aiming for in this column	List aggregate candidate assessment results for this academic year in this column	After meeting as a program and reviewing the data, describe program changes that will be made in response to this year's results	Add notes and follow up reflections from program about implementation

**2. 79.13(5)** The team did not find evidence of a formal process in the education administration program to review the fairness, reliability, and validity of individual candidate assessments. The program also needs to assess candidate performance according to NELP standards at different points and in various ways, including clinical placements. Additionally, formative feedback should support the attainment of NELP standards. The unit must develop a plan to demonstrate how NELP standards are integrated into multiple performance measures, ensuring the validity of the criteria. A process for inter-rater reliability should also be established.

### Program Response

The formal process in the educational leadership program designed to review individual candidate assessments includes the following components:

#### Fairness and reliability

Professors in the EDL program meet regularly to discuss both individual and group performance on assessments. Collaborative scoring is used when necessary to ensure assessments are scored fairly and reliably.

Assessments are fair because students are made aware of the assessments in the first course, all students receive the same assessments, the same standard is assessed in multiple courses, and students are given formative feedback and an opportunity to remediate if necessary.

Inter-rater reliability is the measure of the consistency or agreement between two or more scorers. Drake's EDL program is small. There are two full-time professors in the program, along with a limited number of adjuncts that teach the twelve courses in the EDL program. When the professors teach the same courses, we use the same measures. Comparing these

scores provides evidence of inter-rater reliability. When professors do not teach the same courses, sample assessments are shared between professors in a form of collaborative scoring. This provides another opportunity to ensure inter-rater reliability.

Moving forward, in order to ensure that there is a more formal process in place, EDL program faculty will meet once each semester to specifically review the fairness, reliability, and validity of individual candidate assessment.

### Validity

The unit's plan to demonstrate how NELP standards are integrated into multiple performance measures will ensure the validity of the assessments. The Drake EDL program integrates NELP standards into multiple performance measures, or assessments, in the two-year program. These assessments cover all relevant parts of the NELP standards that they are intended to measure. Assessment of these NELP standards in more than one course over the two-year program provides an opportunity for students to build on their knowledge and skills and apply learning in more than one context. For example, our Field-Based Learning Experiences in each EDL course exhibit face validity. These measures or assessments effectively measure the content and skills in an authentic and relevant setting for emerging school leaders.

### NELP Standards and Multiple Performance Measures

- 1) Each assessment in each EDL course is aligned to one or more NELP standards. This process of standards alignment is indicated in each assessment and in each course syllabus.
- 2) The program provides several opportunities to assess candidate performance according to NELP standards at different points and in various ways, including through clinical placements.
- 3) We introduce the NELP standards at program orientation and in the first course, EDL 270: Personal and Professional Assessment Seminar. NELP standards are also cross walked by content and skills addressed in multiple EDL courses. Students are guided by the NELP standards when engaging in clinical hours with their assigned clinical mentors each year of the EDL program.
- 4) In both year one and two of the program, students, clinical mentors, and clinical advisors engage in an evaluation of student progress related to the NELP standards. In addition, students complete an individual self-assessment of their progress on NELP standards in each clinical course (EDL 280, 281). Students compare their perception of their ability to meet NELP standards with their clinical mentor(s) and clinical advisor's assessment. Clinical mentors complete a formative evaluation of student progress on NELP standards and clinical advisors complete a summative evaluation.

### Formative Feedback

Drake's EDL program utilizes formative feedback to support the attainment of NELP standards in multiple ways.

- 1) Each assessment completed by an individual student is formally assessed by the course instructor at the time of completion. Individual feedback is provided using the language of the NELP standards in the context specific to each assessment.
- 2) Students complete individual and group assessments in each EDL course aligned to NELP standards. Results on these assessments allow professors to review and compare them to the NELP standards. As a result, professors may determine changes or modifications need to be made to assignments, course material, and/or learning activities based on the data.

3) Students also provide an evaluation of the EDL program upon completion. This data also informs the team on what adjustments may need to be made to specific courses, course outcomes, assessments, or field-based learning experiences to be responsive to the data and improve student outcomes.

4) With two professors in the EDL program, collaboration is accessible and frequent. Individual candidate performance is discussed and further addressed when needed.

Example 1: NELP Standard 1.1 – This standard is assessed in five unique courses in the EDL program.

Example 2: NELP Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 6.1 – These standards are assessed in multiple courses.

Additional data to provide evidence of assessment in clinical experiences:

Drake Clinical Handbook

EDL 280 Clinical Experience 1

-Self-assessment and reflection on each standard area

-Clinical Mentor formative evaluation

-Clinical Advisor/Mentor/Student formative evaluation

EDL 281 Clinical Experience 2

-Self-assessment and reflection on each standard area

-Clinical Mentor formative evaluation

-Clinical Advisor/Mentor/Student formative evaluation

**3. 79.13(6)** The team did not find evidence of a comprehensive unit assessment system. Individual programs varied in a. candidate assessment aligned to standards; and b-c. analysis and utilization of data for program evaluation and improvement. The unit is required to develop and execute a plan to provide oversight and ensure a cohesive unit assessment plan.

Comprehensive unit assessment system

### **Program Response**

A comprehensive unit assessment system is ensured by the use of our new system of templates, whereby each program records their candidate and program assessment using the two blank templates presented in response to 79.13(1) above.

Template 1 provides a timeline for when and how candidate assessment data are collected and who is responsible for each phase of the assessment system, including aggregation, analysis, evaluation, program improvement discussions, and sharing with stakeholders.

Template 2 allows programs to track aggregate candidate results, as well as program improvements made in response to the data described in both templates.

Together, these two templates will allow consistent annual oversight on a unit level of the candidate and program assessment data.

a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards

Template 2 ensures that program standards are clearly articulated in Column 1 and assessment alignment with each standard is demonstrated in Columns 2 and 3.

- b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs. This process will be reported by each program annually by utilizing Template 1. Analysis and evaluation of aggregated candidate assessment data will be recorded in Row 3 and 4 specifically.
- c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements. This process will be reported by each program annually by utilizing Template 1. Using data to make program improvements will be recorded in Row 5 specifically.
- d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders. This process will be reported by each program annually by utilizing Template 1. Sharing data with stakeholders will be recorded in Row 6 specifically.
- e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle. The regular cycle for collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data are outlined in Template 1. These processes will be completed at a minimum annually, although programs may choose to complete the assessment cycle every semester.

**4. 79.13(7)** The team found evidence in the IR and PR that the unit utilizes graduate survey data and employer feedback for improvement efforts. The team requires that the administrator preparation program formalize the usage of graduate and employer survey data for programmatic assessment and improvement.

#### **Program Response**

Professors in the EDL program will track the graduate and employer survey data for programmatic assessment and improvement in a shared Excel file.

- *Data will be tracked annually upon receipt of the survey in the Excel file.*
- *Graphs will be created to help professors look for trends.*
- *The team will engage in collaborative discussions regarding the data and recommendations for changes or improvements to the program will be noted/implemented.*

**5. 79.13(8)** Through review of the IR, PR, opening presentation, interviews with program leads, Teaching & Learning Chair, Associate Dean, Dean, and university Assessment Director that regular review, evaluation, and revision to assessment as a system is not completed by the unit, rather by program leads. The unit is required to have a process for review and revision of assessment tools, data and system.

#### **Program Response**

Unit review of the assessment system

Unit review of the assessment tools, data, and system itself will start with the Associate Dean every summer. The Associate Dean will collaborate with the University Assessment Coordinator, who has established a timeline for all programs at the university to follow. Below is the university timeline, shared annually with all program leads by the University Assessment Coordinator. The Associate Dean will capitalize on the May/June work to review the SOE

Assessment system as a part of the overall review of program assessments during the summer that is happening at the university level. Each August, the Associate Dean and the University Assessment Coordinator review results and the assessment system for implications and possible revisions. Suggested revisions will be shared with program leads for them to take back to their faculty for consideration in the upcoming annual cycle.

Timeline for University Program Assessment (emailed to program leads by the University Assessment Coordinator)

Every Fall: After meeting with program faculty, program leads submit student learning outcome(s) for their program to be evaluated and examples of how the outcome will be measured. (Deadline: December 1)

These student learning outcomes and evaluation plan and examples are uploaded to a Teams Folder. Information submitted by programs is reviewed by the Assessment Coordinator and process related feedback is shared. (Every January)

Every Spring: After meeting with program faculty, program leads submit patterns of student achievement and areas of need as noted by use of examples of student work ("Findings") AND any plans for modification to curriculum, assignments, course structure based on findings ("Next Steps"). (Deadline: April 1)

Spring- After meeting with program faculty, program leads submit reflections on the impact of changes they made the previous year ("Closing the Loop") based on prior year assessment and findings/next steps. (Deadline: May 1)

Information submitted by programs is reviewed by the Assessment Coordinator and process related feedback is shared. (Every May/June)

The assessment office schedules annual meetings to discuss program and college/school patterns related to student achievement and overall assessment process with Dean/Assoc. Dean. (Every August)

Judy Jones, MA ED (She, Her)

Assessment Coordinator

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

2505 University Ave, Howard Hall, Office 203D

T 515-271-3524 W [drake.edu](http://drake.edu)

---

### Sources of Information

Interviews with:

University Assessment Director, Dean of School of Education, Associate Dean, Teaching & Learning Chair, Candidates, Faculty.

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation.

Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

---

## TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARD

**281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard.** *The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.14(1)** *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.*

**79.14(2)** *PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:*

- a. *High-quality college/university supervisors, and*
- b. *High-quality cooperating teachers.*

**79.14(3)** *Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates' achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' attainment of unit standards.*

**79.14(4)** *Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.*

**79.14(5)** *Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.*

**79.14(6)** *Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:*

- a. *High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.*
- b. *Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.*
- c. *The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment.*

**79.14(7)** *The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:*

- a. *Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 weeks in duration during the teacher candidate's final year of the teacher preparation program.*
- b. *Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.*
- c. *Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.*
- d. *Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate's classroom.*
- e. *Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment*

*tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.*

*f. Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.*

*g. Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).*

*h. Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate's permanent record.*

**79.14(8)** *The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.*

**79.14(9)** *The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.*

## **Initial Team Findings - Clinical Practice**

### **Commendations/Strengths**

- Candidates in a variety of classes shared their appreciation for the support and accommodation that they received from the teacher preparation placement coordinator.

### **Recommendations**

**1. 79.14(1)** The team found evidence that secondary education majors have a practicum of 40 hours in their first course of 103/203 Foundations of Education and 40 hours of practicum in their 132/232 Secondary Methods course towards the end of their degree before student teaching. The students who choose endorsements, such as science or ELL, may have an opportunity for a practicum, but this does not include all students. It is evident in the IR that this practice is an updated one from the old practice of spreading the secondary placements among EDUC 108/208 Student Development and Learning, EDUC 142/242 Secondary Reading, and EDUC 132/232 Secondary Methods. In the focus groups, candidates mentioned that doing mini-lessons was helpful in implementing a lesson, but they were not effective in taking the place of authentic teaching situations in a classroom. The team recommends that the unit provides an additional practicum/field experience opportunity for Secondary Education students throughout the program prior to their student teaching.

### **Program Response**

The old practice of spreading secondary placements among more classes was changed in response to previous candidates' perceptions that they were not able to align course content with field experiences and that the experiences were too short. Therefore, we updated our practice to the current system where secondary students have two longer practicums rather than more shorter practicums. We appreciate that current students would like to change back to the old system. We are concerned that if we do that, future students will want to change back to the current system. We will survey secondary education students to determine the percentage of current students who would like to change.

**2. 79.14(4)** The team found when candidates major in special education early in the program, they can request a special education practicum during their first year in the first 40 hours of 103/203 Foundations of Education. However, if a student chooses to major in special education after completing Foundations of Education and the 40-hour practicum, they will only have one opportunity for a 10-hour practicum in special education before graduating. The team suggests adding more practicum hours and field experience opportunities in special education prior to the final year and student teaching.

### **Program Response**

To clarify, students cannot major in special education at Drake University. All education students are either elementary or secondary majors. This applies to both undergraduate and graduate students. Students may add a special education endorsement to their general education elementary (#102) endorsement, or they may use one of our Strat II (LD/BD or ID) endorsements as a primary endorsement at the secondary level. If a student is earning one of the Strat II endorsements and are secondary majors, then their 40-hour placement in EDUC 132/232 Secondary Methods course would be in an appropriate special education setting. Additional practicum placements are always appreciated by students, but we have great difficulty placing Drake students in appropriate settings already and feel unable to take on additional practicum placements in a systematic way.

**3. 79.14(4)** The team found evidence in a “different location” of placements, but would suggest documenting the teaching candidate’s classroom demographics more specific to diverse categories in chapter 79.

### **Program Response**

This is a good suggestion that we can implement using our LiveText data collection system. Our Field Placement Coordinator added this data to LiveText in January 2024.

### **Concerns**

None

---

### **Sources of Information**

Interviews with:

student focus groups, faculty members, placement coordinator

Review of:

course syllabus, Drake Site Visit Handbook

---



## TEACHER EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS STANDARD

### **281—79.15(256) Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard.**

*Teacher candidates demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

**79.15(1)** *Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge including but not limited to English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.*

**79.15(2)** *Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to identify and meet the needs of all learners, including:*

- a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*
- b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*
- c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*
- d. Students who are gifted and talented.*
- e. English language learners.*
- f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.*

**79.15(3)** *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in literacy, to include reading theory, knowledge, strategies, and approaches; and integrating literacy instruction into content areas. The teacher candidate demonstrates competency in making appropriate accommodations for students who struggle with literacy. Demonstrated competency shall address the needs of all students, including but not limited to, students with disabilities; students who are at risk of academic failure; students who have been identified as gifted and talented or limited English proficient; and students with dyslexia, whether or not such students have been identified as children requiring special education under Iowa Code chapter 256B. Literacy instruction shall include evidence-based best practices, determined by research, including that identified by the Iowa reading research center.*

**79.15(4)** *Each unit defines unit standards (aligned with InTASC standards) and embeds them in courses and field experiences.*

**79.15(5)** *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in all of the following professional core curricula:*

- a. Learner development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the*

*cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.*

*b. Learning differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.*

*c. Learning environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.*

*d. Content knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.*

*e. Application of content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.*

*f. Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.*

*g. Planning for instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.*

*h. Instructional strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.*

*i. Professional learning and ethical practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.*

*j. Leadership and collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.*

*k. Technology. The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.*

*l. Methods of teaching. The teacher candidate understands and uses methods of teaching that have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level endorsement desired.*

**79.15(6) Assessment requirements.**

*a. Each teacher candidate must either meet or exceed a score on subject assessments designed by a nationally recognized testing service that measure pedagogy and knowledge of at least one subject area as approved by the director of the department of education, or the teacher candidate must meet or exceed the equivalent of a score on an alternate assessment also approved by the director. That alternate assessment must be a valid and reliable subject-*

*area-specific, performance-based assessment for preservice teacher candidates that is centered on student learning. The required passing score will be determined by the director using considerations described in Iowa Code section 256.16(1)“a”(2) as amended by 2019 Iowa Acts, Senate File 159, section 2. A candidate who successfully completes the practitioner preparation program as required under this subparagraph shall be deemed to have attained a passing score on the assessments administered under this subparagraph even if the department subsequently sets different minimum passing scores.*

*b. The director shall waive the assessment requirements in 79.15(6)“a” for not more than one year for a person who has completed the course requirements for an approved practitioner preparation program but attained an assessment score below the minimum passing scores set by the department for successful completion of the program under 79.15(6)“a.” The department shall forward to the BOEE the names of all candidates granted a waiver for consideration for a temporary license.*

**79.15(7)** *Each teacher candidate must complete a 30-semester-hour teaching major which must minimally include the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements, or secondary level occupational endorsements. Additionally, each elementary teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours. Each teacher candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the teacher candidate is recommended.*

*79.15(8) Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in content coursework directly related to the Iowa Core.*

**79.15(9)** *Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.*

## **Initial Team Findings - Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions**

### **Commendations/Strengths**

- Differentiated readings for each secondary content area as evidenced in the KSD chart is particularly remarkable.
- The team finds a well-articulated curriculum map with InTASC standards embedded in courses at three developmental levels.

### **Recommendations**

**1. 79.15(2)** The team found inconsistency between the syllabi provided with the IR and the KSD chart provided in the PR response. The syllabi, activities and assignments provided in the KSD chart meet criteria for this standard, but the team recommends more consistency among different offerings of the course, and additional opportunities for students to demonstrate competence with implementation of differentiation for all types of diverse learners.

### **Program Response**

Beginning in Fall 2024, the department has made curricular changes that result in more consistency in the courses faculty teach. This will result in the same instructor teaching most sections of a single course, which will create more consistency across course offerings. The

Teaching and Learning Department is also engaging in a DEI focused curriculum analysis, part of which focuses directly on the ways support for diverse learners is scaffolded throughout our program.

**2. 79.15(2)** Through the review of the curriculum, conversation with candidates and faculty members, the team recognized inconsistency amongst the unit syllabi. The team recommends a standard syllabus for all unit courses. Consistent syllabi layout and components would improve organization and accessibility for all students, faculty and the review team.

### **Program Response**

The previously discussed (just above under 1. 79.15(2)) review of the InTASC alignment with curricular materials and DEI curriculum analysis may reveal opportunities for revision related to accessibility. We appreciate the team highlighting accessibility of syllabi and will include that in our DEI review.

**3. 79.15(3)** The team found evidence within syllabi that candidates demonstrate competencies to teach literacy, the table provided under the KSD section indicates that this standard is met for all teacher candidates. Candidates commented that they learned some similar content in all three courses related to phonics. The team recommends review of the curriculum framework for the three required literacy courses for appropriate scope and sequence.

### **Program Response**

Preliminary review of the required elementary education literacy courses: EDUC 124/224 Literature of Childhood and Youth, EDUC 137/237 Teaching Reading in the Elementary Classroom, and EDUC 139/239 Teaching Communication Arts in the Elementary Classroom did not reveal redundancy in instruction related to phonics. It is possible that this feedback may be related to those who pursue a reading endorsement, as they develop additional expertise in literacy, including a deeper understanding of phonics instruction. Our elementary literacy faculty will review their syllabi related to appropriate scope and sequence for phonics instruction.

**4. 79.15(5)** The team found all InTASC standards are embedded within the unit curriculum in syllabi and in the KSD chart. To improve the candidates' demonstration of understanding the InTASC standards, the team recommends that a process be implemented to provide oversight of revision to target assignments and curricular changes to ensure a variety of developmentally appropriate opportunities to demonstrate sufficient competence with regard to the InTASC standards.

### **Program Response**

We will leverage the previously discussed syllabi review (above under 79.10(4)) for course activities as aligned to InTASC standards to create a document to monitor and reflect curricular changes that may impact candidate competence regarding InTASC standards.

**5. 79.15(7)** The team found evidence in conversations with the registrar and students, a need for clearer pathways in majors and endorsements. The team recommends either an updated guide for students to follow, or careful advising (particularly in SPED) to ensure students are able to take courses and practicum experiences at appropriate times within their program to ensure timely preparation for student teaching.

### Program Response

Here are program sheets (the first tab outlines the elementary program and the second tab outlines the secondary program) and sample 4-year plans (again, the first tab outlines the elementary program and the second tab outlines the secondary program) that are posted in Blackboard. Whitney Harris, our Director of Advising, updated these. To clarify, SPED students are either elementary or secondary majors at Drake: it is an endorsement area rather than a separate degree program. No doubt a student with a SPED endorsement shared some concerns with the visiting team, but we want to be clear that they aren't in a separate program. Also, starting Fall, 2023, all undergrads have one advisor, so they will all be the beneficiaries of consistent, quality advising.

**6. 79.15(8):** The team found evidence that Iowa Core standards are utilized by students but the team recommends making this connection to Iowa Core more explicit in all unit syllabi and any relevant assignments.

### Program Response

Faculty will be encouraged to make connections to the Iowa Core more visible in their syllabi and assignments.

**7. 79.15(7):** The team found evidence in syllabi and approved curriculum exhibits that STEM 107, STEM 108, and STEM 109 meet criteria for the elementary education teaching major, but there were clear concerns from students about redundancy of the courses rather than scaffolding of the content for developmental progression. The team requires that this sequence of courses be reviewed, based upon student feedback, and the unit shares their plan to ensure adherence to the approved curriculum exhibit/syllabi.

### Program Response

The department has reviewed student feedback and we have also carefully reviewed the curriculum to ensure each course has distinct outcomes.

With respect to science content, each course targets different science content. 107 addresses the science content teachers need for implementing the NGSS K-1 standards, 108 addresses content needs for grades 2-3, and 109 addresses content needs for grades 4-5. Because the Next Generation Science Standards build on each other across the grades, there are similar "big ideas" being addressed across each course, but each course addresses distinct nuances within those big ideas. No science content lesson/activity is repeated across the courses.

While pedagogical principles are largely the same across the three courses by design, the expectations for preservice teachers are highly scaffolded across the three courses. In their first course, students must demonstrate understanding of effective science pedagogy via a paper. In their second course, students must demonstrate implementation of effective science pedagogy in a highly supportive and controlled environment (peer teaching). Then, in their final course, students must demonstrate that they can implement effective science teaching in the real classroom with elementary students (practicum). Thus, the pedagogy content of the three courses is meant to be a spiral curriculum in which similar ideas are revisited to deepen and extend preservice teachers' knowledge while scaffolding the expectations of what preservice elementary teachers are required to do with that knowledge.

To ensure adherence to the approved curriculum exhibit/syllabi the courses are all currently taught by the person who wrote the syllabi. In addition to the clear distinctions noted above, the science educator who teaches the courses keeps track of the science content activities used in each course to further ensure that each course is unique. This list of activities and strategies used to achieve course outcomes will help ensure that any new instructors are able to implement the courses with fidelity to the original creator of the courses.

### **Concerns**

None

---

### **Sources of Information**

Interviews with:

Registrar, Candidates, Unit Faculty, Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Student Records Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation.

---

## ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION CLINICAL PRACTICE

281—79.16(256) *Administrator preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful school administrators in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.16(1) *The unit ensures that:*

a. *Principal candidates successfully complete clinical experiences that provide candidates with opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in subrule 79.17(2) in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building-level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school.*

b. *Superintendent candidates successfully complete clinical experiences that provide candidates opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in subrule 79.17(3) in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of district-level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their district.*

79.16(2) *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are coherent, authentic, sustained, and purposeful opportunities that are monitored by the unit. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating administrators.*

79.16(3) *Candidates are supervised by knowledgeable and qualified practitioners. The PK-12 school and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, supporting, evaluating, and retaining both:*

a. *High-quality college/university supervisors, and*

b. *High-quality cooperating administrators.*

79.16(4) *Cooperating administrators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate's achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' attainment of unit standards.*

79.16(5) *Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:*

a. *A minimum of 400 hours during the candidate's preparation program.*

b. *Take place with appropriately licensed cooperating administrators in state-approved schools or educational facilities.*

c. *Take place in multiple high-quality educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups.*

d. *Include documented expectations and responsibilities for cooperating administrators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members.*

e. *Provide opportunities for candidates to apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified in subrules 79.17(2) and 79.17(3).*

79.16(6) *The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating administrators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating administrator, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating administrator other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.*

79.16(7) *The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for administrator candidates.*

## Initial Team Findings - Administrator Clinical

### Commendations/Strengths

- The team found evidence in the syllabi, interviews with current candidates and the IR that the course embedded clinicals (Clinical I & II) and field-based learning experiences (FBLE) provide candidates with rich and diverse experiences for feedback and learning.
- The team found evidence in the interview with current candidates and faculty that the faculty are open to feedback, committed to their work and that they provide rich learning experiences, timely feedback and a high level of care for candidates in the program.

### Recommendations

**1. 79.16(2)** The team found evidence through the IR and review of the mentor contract that the unit requires clinical mentors to be appropriately licensed. The team did not find evidence that requires a clinical mentor to have a minimum number of years of administrative experience before taking on that role. The team recommends the unit specify the minimum number of years an administrator needs in the field before becoming a mentor.

### Program Response

Mentors will be required to have one year of administrative experience to serve as a clinical mentor. This has been updated in our Clinical Mentor Handbook.

**2. 79.16(3)** While the team found evidence through interviews with faculty and the program response to the PR that candidates can provide informal feedback to the clinical advisor on mentor effectiveness, the team could not find evidence that mentees participate in formal, summative evaluation of mentors to assess their effectiveness. The team recommends the unit implement a formal evaluation process of mentors.

### Program Response

A Google form will provide the opportunity for students to offer feedback regarding their experiences with clinical mentors. The survey results will be reviewed by professors in the EDL program.

**3. 79.16(4)** While the team found evidence through the IR and clinical evaluation report that mentors in the EdS program provide multiple performance-based assessments that are aligned with NELP standards and shared with the candidate and clinical professor, the team could not find evidence through a review of the Institutional Report and Clinical Mentor Handbook that the EdL program provides the mentor multiple performance-based assessments of principal preparation candidates that are aligned to NELP standards. The team recommends the EdL program adapt the EdS Clinical Evaluation form.

### Program Response

This has been addressed. Clinical Advisor/Mentor/Student formative evaluation

**4. 79.16(6)** The team found evidence that each fall the unit provides an information and orientation session for mentors that focuses on understanding the NELP standards and mentor responsibilities. The team recommends the unit consider how to utilize this time to gather feedback that the unit can analyze and potentially utilize for program improvement.

### Program Response



A google form will provide the opportunity for clinical mentors to offer feedback regarding their experiences working with NELP standards and the orientation process. The survey results will be reviewed by professors in the EDL program.

### **Concerns**

None

---

### **Sources of Information**

Interviews with:

Assessment Director, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean/Chair of School of Education, Teacher Advisory Council members (local principals, adjuncts, current candidates, alumni), Candidates, Unit Faculty, Library Director, Director of the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Faculty, Field Placement Coordinator and Licensing Officer.

*Review of:*

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Student Records, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation

---

## **ADMINISTRATOR KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS**

*281—79.17(256) Administrator knowledge, skills, and dispositions standard. Administrator candidates shall demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

*79.17(1) Each educational administrator program shall define program standards (aligned with current NELP standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice administrator.*

*79.17(2) Each principal candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to:*

- a. Collaboratively lead, design, and implement a school mission, vision, and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community. (Mission, Vision, and Improvement)*
- b. Advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms. (Ethics and Professional Norms)*
- c. Develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive school culture. (Equity, Inclusiveness, and Cultural Responsiveness)*
- d. Evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, and assessment. (Learning and Instruction)*
- e. Strengthen student learning, support school improvement, and advocate for the needs of the school and community. (Community and External Leadership)*
- f. Improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems to develop and improve data-informed and equitable school resource plans and to apply laws, policies, and regulations. (Operations and Management)*
- g. Build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support, and professional learning. (Building Professional Capacity)*

*79.17(3) Each superintendent candidate demonstrates competency in all of the following professional core curricula:*

- a. Collaboratively lead, design, and implement a district mission, vision, and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community. (District Mission, Vision, and Improvement)*
- b. Advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate professional norms and culture. (Ethics and Professional Norms)*
- c. Develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture. (Equity, Inclusiveness, and Cultural Responsiveness)*
- d. Evaluate, design, cultivate, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, assessment, and instructional leadership. (Learning and Instruction)*
- e. Understand and engage families, communities, and other constituents in the work of schools and the district and to advocate for district, student, and community needs. (Community and External Leadership)*
- f. Develop, monitor, evaluate, and manage data-informed and equitable district systems for operations, resources, technology, and human capital management. (Operations and Management)*
- g. Cultivate relationships, lead collaborative decision making and governance, and represent and advocate for district needs in broader policy conversations. (Policy, Governance, and Advocacy)*

79.17(4) *Each new administrator candidate successfully completes the appropriate evaluator training provided by a state-approved evaluator trainer.*

79.17(5) *Each administrator candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support the implementation of the Iowa core.*

79.17(6) *Each administrator candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences, the ability to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture with students and staff from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that administrator candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, as well as ensuring teachers meet the needs of diverse learners, including:*

*a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*

*b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*

*c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*

*d. Students who are gifted and talented.*

*e. English language learners.*

*f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.*

79.17(7) *Each administrator candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended.*

*Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.*

## **Initial Team Findings - Administrator Knowledge Skills and Dispositions**

### **Commendation/Strength**

- Students continually reported their belief that the support and resources provided for their success was a strength of the program.

### **Recommendations**

**1. 79.17(2 & 3)** Through the review of syllabi and faculty interviews, the team found a high degree of inconsistency with regard to syllabi uniformity. This inconsistency led to concerns regarding standard alignment and assessment. The team recommends that unit faculty create a template for all syllabi that addresses the concerns identified below.

### **Program Response**

*Completed. Please see the Concern below re: 79.17(2 & 3)*

**2. 79.17(2 & 3)** Through the review of syllabi and faculty interviews, the team recommends that unit faculty engage in interrater reliability work that will allow them to more uniformly assess students' ability to "demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions" as per the standards.

### **Program Response**

Professors in the EDL program will engage in collaborative scoring of student assignments - specifically Field-Based Learning Experiences (FBLEs) to meet the requirements of interrater reliability. Each fall and spring, professors will meet to share student work and discuss the ways in which the student(s) will be assessed against the standards.

**3. 79.17(6)** While the team found evidence that the unit is working diligently to provide administrator candidates with coursework focusing on a candidate's ability to "... develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture", student interviews and alumni survey results provided additional evidence that cause the team to recommend an increased focus on working with diverse learners as listed in chapter 79 within the unit coursework and clinical experiences.

### **Program Response**

Courses in the EDL program have been undergoing revisions to update course readings and text selections to reflect a variety of diverse perspectives.

For example:

- *EDL 275 includes the text Street Data*

- *EDL 273 uses a core text titled Critical Curriculum Leadership by Rose Ylimaki*

Course content includes preparing students for leadership in serving students from diverse backgrounds. This content is evidenced in many courses, but especially in EDL 274: Schools in a Diverse Society.

EDL professors will also seek input from students about additional course needs to ensure we are preparing them well to address a focus on working with diverse learners as listed in Chapter 79.

### **Concerns**

**1. 79.17(2 & 3)** Through the review of the IR, syllabi, and faculty interviews, the team found evidence that while all course syllabi identify NELP standards to be addressed within specific courses, many lack a connection between the assignments, assessments, and standard(s) to be addressed. The absence of this alignment causes the team to question how the unit can assess "candidate's ability to demonstrate KSD's" for each standard. A model that precisely links assignments with assessments and standards was provided through the revised syllabus for EDL 270. The team requires the unit to formalize this process within all course syllabi.

### **Program Response**

Course syllabi are being updated to reflect the syllabus structure from EDL 270.

Exhibits are available for review. And these revised syllabi have been uploaded to Drake's BOEE Google Drive.

**2. 79.17(5)** A review of the syllabus for EDL 273 provided evidence that the unit addresses the implementation of the Iowa Core. However, the team did not find an assessment for this corresponding assignment. The team requires the unit to provide evidence of an assessment that addresses the candidate's ability to demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to support the implementation of the Iowa Core. The team requires that this be completed and updated curriculum syllabi be submitted to the BoEE and Department.

### **Program Response**

Link to new syllabus was provided for EDL 273 with assignments to assess candidates' understanding of Iowa Core and implementation of the standards in an administrative position.

**3. 79.17(6c)** The team did not find evidence that “candidate’s ability to meet the needs of students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia” is taught or assessed. The unit provided documentation that they are aware of this and are working on meeting this sub-standard through the revising of course syllabus for EDL 273. The team requires that this be completed and updated curriculum syllabi be submitted to the BoEE and Department.

### **Program Response**

Link to new [syllabus EDL 273](#)

---

### **Sources of Information**

#### *Interviews with:*

Candidates, Unit Faculty, Department chairs

#### Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation, Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

---

## **PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM CLINICAL PRACTICE**

*281—79.20(256) Clinical practice standard. The unit and its school, AEA, and facility partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful practitioners in accordance with the following provisions.*

*79.20(1) The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating professional educators.*

*79.20(2) The PK-12 school, AEA, and facility partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:*

- a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and*
- b. High-quality cooperating professional educators.*

*79.20(3) Cooperating professional educators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate's achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate the candidate's attainment of unit standards.*

*79.20(4) Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:*

- a. Learning that takes place in the context of providing high-quality instructional programs for students in a state-approved school, agency, or educational facility;*
- b. Take place in educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups;*
- c. Provide opportunities for candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice;*
- d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating professional educators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members;*
- e. Include prescribed minimum expectations for involvement of candidates in relevant responsibilities directed toward the work for which they are preparing;*
- f. Involve candidates in professional meetings and other activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning; and*
- g. Involve candidates in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating professional educators in the school.*

*79.20(5) The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating professional educators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating professional educators, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating professional educators other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.*

*79.20(6) The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for candidates.*

### **Initial Team Findings - Professional School Counseling Clinical**

#### **Commendations/Strengths**

- The team found evidence in the IR, Counseling Program Evaluation Report and conversations with faculty members that the unit values continuous improvement of the

program. Data from this report and other sources provide evidence, prior to each term, that reflects strengths in the program as well as opportunities for improvement.

- The team found evidence through conversations with unit faculty and candidate interviews that candidates feel they are being well prepared to be responsive to the current needs of students in the K-12 school counseling profession.

## Recommendations

**1. 79.20 (1) (5)** Through review of the IR, Practicum/Internship Handbooks and discussions with candidates, the team found evidence that candidates and cooperating supervisors are informed about expectations for the clinical experience; however, multiple candidates reported the information was not fully explained to them or the cooperating supervisors resulting in confusion and stressful situations. The team recommends the unit establish a process for providing information and expectations to orient candidates and cooperating supervisors well in advance of the clinical experience.

### Program Response

Counseling Program offers an orientation to practicum and internship two times a year. Students who are planning to take the Practicum or Internship courses the following semester are required to attend this orientation. Program's Practicum and Internship coordinator reaches out to sites to discuss if there are questions. Site supervisors are also provided an online supervision training. The program outlines roles and responsibilities for practicum students, interns, onsite supervisors, and faculty course instructors for the counseling practicum and counseling internship courses.

The program understands the site team's feedback that the practices in place are not sufficient. We will use the site visit team's feedback and we are in the process of creating regular consultation schedules with site supervisors.

### Counseling Practicum

The onsite supervisor and course instructor will communicate before practicum starts and for consultation at least three times during the counseling practicum on week 4, 7 and 10. At least one of these consultations will occur via phone/zoom/in person.

**2. 79.20(4) b** The team found evidence in the IR, Practicum/Internship Handbooks and interviews with faculty members and candidates that clinical placements settings include diverse populations; however, it is recommended that candidates are directed to explore publicly available data and information about their schools where they are assigned. Candidates should be expected to identify, consider and reflect on contextual factors such as age, socio-economic background, race/ethnicity, gender, special needs, achievement, developmental levels, culture and language.

### Program Response

The Counseling program will include this recommendation into the practicum and internship experience.

## Concerns

None

---

## Sources of Information

Interviews with:

Dean/Chair of School of Education, Department Chairs, Faculty, Field Placement Coordinator and Licensing Officer, Director of Student Teaching

Review of:

Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Student Records, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation, Visits to classrooms and discussions with students

---



## **PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS**

*281—79.21(256) Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Candidates shall demonstrate the content knowledge and the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

*79.21(1) Each professional educator program shall define program standards (aligned with current national standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice professional educator.*

*79.21(2) Each candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:*

- a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*
- b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*
- c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*
- d. Students who are gifted and talented.*
- e. English language learners.*
- f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.*

*79.21(3) Each candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.*

### **Initial Team Findings - Professional School Counseling Knowledge Skills and Dispositions**

#### **Commendations/Strengths**

- The team appreciates the intentionality of meeting standard 79.21(2) in both the coursework and clinical experiences. The syllabi alongside faculty and student comments note specific areas of diversity are reviewed multiple times in didactic classes. Students also track the specific diverse identities of the learners they are serving in their practicum and internship experiences.
- The team recognizes the significant time and effort involved in their process for assessing both students and the program in general.

## Recommendations

**1. 79.21(3)** The team found evidence in the IR, course syllabi, and through conversations with faculty and students that the unit is meeting Board of Educational Examiners standards related to counseling students in the areas of personal, social, academic and career development; however, the team recommends the unit have more intentional and consistent preparation for counseling children and adolescents (BoEE 172/3 (3) Fostering of relationships 3.). The students indicate that currently the level to which they feel prepared to counsel this population is heavily dependent on the professor who teaches the COUN 221 Methods of Counseling course.

### Program Response

We appreciate this feedback from the team. With the increase of our school counseling program to 60 credit hours, we are considering adding a course specifically about counseling children, can consider making the Play Therapy elective course available to school counseling students and including more content about children and adolescents into existing courses.

**2. 79.21(3)** The team was able to find evidence in the IR and the course syllabi that the unit is meeting BOEE standards; however, based on conversations with students, the team recommends that faculty include more school counseling related material and examples within the unit's core coursework.

### Program Response

The program provided updated syllabi to specifically address these competencies

**3. 79.21(3)** While the team did find the unit met the requirements established by the Board of Educational Examiners through review of syllabi and conversations with faculty, the team did have a difficult time aligning the BoEE standards to the appropriate assessment and course topic. The team recommends that the unit include the BoEE required standard crosswalked with the CACREP standard being covered and assessed within the course.

### Program Response

Until 2022, our syllabi included both BOEE and CACREP standards and crosswalk. Counseling team felt that the syllabi were getting too long and overwhelming for students. When we reworked our program assessment process, we created Key Performance Indicators based on BOEE and CACREP standards and dropped the crosswalk list of BOEE and CACREP tables from our syllabi. However, we are now in the process of adding the crosswalk table into our syllabi starting the Spring 2024 semester.

## Concerns

None

---

## Sources of Information

Interviews with:  
Professors of School Counseling program

Review of:

Classroom visits and discussion with students, Institutional Report, Program Response to the Preliminary Review, Student Records, Surveys, Course Syllabi, Program opening presentation

---