

Weber State University-Evaluation Team Report
Teacher Education
March 3, 2014

1) Overview/introductory Statement

The program review for the Teacher of Education at Weber State University revealed a quality and effective program for the College of Education. Following a thorough review of faculty, students, curriculum, and program resources, the evaluation team compliments administration and faculty on their team approach, quality mentoring, outcome based curriculum, formative and summative assessments, community partnerships, and for moving in a direction that will continue to align their program with teachers who will be able to educate students effectively with Utah Common Core, UETS, TEAC/CAEP standards. Recommendations on continued movement towards a more detailed and clear program mission statement, as well as keeping detailed meeting minutes will provide a clear roadmap for others to follow with regards to where you have been, what you are doing, and where you are going in the future. Overall, the Teacher Education program is a quality program. Details on program strengths, challenges, and recommendations are listed below.

2) Program strengths (please reference Standard where appropriate)

Program Strength 1: The program is seeking to develop a mentor teacher academy. This academy has the potential of greatly strengthening the field experiences, particularly student teaching, for program candidates. Extensive field experiences enhance the relationship between the program and surrounding school districts. It is evident there are formal relationships between the program and external communities which provides evidence of duca

quality improvement for degree programs. Recruitment efforts to hire diverse faculty have been expressed as they seek to fill positions. The collegial department atmosphere is evident. (*Standard E: a - h*).

Program Strength 5: The program demonstrates appropriate allocation of resources and administrative support (e.g., facilities, financial, endowments, technology, etc.) for curriculum delivery (*Standard B: c; Standard F: a, c*).

Program Strength 6: The creation of the Associates Degree for Education Majors is very innovative and will serve as a recruitment for teacher candidates. The curriculum supports general education requirements and is offered on a regular basis (*Standard B: d*).

Program Strength 7: There is a clearly defined education program that includes that enables graduates to achieve the college and institutional mission (*Standard A: c, d*). It is noted that the program is changing standards to better align with the college and institutional mission statements (*Standard B: b*).

Program Strength 8: Program outcomes are cross-listed with specific courses and support the goals of the program and constituencies served (*Standard C: a-c*).

Program Strength 9: The program has a strategy for advising students which provides assistance in making career decisions and seeking placements (*Standard D: a, c*).

3) Program challenges

- New faculty induction/culture due to retirements.
- Development of new assessment protocols and reliability measures.
- Decline in applicants.
- Evidence of measuring success of graduates with regards to assessment/analysis.
- Placement for field experiences.

4) Areas where the program did not meet the Standards and why

Program Concern 1: The program outcomes are listed, but need to be clearly defined. It recognizes the program is in transition in establishing new standards, Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS), and aligning curriculum and program assessments with these standards. The program developed an excellent matrix (table 11) showing the alignment of program assignments and assessments to the Utah Pre-service Teacher Learning Outcomes (UPTLO). This table should be up-dated to show the same alignment with UETS (*Standard A; a, b; Standard B; b*).

Program Concern 2: The program needs to develop measured assessments that are clearly defined and collected on a regular basis that is aggregated, and reported. Data collection in a systematically manner and used to improve and direct program change was not evident and therefore, assigne
s (*Standard C: a, c, d, e*).

Program Concern/Recommendation 3: Students shared that the advisement they received was top notch, but it was very difficult to get an appointment when needed. The program should consider how to make more student advisement available, particularly at critical decision times during the year. The team noted that the advisement office was restructured recently and would recommend that the program seek ways to share with students and faculty these changes and additional advisement resource now available. The team also noted that faculty and students were used to going to Kristin Radulovich but not Natalie Struhs. The program needs to find ways to communicate to the campus that Natalie is available for student advisement as well (*Standard D: b*).

Program Weakness 1: The program needs to work with university leadership to clarify the mission of the University Council on Teacher Education and its bylaws and operational processes, particularly membership and length of service (*Standard G: c*).

5) Recommendations for change – suggested changes for meeting Standards

Recommendation 1: The program is encouraged to continue the development of the program mission statement and program standards. When the team met with Dr. Kristin Hadley, department chair, Dr. Peggy Saunders, M.Ed. program director, and Dr. Louise Moulding, accreditation director, they indicated that the mission statement is still under development and needed stronger underpinnings to be an effective statement to help guide the program. While strengthening the mission statement and standards, the program should develop ways they will measure if they are accomplishing the statement.

Recommendation 2: The program should identify and develop program summative assessments for each of the three program levels that will allow the faculty to measure the strengths and weaknesses of each level. This should help the faculty know if the level learning outcomes are being met or not.

Recommendation 3: The three level teams should work to document, agendas and minutes, the work done in their monthly meetings. The level teams should incorporate data and evidence reviews as part of their monthly meetings. They should document the findings of these reviews that include plans made for program changes, improvements, and outcomes of previous plans. This evidence will show how the program is working for continuous improvement. The level three teams needs to start holding formal meetings, particu

