

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT ADDENDUM:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION
Addendum Date March 8, 2013**

**University of Idaho
Site Visit
April 7-10, 2013**

**Dr. Corinne Mantle-Bromley, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Education
University of Idaho**

We thank the Board of Examiners for their thoughtful review of our Institutional Report, evidence and supporting appendices. With the goal of continuous improvement and to provide as clear and concise responses as possible, this addendum is organized by standard and then by the Areas of Concern, Areas for Improvement and additional requested evidence. Each point addressed also includes (where needed) a brief institutional response to contextualize the additional information requested.

Each exhibit listed is in a [supplemental evidence room](#) on the University of Idaho NCATE Accreditation website (<https://ncate.ed.uidaho.edu>). The evidence is organized in the Addendum page, as is a copy of this full report. The site is protected and can be accessed by the BOE members using the same login information as was used for the Institutional Report.

To ensure that data is protected in accordance with FERPA guidelines, please take the following steps to ensure that you can view our [Supplemental exhibit room](#).

Compatible Browsers include Chrome and Mozilla Firefox

- *Internet Explorer is not fully compatible with our Electronic Exhibit Room*

Step 1. Please Visit <https://ncate.ed.uidaho.edu/Supplemental.asp>

Step 2. Use the login “ncate-reviewer” (without quotation marks) and the password that was emailed to your BOE email address.

Step 3. Depending on your browser, you will need to

- “Accept the certificate” (even if it is untrusted) and or “Proceed Anyway”
- Show all content (if asked).

If you have any challenges or difficulties please contact our Office of Assessment and Accreditation 208- 885-5014 or email dcampbell@uidaho.edu

1. Standard 1 Addendum Responses

1.5.1 Follow up on the programs that are distance learning programs---would like to see what those programs have as the distance learning component that is different from the on-campus program.

The Professional Educator Preparation Unit, led by the College of Education and its partner colleges (Agriculture and Life Sciences; Art and Architecture; Liberal Arts and Social Sciences; Business and Economics; and Science) are in the process of embracing hybrid delivery for select courses within the educator preparation program. The selection of courses for transfer to a hybrid model is dependent upon the course content and the individual faculty member. The components of hybrid and online that vary from face-to-face consist of how the material is delivered and in certain aspects, how the data is assessed (e.g., online tests versus face-to-face tests). Please see [Exhibit 1.5.1 – Comparison Overview of Hybrid and F2F Components](#). A major indicator of this is the deployment of TaskStream for signature assignments and assessment of dispositions. Many programs deliver courses face-to-face and online, and in some instances, the same course are taught using two different modalities by the same faculty member, in the same semester. The content and assessment are the same, the only difference is how the candidate participates, and how the assessments are collected. The innovative use of BlackBoard Collaborate (a program within BbLearn) allows for synchronous and asynchronous delivery of the same material in a modality that accommodates the extreme rural nature of Idaho. Additional information can be explored with Associate Dean Gregson during the interview portion of the onsite visit.

1.5.2 It was not clear whether the educational leadership program is offered online.

With the exception of internships, all courses associated with certificates for principal, superintendent and special education director are available online. This is in response to the experiential and anecdotal findings of faculty within the department which identified that candidates in this program, many of whom are working professionals, preferred the online delivery modality. Online courses are designated by www on the university class schedule. Course schedule information can be viewed online at <http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/schedule/> Additional information about course enrollments can be seen in [Exhibit 1.5.2 – Matrix of enrollments in Hybrid, F2F and Online in the Ed Leadership Program](#)

1.5.3 Follow up on the reading specialist program- what is being done with that program and candidates who are still in it.

The reading specialist program is also referred to as the literacy endorsement, and this program is still active and preparing for review by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission.

1.5.4 Find out what the LCSC PACE program is.

Pathways for Accelerated Certification and Endorsement (PACE) is an online option in the Secondary Education Program operated by Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC). LCSC is a local public undergraduate institution located approximately 30 miles south of Moscow ID. The PACE program is designed to serve post-BA/BS teacher candidates who are seeking to earn a secondary teaching licensure. Through PACE, candidates can work toward Secondary Teaching Certification (grades 6-12) in many academic areas, including some not available to LCSC undergraduates.

1.5.5 Follow up on content concerns indicated in employer/alumni surveys.

The unit takes a systematic approach in regards to concerns from all stakeholders, not just employers and alumni. The concerns that are referenced within the graduating senior survey are presented annually via electronic mail from the Dean and Department Chairs to program faculty and advisory boards and discussion ([Exhibit 1.5.4 – Meeting Notes C&I Retreat](#)). As the design of the Graduating Senior Survey ([Exhibit 1.5.4 Graduating Senior Survey \(GSS\)](#)) and the administration of the GSS is by the University of Idaho Office of Institutional Research additional follow-up of concerns with specific students is not possible. Review of the comments and content of the GSS include both a review of the positive comments and the negative comments to identify trends. For those areas where concerns of recent (or longitudinal alumni) present themselves as trends, faculty discuss curricular and co-curricular changes that could be made to address those issues as articulated in the individual programs annual assessment cycle findings. ([Exhibit 2.5.4 – Annual Assessment System](#)). Systematically, the GSS data is compared by individual programs, depending upon the GSS findings, in different ways. Examples of discussions relating to content changes by program (as applicable) are linked in with [Exhibit 2.5.4](#).

For example, one area that was found to be of concern was the integration of technology into the classroom. In response the professional education unit identified a funding opportunity and a team, led by the College of Education developed a successful grant proposal to establish a technology integration laboratory on the Moscow campus. This proposal not only funds the renovation and creation of a state of the art technology integration laboratory but also supports a new tenure-line faculty member whose focus will be the integration of technology into the classroom. The new faculty member was hired early April and will begin his work in June. [Exhibit 3.5.5 Technology Integration Laboratory](#).

When analysis of employer survey data identifies trends, the individual colleges within the unit refer curricular related matters to the associated department, or in cases where unit-wide matters are involved,

the College of Education takes a lead in facilitating discussions across departments. For example, one area of employer concern relates to the interview skills of graduates. In response, the College of Education has established an Office of Student Services where all teacher education candidates receive advising and support. Another area of concern referenced related to issues of classroom management preparation of candidates. Currently this matter has been referred to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction for faculty review of classroom management preparation as well as consideration of a new stand-alone course in classroom management.

Standard 2 Addendum Responses

2.3.1 (Previous AFI) The unit assessment system has not been implemented for programs at the doctoral levels. (Rationale) Little information on assessment of doctoral programs was provided.

As was indicated in our Annual Reports, and was further clarified with our BOE Chair, the University of Idaho does not offer doctoral level teacher preparation. Professionals who participate in the doctoral programs are preparing for careers in higher education and the professorate, not the P-12 system. Please see [Exhibit 2.3.1 – NCATE and University of Idaho Clarification of non-inclusion of doctoral programs in NCATE Review](#)

2.3.2 (Previous AFI) Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not consistently analyze and evaluate those data for all advanced programs. (Rationale) The unit appears to have a system for analyzing and evaluating data for advanced programs.

The regular and systematic analysis of data for all programs (Initial Teacher Preparation level and for advanced programs) is conducted annually via the Institutional Annual Assessment Cycle. This assessment addresses the core university learning outcomes, which have been cross-referenced to the Units' conceptual framework (Please see [Exhibit 2.3.2 Crosswalk from CARE to UoI Learning Outcomes](#)). Each program identifies specific outcomes relating to the Conceptual Framework (through the University Learning Outcomes) and reviews Direct, Indirect and Face-to-Face measures for all programs at all levels. Please see [Exhibit 2.5.4 – Annual Assessment System Link](#) and 2.3.h Annual Assessment Cycle Summary Spreadsheet.

2.3.3 (Previous AFI) The unit's assessment system does not include a fully implemented process to ensure that all key assessments are systematically evaluated for bias and fairness. (Rationale) The unit has taken steps to evaluate key assessments for bias and fairness.

In addition to the information in the Institutional Report relating to faculty led reviews to ensure that key assessments are systematically evaluated for bias and fairness, the edTPA submissions of candidates are reviewed by UoI faculty as well as external reviewers. As a component of the ongoing training of UoI faculty to become TPA reviewers, the raw and aggregated scores of the internal and external reviewers are compared to ensure that all reviews are fair and free of bias. Please see [Exhibit 2.3.3 – EdTPA Internal and External Reviewers Comparisons](#)

2.5.1 How often does the faculty meet to make program changes based upon the data?

A schedule of meeting frequencies by departments as provided through the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee is referenced in [Exhibit 2.5.1 – Matrix of Meetings](#). As a matter of policy and practice, any curricular or co-curricular changes that are made in these programs are routed through the individual departments, and colleges. Systematically, the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC), reviews changes that impact the teacher education program, and then forwards to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for approval and ultimately for presentation to the Faculty Senate. ([Exhibit 2.5.1 – TECC University Policies and TECC College By-Laws](#)). Changes that have been made by faculty can be seen in the Annual Assessment System ([Exhibit 2.5.4 – Annual Assessment System](#)).

2.5.2 What steps are taken once faculty determine that something is not fair in terms of the course delivery or faculty treatment of students?

The Unit has multiple policy, and professional practice pathways to ensure that all candidates are able to avail themselves of their due process rights. With regards to course delivery all candidates and faculty are governed by the University of Idaho's Classroom Learning Civility Clause and the Non-Discrimination Policy ([Exhibit 2.52 – The CLC and NDP Clauses](#)). When issues arise, candidates are first encouraged to discuss the issue with the course faculty member. Next steps include discussion with the course department chair, then the affiliated associate dean, the college dean, and finally a formal petition through the Teacher Education Petitions Committee ([Exhibit 2.5.2 – Teacher Education Petitions Committee](#)).

In terms of treatment of students unit wide, the University as a formalized Academic Appeals Process where students can further avail themselves of their due process rights. These committees include the;

- **Academic Petitions Committee.** This committee hears student appeals for exceptions to the regulations in this catalog section including, but not limited to, such matters as (1) registration for courses after the deadline, (2) reinstatement from 3rd disqualification, (3) withdrawing from a course after the deadline, and (4) expunging a grade of W from an academic record. Should be presented to the Academic Petitions Committee on forms available in college offices. www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/1640.html#1640.04
- **Academic Hearing Board.** This committee hears student appeals from decisions made by college authorities concerning, but not limited to, such matters as (1) eligibility for advanced placement or credit by examination, (2) objectivity or fairness in making, administering, and evaluating class assignments, (3) maintenance of standards for conscientious performance of teaching duties, and (4) scheduling of classes, field trips, and examinations. The board does not hear appeals concerning requirements or regulations of the College of Graduate Studies or the College of Law. www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/1640.html#1640.02
- **Administrative Hearing Board.** Students submit appeals to the Administrative Hearing Board on administrative decisions in such matters as residence status for tuition purposes, granting of student financial aid, and assessment of fees or charges (except in connection with parking regulations), and disputes involving interpretation and application of policies concerning such matters as student records, smoking, and treatment of disabled persons. www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/1640.html#1640.06

Appeals from decisions of the Academic Petitions Committee and the Academic Hearing Board are submitted to the provost. If the provost concurs with the body whose decisions was appealed, the appellant then may appeal to the president and regents if the president and regents consent to hear the appeal. Decisions of the Administrative Hearing Board may be appealed to the president and regents when they consent to hear such appeals.

Faculty regularly and systematically review cross section grading data at the initial and advanced levels ([Exhibits 1.3.e and 2.3.c from Institutional Report](#)) to review that faculty treatment of students is fair and ensures that all candidates are prepared to help students learn. As with any complex issue such as fairness, the faculty must first determine the nature of the issue and identify what steps will be needed to address the situation. This occurs in faculty meetings. With regards to course delivery, if the issue relates to capacity, then a discussion about teaching rotations and or course load is the course of action. If an issue of fairness in regards to cross-section grading were to occur, then a meeting of the faculty teaching those sections, facilitated by the College of Education would occur. In this instance, a faculty led discussion would be a primary method of working to resolve the issue.

Recognizing the critical need for further capture of data, and to provide additional support to our candidates the unit has launched a Conflict Resolution Policy for Teacher Education. While this policy is

currently working its way through the institutional administrative policy development process, the fundamental tenants of this policy are;

- Process for submitting a complaint
- Steps within the resolution process
- Record keeping and confidentiality
- Protection against retaliation
- Exclusivity and relation to university policy

In conjunction with this policy, departments within the College of Education are piloting a tracking system to capture student concerns and complaints that progress beyond the individual faculty member. Department chairs capture the complaint, and document the unit response, or if necessary, capture that the matter has been referred to the Dean ([Exhibit 2.5.2 Pilot Complaint Tracking System](#)).

2.5.3 What is the process used to assess the data for both undergraduate and graduate candidates?

The unit systematically utilizes a variety of data points at both the undergraduate and graduate levels to ensure that all candidates are well prepared to help students learn. First - direct, indirect, and face-to-face measures are collected by programs across the unit at all levels through the Annual Assessment Cycle. These metrics are reviewed annually by programs to ensure that data being collected is meaningful and integrated into operations unit wide. The overall quality of the data is determined by faculty within individual programs ([Exhibit 2.5.4 – Annual Assessment System Link](#)) for use in curricular and co-curricular program changes. The unit is also working to deploy TaskStream unit wide to capture data relating to candidate learning. While at varying stages of deployment, the TaskStream system, based upon the Direct Response Folio (DRF) model is gaining wider adoption. TaskStream allows for multiple types of analysis that can be aggregated and disaggregated. This data is shared with program faculty during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Two excellent examples can be seen in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (the largest department with regards to teacher preparation) and with the Lionel Hampton School of Music, one of the first adopters of TaskStream university wide. Programs that are still in transition to TaskStream also utilize BlackBoard Learn (BbLearn), which is a university supported, centralized system that allows for the capture of candidate learning data at all levels. In conjunction with the State of Idaho’s partnership agreement with NCATE, the College of Education’s Office of Assessment and Accreditation has recently deployed an online system to capture content knowledge and performance artifacts from all thirty-three endorsement areas across the unit ([Exhibit 2.5.3 Professional Standards Commission Site](#)). The quality of the content knowledge is reviewed on a 7 year cycle by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission, and starting in 2013, will be reviewed annually by a series of content sub-committees under the joint authority of the Unit Assessment Committee and the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee.

The assessment process for candidates depends upon the level (ITP or ADV) of the candidate and their current place within the matriculation process. In a general sense, candidate’s progress through the following stages;

- **Admission to the Teacher Education Program or Advanced Program.** Candidates apply in accordance with existing policy ([Exhibit 2.5.3 – Undergraduate Teacher Education Application Process and Graduate Application Process](#)). Materials are forwarded to department faculty for review and approval.
- **Completion of Course Work.** Throughout the course of study, the candidates’ individual course learning data are assessed by the course instructor. This includes signature assignments, dispositions, and other course specific materials that are determined by the

- faculty to be demonstrative examples of content knowledge and performance. Examples from TaskStream will be available during the off-site visit.
- **Field and Clinical Experiences** Prior to entering the clinical site and before any recommendation for certification, candidates must take and pass the Praxis II Exam, which is a measure of content knowledge, and is administered and evaluated by Education Testing Services ([Exhibit 2.5.3, Praxis Tests at a Glance](#)). Mentor teachers work to evaluate the candidates during their clinical experience, in conjunction with the Director of Field and Clinical Experiences as well as university supervisors. ([Exhibit 2.5.3 Clinical Evaluation Form](#)). Field experience assessment also includes evaluations on the Practicum ([Exhibit 2.5.3 Practicum examples](#))
 - **Teaching Credential** Candidates also complete a Teaching Performance Assessment which is evaluated by trained evaluators as a measure of comprehensive candidate preparation. edTPA is subject-specific with separate versions for Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle Childhood and Secondary licensure fields. edTPA includes a review of a teacher candidate's authentic teaching materials as the culmination of a teaching and learning process that document and demonstrate each candidate's ability to effectively teach subject matter to all students. [Exhibit 2.5.3 – edTPA Information, Exhibit 2.3.3 EdTPA Internal and External Reviewers Comparisons](#)
 - **Portfolio/Comprehensive Exams (Advanced Candidates).** The only advanced degree that is a part of Teacher Education at the University of Idaho is the Masters of Education (M.Ed) degree. Candidates preparing to complete their M.Ed degree must develop with their committee a portfolio project and or a slate of discipline relevant and specific questions for use in an intensive comprehensive exam. Answers are evaluated by each candidate's graduate committee and upon approval, are accepted as the final step in the advanced studies process. [Exhibit 2.5.4 – Portfolio defense materials](#)

2.5.4 What is the process involved with the external reviews

The process of the External Review Program (ERP) is outlined in [Exhibit 2.5.4 – External Program Review Overview](#) as provided by the University of Idaho Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The fundamental basics of the EPR include;

- **Annual Assessment Cycle.** This process occurs annually and involves faculty from every academic program unit wide. First, the representative program and department faculty identify and articulate their programs learning outcomes in relation to the University's Core Learning Outcomes while identifying benchmarks, and data to be collected. Collected data is analyzed in program meetings for use in curricular and co-curricular program changes. Collected data and evidence or program findings are then uploaded to a central repository ([Exhibit 2.5.4 – Link to IR Annual Assessment Cycle Page](#))
- The External Review Program (ERP) utilizes the Annual Assessment Cycle data as an initial point of analysis in the larger 7 year cycle. During this cycle, each program completes an EPR which explores not only the annual assessment data, but also explores;
 - The Mission and Vision
 - Core functions of the program
 - Program contributions to Core Curriculum and University Service Courses
 - Graduate Education and Research
 - Outreach
 - Enrollment Management
 - Assessment of Student Learning
 - Personnel
 - Finances

- Facilities and Equipment

These areas guide an intensive self-study by each program area. At the completion of the self-study, the University and program engage a team of external reviewers, who review the materials, assess and report their judgments on:

- The program quality according to the criteria provided;
- The role of the program in the UI environment, relative to UI role and mission, and goals;
- The projected value or feasibility of various planning alternatives and priorities set forth by the department
- Provide recommendations to assist the unit toward continual improvement

2.5.5 Involvement of school partners in the evaluation and refinement of the unit's assessment system. How does the advisory board participate throughout improvement of the assessment system?

It is important to note that in 2010, the Dean's (COE) Advisory Board, which supports the head of the professional educator preparation unit, was primarily comprised of practitioners and/or retired practitioners. While feedback from the Board was important and always communicated to program faculty, it was not as direct a link to programs as the Dean wanted. As part of the External Review process, a change was made and the Dean's board became the College Advocacy Board, which consists of high level practitioners, policy experts, those with fund raising experience, and/or donor capacity. The Dean required that each department create its own Advisory Board, comprised of active practitioners who could provide current and meaningful feedback directly to the program faculty. School-based Advisory Board members, specific to each department's programs, review assessment data and provide feedback on a regular basis.

The involvement of school partners in the continuous improvement of the assessment system occurs systematically at multiple levels and in multiple ways. While each program advisory group utilizes a schedule and format that is appropriate to their program (as determined by the advisory group and program faculty) the advisory boards are integrated into the operations of the unit's programs. Advisory boards serve to act as a conduit of communication between the schools and the unit. Advisory boards also provide a mechanism for alignment of expectations between the unit and schools. This alignment includes working with faculty to ensure that unit goals and objectives can be successfully integrated into the goals and mission of the individual schools. Finally, advisory boards provide a means to keep faculty at both sites connected with contemporary practices so that the partnership between the unit and the individual schools benefits both the candidates and the students equally. For example, the C&I Advisory Board (the primary department involved with teacher preparation) includes local school partners who meet with the C&I department chair and faculty throughout the academic year to provide input in program and assessment issues, provide field and practitioner expertise in the refinement of the assessment system, and address emerging issues that contribute to the success of candidates in the field. The C&I Advisory group was also involved with the development of the Conceptual Framework, which outlines the assessment plan for teacher education. Information relating to alumni/employer surveys, curriculum change matters and supporting data, strategic planning, annual assessment cycle data, External Review Process findings is all shared with this group. The upcoming NCATE and State Content Reviews will be shared with this group when completed for use by the unit in developing next steps along the continuous improvement pathway.

Feedback on candidates and in the instruments used to collect candidate success data in the clinical setting is provided by all cooperating teachers (some of whom serve on the various advisory committees) and is

discussed within the advisory committee structure as well as in faculty meetings ([Exhibit 2.5.6 Select examples of Faculty and Advisory Board Minutes](#)) .

Feedback from practitioners is requested systematically in advanced programs as well. An Educational Leadership faculty member regularly attends each of Idaho's six regional meetings of superintendents which occur throughout the year. The faculty members bring back to the unit areas of concern, current realities facing schools, and fresh ideas that need to be implemented into programs. Additionally, the head of the professional educator preparation unit meets at least bi-monthly with the local superintendent where they discuss issues impacting both P-12 and higher education.

2.5.6 When and how data are shared with faculty? In what format are data presented to the assessment office and faculty?

The frequency of data distribution is again, dependent upon the type of data being discussed. At the candidate learning level, aggregated course data is reviewed at least bi-annually, following the completion of each semester. Individual faculty review their candidates' signature assessments for each course and make changes in their teaching on a semester level, and present findings at department meetings in accordance with the meeting schedule. Programs also review a set of core data annually which includes (but is not limited to);

- Graduating Senior Surveys and Alumni Surveys ([Exhibit 1.5.4 Graduating Senior Survey](#))
- Direct, Indirect and Face-to-Face data in relation to program/candidate learning outcomes ([Exhibit 2.5.4 – Annual Assessment System Link](#))
- Accreditation related data and State Content Knowledge Data ([Exhibit 2.5.3 Professional Standards Commission Site](#))

The sharing of data amongst faculty occurs during scheduled faculty meetings. Data is presented to the Office of Assessment (and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment) based on established schedules for activities such as the annual assessment cycle and upon request.

2.5.7 Where are the data from each of the transition points?

Please see the response to 2.5.3

2.5.8 How are the data from the external review process integrated into the program?

Each program within the unit is responsible for providing a rejoinder to their external review findings submitted to the respective College Dean and to the University Provost. With the EPR addressing all programs in a comprehensive manner, individual program faculty discuss the findings to develop the rejoinder ([Exhibit 2.5.9 - Minutes of EPR Discussion](#)) and to formulate next steps. For example, when the College of Education recently completed its EPR, all departments were asked to use the external review findings in developing the college and individual department's strategic plans. These department strategic plans are in full alignment with College Strategic Plan and give direction regarding priority needs and areas for improvement.

Standard 3 Addendum Responses

- 3.4.1 (Area of Concern) There was considerable evidence related to clinical/field experiences for the teacher program, but much less information for advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals (administration). Rationale: Limited information on advanced programs and programs for other school professionals makes it difficult to make judgments at this time.**

Advanced Studies candidates have an earned bachelor's degree, and most possess a certificate to teach in the P-12 system as well as have professional experience working in a P-12 classroom. The advanced studies coursework engages and prepares candidates to conduct course activities in their own classroom, thus providing meaningful and intentional clinical/field experiences. The coursework in the Advanced Studies programs are offered in online, face-to-face, and in blended (hybrid) formats. Advanced Studies programs are flexible and while there are required and recommended courses, each student's plan of study is individually crafted with the guidance of a major professor, addressing the specific needs and interests of the student.

- 3.5.1 Information on internship requirements, placement procedures, mentor orientation/training, and mentor evaluation for candidates in administration certification programs; also, is there a handbook for these internships?**

[Please see Exhibit 3.5.1 – Program Documents for Educational Administration](#)

- 3.5.2 The strategies currently being used by the unit to assure that all candidates participate in field experiences that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups.**

The unit has, with intention and purpose, worked to develop a portfolio of school districts where candidates can be exposed to clinical experiences with the highest levels of diversity possible. This includes the identification and partnering with schools and districts outside the state of Idaho. Historically, the practice of clinical placement has been to work with the candidates during their clinical intake and evaluation meeting to identify what types of diversity the candidate has experience in and what types of diversity the candidate still needs to engage with. Then, the Director of Field and Clinical Experiences works to identify schools that will address the candidates' needed areas of diversity exposure while addressing the provide additional opportunities that will be a best fit for the candidate and the school.

As part of the continuous improvement efforts, the Office of Field and Clinical Experiences instituted a Diversity Scan Instrument that is now completed by candidates prior to field placement in conjunction with the pre-placement interview. This instrument allows for an even more formal assessment of the students' self-reported level of diversity competency and now provides a mechanism to inventory the experiences of diversity for students preparing to student teach ([Exhibit 3.5.2 Diversity Scan Data](#)). With the data from the diversity scan, the Office of Field and Clinical Experiences is better equipped to design field experiences that further enhance our candidates abilities to help all students, regardless of their ethnic, gender, socio-economic, linguistic status.

- 3.5.3 Clarification needed: are the internship/practicum handbooks for specific programs (special education, physical education, family and consumer sciences) supplemental to, or in lieu of, the general internship and practicum handbooks?**

The handbooks for special education, physical education, and family and consumer sciences are supplemental to the internship/practicum handbook developed by faculty and maintained by the Office of Field and Clinical Experiences. Given the unique music system syllabi, the music education handbook is a larger supplement and is maintained by the music department.

3.5.4 Clarification needed: The FCS internship handbook refers to a minimum of 240 hours, which seems inconsistent with the IR assertion of a 16-week internship for teacher programs.

The FCS handbook is referring to FCS497 Preschool Practicum/Internship which runs 15 weeks at 19 hours a week in an early childhood setting with a minimum total of 240 hours logged in the classroom. There are sixteen weeks in the semester but candidates are not teaching or in the classrooms during finals week. The 240 hours reference has been specified due to the fact that occasionally a candidate may need to schedule their internship for the summer and the length of time is compressed into a shorter amount of time.

3.5.5 Further exploration (interviews with candidates and mentors) of technology use in field experiences.

The University looks forward to scheduling interviews for the Board of Examiners to meet with our candidates and our mentors on the success of technology integration throughout the clinical experience.

As a complement to these meetings, the College of Education is also in the pre-construction phase of a now fully funded Technology Integration Laboratory to support candidate preparation unit wide. This new laboratory will provide five critical and complementary purposes:

- To prepare all University of Idaho candidates to skillfully and purposefully integrate technology into their teaching.
- To provide professional development opportunities for in-service teachers and University of Idaho Faculty to learn about and improve their skills relating to technology integration
- To provide faculty and candidates with a project design space that fosters creativity and technology innovation
- To create a library of tested and reviewed technology tools and software for P-12 teachers and allied professionals to explore
- To house ongoing research on technology tools and software, research and evaluation data on best practices for technology integration, and research on the impact of technology on teachers' teaching and their students' learning.

It is expected that this new space will come online in late Fall 2013. Please see [Exhibit 3.5.5 – Technology Integration Laboratory](#) for the now fully funded proposal.

3.5.6 Role of the recently re-instituted advisory committee in designing and evaluating field experiences.

The department-level Advisory Board has a charge from the Dean of Education to review and provide feedback on all aspects of teacher preparation, with a focus on curriculum, programs, and field and clinical experiences. This role is review and advisory in nature, as committees such as this are instituted by Colleges as a matter of best practice rather than formal governance within the institution. Information, concerns and program changes under review are all submitted to the advisory board. Comments generated during these advisory board meetings are then returned to the faculty for integration into the more formal institutional decision making process ([Exhibit 3.5.6 – Minutes from the Advisory Board](#))

3.5.7 Specific criteria for mentors (teacher and administrator programs).

Mentor teachers must have completed a minimum of three years of classroom experience and must be strongly recommended by their building administrator. All placements go through building administrators and prospective mentors must have their approval before we will place in those classrooms.

All mentor teachers who choose to implement the co-teaching model of internship must attend a mandatory workshop prior to the beginning of the semester. Mentor teachers for the administrator programs are all licensed principals in the State and are in many places, are the senior administrator in the clinical site.

3.5.8 The nature of the internship for candidates placed in Washington, rather than Idaho, schools.

The nature of the internship and placements in Washington rather than Idaho is a matter of geographical proximity. The University of Idaho Moscow Campus is 8 miles from Washington. The composition of both states is relatively similar in many regards, depending upon the comparative locations. Many times, placements are made into Washington as there may be a placement opportunity for a clinical experience that may not be currently available in Idaho.

Standard 4 Addendum Responses

4.3.1 (Previous AFI) The unit’s professional curriculum does not adequately address aspects of diversity related to race, gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status that support candidates’ abilities to help all students learn. (Rationale) The unit has taken steps to address aspects of diversity in its curriculum both at pre-service and advanced levels, but further onsite triangulation is needed to assess the effectiveness of the changes.

The conceptual framework embodies issues of diversity through its first tenant, the “C” (Cultural Proficiency). This first aspect of our conceptual framework embodies the unit’s approach to ensuring that all candidates have opportunities for not only interaction with students from multiple backgrounds, but also that candidates are able to demonstrate proficiency in helping students from all backgrounds learn. At all levels, diversity is infused into the curriculum, as articulated in [Exhibit 4.3.1 – Crosswalk of Diversity to the Idaho Core Teacher Standards](#). In the EdCore, EDCI 302 captures diversity preparation through dispositions ([Exhibit 4.3.1 – EDCI 302 Summary Data](#)). At the advanced level, diversity preparation is conducted in both EdAD 571 and EdAD 533, where advanced candidates’ diversity preparation and ability to help all students learn is evaluated on a three point scale (emerging, meets, exceeds). ([Exhibit 4.3.1 – Samples of Advanced Studies Work Relating to Diversity Preparation](#)) Also, the EdTPA addresses issues of Diversity ([Exhibit 4.3.1 edTPA Diversity Summaries](#)). At all levels faculty review candidates’ submissions (during faculty meetings and with the candidates) to systematically ensure that coursework preparation supports and enhances the clinical experience with attention to diversity and other professional issues. Supplemental data to the Institutional Report as referenced in this addendum is available in the supplemental exhibit room and will also be available for review during the onsite visit.

4.3.2 (Previous AFI) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with ethnically and racially diverse P-12 Students (Rationale) The unit works to provide candidates with opportunities to interact with diverse P-12 students, but there are insufficient data to show effectiveness of these efforts.

As presented in our updated Appendix C, the major issues of ethnic and racial diversity within the State of Idaho is challenging due to the overall composition of the state ([Exhibit 4.3.2 US Census Data on Idaho](#)). It is with great purpose and intention that the unit works to select districts with as diverse a make-up as possible so as to maximize the exposure of our candidates to as many diverse settings as possible. The effectiveness of efforts to provide candidates with opportunities to interaction can be seen in the current composition of our field placement sites portfolio. The unit has developed a portfolio of clinical sites that is as diverse as possible. For example, the 2010 US Census reports that, Idaho is 89.1 percent White while the composition of the clinical site portfolio is lower at 72 percent white. The clinical site portfolio also has an average 40 percent of student receiving free/reduced lunch, and 10 percent with disabilities as an average across all districts.

4.4.1 (New AFC) Effectiveness of unit efforts to provide candidates with interactions with diverse candidates and P-12 students. Rationale: The unit has made efforts to provide broader experience with diverse populations, but there are limited data or other evidence showing the effectiveness of these efforts.

As discussed in 4.3.2, the unit places a strong emphasis on ensuring that the portfolio of placement sites is comprised of as diverse districts as possible. Candidate-to-candidate interactions across the unit are facilitated through a number of university sanctioned groups. These university sanctioned groups provide candidates from a wide variety of backgrounds opportunities for interaction and engagement with all

candidates. A listing of these groups can be viewed by visiting <http://www.uidaho.edu/diversityandhumanrights/studentgroups>

The effectiveness of all these interactions can be seen in such examples as the Physical Education Teacher Education program where candidates are assessed in their effectiveness in teaching students in these settings (e.g. see PEP 484 TPA). Another example is from the Educational Leadership program where Faculty assess the effectiveness of candidates' interactions with diverse P-12 students through demonstration of standard 4 IFSSA in one of the course objectives for EdAD 598 - Ed Leadership Internship. As referenced in IFSSA Standard 4: *Family and Community Partnerships – A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of each student by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.*

4.5.1 Faculty Diversity: What steps is the unit taking to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of its faculty beyond advertising in publications geared towards professionals who belong to diverse groups?

The Professional Education Preparation Unit, as a part of the University of Idaho, is deeply committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty. Within the framework of the President's Diversity Council, the Committee on Faculty Recruitment and Retention was formed to provide thoughtful consideration of the University's goals, efforts, and issues surrounding diverse faculty hiring and promotion. This committee further works with the Office of the President in an advisory capacity to provide feedback and recommendations as to institution wide strategies on addressing issues relating to faculty diversity recruitment and retention. Please see [Exhibit 4.5.1 – PDC Report on Faculty Hiring Diversity](#).

4.5.2 Candidate opportunity to interact with diverse P-12 students: Data and examples for pre- service teachers, especially those working in secondary schools, are needed. What are the results of candidate interaction with diverse students and cooperating teachers?

Candidates have multiple opportunities to interact with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds. The Education Core, which all candidates take, includes multiple course opportunities, such as EDCI 302 which includes a on-campus and an "in school" component where a practicum experience provides exposure to real world experiences in teaching strategies, lesson planning and identification of resources. Placements are selected from the Clinical Site Portfolio which is designed to have as diverse student composition as is possible and available. This practicum is completed by all teacher candidates, both elementary and secondary.

Student teaching is the culminating field experience of the teacher education program. This field experience is an all day, full-semester placement in a school setting. Student teaching is an integral and transformative part of the candidate preparation process. During this internship, candidates learn about not only how to apply their skills in differentiated learning and lesson planning, they also have the opportunity to practice classroom management and more.

While the unit is currently making good faith efforts to transition the evaluation and impact collection systems to an online format, paper copies of candidate's evaluations from practicum and field internships are available onsite for the Board of Examiners.

4.5.3 Data on how candidates are meeting proficiencies that are necessary to work effectively with students from diverse populations. What do the data indicate about the

programs' preparation to help candidates respond to the needs of students from diverse populations?

The edTPA ([Exhibit 4.5.3 edTPA Results](#)), which is administered during the EDCI 401 course, indicates that our candidates are equal in terms of diversity preparation to other teacher preparation institutions around the country. This includes preparation in differentiation of instructional strategies and educating for exceptionalities.

4.5.4 What has been the impact of the TRIO program?

The impact of TRIO has been significant for individuals from low-income and first generation families. Selected highlights include a seventy-three percent enrollment in post-secondary education and an eighty-two percent post-secondary persistence. [Exhibit 4.5.4 – TRIO Impact Documents](#) include a testimony of a TRIO student who became an education candidate with the Professional Education Preparation Unit at the University of Idaho. Furthermore, TRIO faculty interact with unit faculty on joint projects and in institutional efforts to increase interest and pursuit of STEM related education.

Standard 5 Addendum Responses

5.3.1 Professional development for part-time faculty and P-12 teachers initial training for adjuncts

Professional opportunities for part-time faculty are addressed in the Faculty and Staff Handbook, Section 3180 ([FSH 3180 Direct Link](#)). This policy outlines the general approach for all employees. While employment for part-time faculty is largely based upon specific program need as contract work, there are several key trainings that are provided by the university to these professionals. Netlearning is a comprehensive, web-based learning management system that provides integration of needs, development plans, and training materials. Professional faculty are also given departmental orientations to TaskStream and BbLearn, which are the units' online learning outcomes and delivery suites.

Faculty who are full-time instructors, but not on tenure lines, are afforded professional development funds for travel to conferences. The unit head has provided funds for teams of faculty (part-time, tenure line, and school-based mentor teachers) to attend national conferences such as the National Network for Educational Renewal. All faculty participate in trainings such as the edTPA scoring, attend faculty meetings which are professional development opportunities, and attend college-wide meetings which also incorporate professional development. An example would be the spring all-college meeting, where a panel of Native American educators addressed the faculty at large, discussing issues of cultural sensitivity and best practices for Native American student success.

The University of Idaho provides also a host of professional development opportunities for P-12 teachers. In addition to the advanced studies program, teachers can enroll in a variety of professional development course offerings. A historical listing of these courses can be seen online in the Class Schedule Archive <http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/schedule/archive/schedule.html> and are organized under the links titled "Professional Development"

5.4.1 (NEW AFI) Modeling best professional practice in scholarship and service. Rationale: Twenty-two of 56 faculty members have no activities listed for the past three years in Appendix D (Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Association, and Service). More information on the activities of those faculty members is needed.

To address this and correct the technical errors from our Institutional Report, please see [Appendix D \(amended\)](#).

5.5.1 Clarification is needed pertaining to Exhibit 5.3a (Appendix D): (Items a-d)

Please see [Appendix D \(amended\)](#)

5.5.2 Need verification of unit faculty and administrator clinical faculty contemporary professional experience in school settings at the level that they supervise.

The Ed Leadership program's practice is to use affiliate faculty with successful school administrator experience to supervise professional experiences in the school setting.

5.5.3 Instructional strategies used by faculty members. How do they integrate technology and diversity into the teaching and learning process?

The integration of technology by faculty is a highly personalized process where each faculty member reflects upon their individual course material, pedagogical approach, and individual level of technical literacy. At the unit level, the availability of BbLearn provides faculty members with a suite of services

for online collaboration (synchronous and asynchronous) and includes course enrollment tools as well as lecture, presentation, audio and video tools for material delivery. TaskStream utilizes the Direct Response Folio (DRF) model for the collection and analysis of course and candidate level outcomes, as well as a way to disseminate and collect data, develop rubrics and tie candidate outcomes to standards at the state and national levels.

Some of the strategies that are used include lecture and lecture discussion to facilitate learning at the informational level. The use of discussion engages candidates at the distant sites and combining lecture provides a venue to distribute essential information. Demonstration in the distant environment by modeling teaching and asking the candidates to perform as teachers in class as a simulation of what being a teacher might be like. Collaborative and cooperative learning where candidates are placed in groups to complete assignments and presentations allows them to begin the process of working as an educational team. The collaborative process is also a type of role play preparing candidates for their eventual positions as secondary instructors when they will have to cooperate and collaborate within a school to provide the best possible education for their candidates and provide a consistent and cohesive education. Problem Based and Inquiry Learning by giving candidates a problem which they must solve by gathering data, organizing data, and attempting an explanation. Candidates also analyze strategies that they used to solve the problem. When working with candidates in the clinical setting major instructional strategies include discussion and questioning to allow for self-identification of areas of strengths and opportunities for growth within their own instruction and employ problem solving to help them identify solutions and adaptations to their instruction and studies to make them successful.

While BbLearn has an integrated communication suite, several other technologies are utilized by faculty across the unit to address the specific needs of candidates. Programs such as Skype, MOVI, Video Conferencing, email and FaceTime are all utilized to reach candidates at a distance. Faculty also model the use of technology in the classroom through video conferencing technologies sharing materials on Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Prezi, Publisher, SurveyMonkey, Qualtrics and various other web applications.

5.5.4 Qualifications of P-12-based faculty. Are they licensed in the fields that they teach and/or supervise?

Yes. All P-12 faculty are licensed as a condition of their agreement to serve as a mentor teacher.

5.5.5 Workloads of full-time and part-time faculty.

Please see [Exhibit 5.5.5 Workloads for Faculty](#)

5.5.6 Professional development opportunities for, and participation by, full-time, part-time, and P-12 faculty.

Cooperating teachers work with University of Idaho Faculty and provide supervision of student teachers in accordance with the student teaching handbook. These P-12 faculty are provided with training for student teacher supervision and earn 2 credits for the work done with student teachers each spring ([Exhibit 5.5.6 Summary of Professional Development for P-12 Faculty](#)). Professional development opportunities are made available full-time faculty on topics such as TaskStream training, IRB training, and Blackboard Learn where faculty design and build courses that meet criteria set forth in the Blackboard Exemplary Course Program Rubric ([Exhibit 5.5.6 L&C Exemplary Course Program Rubric](#)). Unit faculty also participate in a variety of self-directed professional development opportunities, which can be seen in the onsite review of annual reviews.

5.5.7 Search practices for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, part-time faculty.

As the unit utilizes a distributed model across its partner colleges for the delivery of content related knowledge, the search practices for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, as well as part-time faculty adhere to the general practice of the University. In the early spring of each year, each department chair is asked to provide their greatest needs for faculty and the sources of funding (retirements, resignations, and need for new funds). The Dean and Chairs discuss the requests. The Dean presents the College hiring plan in the spring to the Provost. In the early fall of each year, final determinations are made. The Dean and the Chair consult regarding the committee make-up for each search. We require that the searches include both male and female members as well as a member outside the hiring unit. All tenure line searches are advertised nationally. The Dean approves all position descriptions, ensuring that positions meet multiple needs whenever possible (e.g. science education with quantitative background for advanced program needs). Diversity experience is always stressed in the position descriptions and we always advertise in locations noted for diversity of audience. Tenure line searches require screening, often include phone interviews to narrow pools, and face-to-face 2-3 day interviews for at least 2 and often times 3 candidates. Committees note strengths and weaknesses of candidates and the Dean makes the final decision. We frequently ask a local P-2 educator to serve on search committees. For example, the current search for a new chair of the Department of Leadership & Counseling includes the superintendent of Boise School District, the Deputy Superintendent for the state of Idaho, and a board member of the Idaho Board of Education. The current search for the clinical faculty member in technology integration includes a Moscow teacher invested in technology integration. Please see [Exhibit 5.5.7 Faculty Search ATS Handbook](#).

5.5.8 Verify faculty evaluation process with faculty interviews.

The unit looks forward to coordinating a slate of representative faculty interviews for the Board of Examiners during their onsite visit.

5.5.9 Record of extramural funding sought and obtained within the unit.

[Exhibit 5.5.9 – Record of Extramural Funding](#)

Standard 6 Addendum Responses

6.3.1 (Previous AFI) The unit does not effectively engage P-12 practitioners in governance structures related to the design, implementation, and/or evaluation of the unit and its programs. (Rationale) The evidence provided was not sufficient to determine the degree to which P-12 practitioners are involved in design, implementation, and evaluation of unit programs.

The engagement of P-12 practitioners permeates the governance of the unit, from advisory boards to the composition of the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (TECC). As stated in the TECC Policy (revised) the committee shall include three P-12 school personnel, including (1) a superintendent, (2) a principal, and (3) a teacher, representing both Elementary and Secondary Education ([Exhibit 6.3.1 TECC Policy- Revised](#)). This university standing committee: (a) conducts a continuing review of teacher-education policies and promotes quality teacher preparation, (b) acts on and submits to the University Curriculum Committee proposed changes in teacher education certifications and endorsements, (c) functions as a standing committee of the university faculty and as a subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee, and (d) provides updates on state and national issues pertaining to the preparation of educators.

6.3.1 The unit does not provide systematic professional development for part-time and P-12 faculty.(Rationale) The IR mentions professional development courses offered for cooperating teachers and mentor teachers, trainings on the co- teaching model, workshops for university and school-based faculty on evaluating teacher candidates using Teaching Performance Assessments (edTPA), and conferences and workshops for P-12 teachers in partner schools. Evidence of these activities is needed to document that a systematic approach to PD for part-time and P-12 faculty is in place.

The Professional Educator Preparation Unit supports any Idaho teacher wishing to pursue National Board Certification. It is also our understanding that the unit, and by extension the University of Idaho, is the only institution providing this service to Idaho teachers. The unit annually recruits and seeks funding to support P-12 teachers seeking this certification. Additionally, the unit has a fully-funded Masters Scholarship Program, called the Wright Fellows program (M.Ed.) that provides full funding for a 15-month master's degree focusing on instructional leadership. This program supports an annual cohort of ten teachers. Faculty provide professional development to Idaho teachers through multiple external funding opportunities ([Exhibit 5.5.9](#)). As a benefit to the communication through unit advisory boards, partner districts and teachers are first to be notified of new opportunities for professional development with the unit.

In addition to the following exhibits, the unit is happy to arrange interviews with any individual(s) that the Board of Examiners would like to meet with in order to triangulate the systematic approach taken in professional development.

- [Exhibit 5.5.6 Summary of Professional Development for P-12 Faculty](#)
- [Appendix D \(amended\)](#)

6.3.2 (Previous AFI) The unit lacks sufficient numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty to implement its programs consistently. (Rationale) Specific information related to frequency of courses, course enrollment needs, and the matching faculty data are needed.

[Exhibit 6.3.2 – Matrix of Course Rotations](#)
[Exhibit 6.3.2 – Faculty to course offerings](#)

[Exhibit 6.3.2 – Faculty to Student Ratios over time \(College of Education\)](#)

As the data show, the faculty-to-student ratios over time are decreasing, demonstrating sufficient resources to deliver courses and programs consistently. With the decline in resources since the last NCATE visit, the administration made the decision to cut the School Psychology program to protect the teacher education program as a whole, and further suspend the School Counseling program (new enrollments) so as to concentrate the faculty to student ratios in this program pending a redesign of the program and recruitment of new faculty.

In addition to the consistent delivery of programs, the Curriculum and Instruction department, the largest teacher preparation department in the unit, is currently recruiting for ten new tenure track and clinical positions which further contributes to the ability of the unit to deliver programs.

Faculty in unit programs are also demonstrating their exceptional abilities as is evident in the increase in funded proposals ([Exhibit 5.5.9 – Record of Extramural Funding](#)) and in the high levels of productivity ([Exhibit 6.3.2 – Curriculum and Instruction Productivity](#))

As a matter of clarification, we believe that the Amended Appendix D will show that the unit has sufficient faculty to implement and deliver its programs consistently. In addition, please see ([Exhibit 6.3.2 Matrix of Course Rotations](#))

Faculty course loads for tenure track and tenured faculty are consistent with peer institutions and across the unit. As described in [Exhibit 6.3.2 – Faculty Course Loads](#), faculty have an expectation of a 2 course per semester (6 credit hours of instructional delivery). Currently, the University of Idaho is focusing on increasing overall institutional enrollment to 16,000 by 2016. This increase in enrollment will be directly tied to increases in funding, and as programs increase their enrollment it is expected that additional faculty lines will be established.

6.5.1 Evidence of adequate workloads to support the instructional program, including supervision and professional/support staffing for programs.

The unit has made significant investments into increasing the overall number of faculty and support staff while reducing workloads in all possible areas. We now have an Office of Student Services and two full-time advisors, one for Curriculum & Instruction undergraduate students and another for Movement Sciences undergraduate students, which reduces the amount of advising that faculty have traditionally done. This office also includes the director who oversees state licensure recommendations, recruitment, and retention efforts, a full-time staff member who supports the office, the clinical faculty member in charge of school partnerships, and the coordinator of school internships/student teaching, all of which allow faculty to have an increased focus on teaching, research, and scholarship. Each department has at a minimum a full time budget officer and a full-time administrative assistant which reduces the administrative overhead necessary to operate a department.

6.5.2 Evidence and explanation of expectations for increasing tenure-line faculty and sufficiency for adequate program implementation.

As evidence earlier, the student FTE has decreased in recent years and faculty numbers are increasing. This has led to a strong faculty-to-student ratio. There are no courses offered in our programs that are oversubscribed nor are there waiting lists for required coursework, indicating faculty sufficiency.

6.5.3 Evidence of technology and facility upgrades and future commitments by university and the unit, including evidence of accessibility and sufficiency for faculty, staff, and candidates.

The unit, as a part of the University of Idaho, is subject to the funding of the Idaho Legislature for capital repairs and improvements. The University of Idaho estimates that the list of delayed projects is now approaching \$200 million. The Education building has recently been the topic of intense conversations regarding asbestos and overall facility related issues. The unit has been addressing these issues in two ways. First, individual classrooms most used by educator preparation programs have been upgraded, including increased technology capacity, new furniture, paint, etc. This has been accomplished through budget prioritization by the professional educator preparation unit head out of the College of Education budget. This effort is costly as it requires asbestos abatement. At the current time, two classroom renovations have been completed and a third is slated for renovation this summer. The larger issue is the demolition of the current building and reconstruction. This effort is being discussed at the highest levels and will be resolved, with plans and timelines, within the next several months. Until then, the majority of classrooms that our students use, starting fall 2013, will meet university standard. Furthermore, the new technology integration classroom and laboratory will be fully functional in late fall 2013. This space will be a cutting edge laboratory for using and learning to use technology as a pedagogical tool. As is discussed in our Institutional Report, the College of Education is under review with the University Leadership team to determine a course of action to address the issues related to the primary building for teacher education. At this time, no decisions have been finalized, however extensive work and planning is underway with the University of Idaho Office of the President, Provost, Facilities and Environmental Health and Safety.

To address the immediate issues relating to facilities and technology, several classrooms are undergoing renovation;

- Technology Integration Laboratory Beginning in 2013
- Student Lounge and Collaboration Center within the Office of Student Services (Completed)
- Education Building Classroom renovation with technology upgrades – beginning in 2013
- Education Teaching Laboratory (Completed)
- Physical Education Classroom renovations (Completed)

The funding for these improvements has already been committed, including the installation of University Technologies (presentation systems) as well as enhanced technology for the Technology Integration Lab. In addition, to address the technology integration needs of faculty in rooms that, due to asbestos and infrastructure related issues, are unable to be upgraded, the College has purchased a series of custom “technology” carts with presentation and collaboration technologies that are available for faculty use through the Instructional Media and Technology Center. The Office of Assessment and Accreditation has recently deployed a multi-tiered server system for the collection of state content assessment data on a unit wide scale in conjunction with TaskStream.

6.5.4 Evidence and interviews addressing budgeting of the unit and the university.

The unit looks forward to arranging interviews with members of the University Executive Leadership for Finance

6.5.5 Evidence of expectation and effective implementation of P-12 representation on advisory committees in the unit and in the departments.

The unit looks forward to arranging interviews with members of the various advisory boards to discuss the expectations and implementation of P-12 representation.