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Historical Context

While New Mexico was still a territory, 23 years before it was to become the 47th state of the United States, the settlers of the Mesilla Valley recognized the need for an advanced educational system. This recognition and the energetic efforts of leading citizens resulted in the founding of the Las Cruces College in 1888. During 1889, the territory legislature designated Las Cruces as the site for land-grant agricultural college and experiment station. Las Cruces College assumed this role as the land-grant institution and changed its name to the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, the first-degree granting institution in the territory. In 1960, the growth and maturity of the college were formally recognized when the New Mexico Constitution was amended to change the name of the institution to New Mexico State University. A five-person Board of Regents, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate, governs NMSU. Members serve staggered six-year terms, except for the Student Regent, who serves a two-year term.

NMSU provides a liberal and practical education for students, as originally designated by the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862. In addition, the University maintains active programs of research, extension education, and public service. NMSU is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a doctoral comprehensive high-level research university and is one of 52 institutions in the United States to be designated a Space Grant College. NMSU is a minority serving institution under USDOED Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and is an active member of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU).

NMSU offers a wide variety of undergraduate degrees through its colleges: Agriculture, Consumer and Environmental Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Extended Learning and Health and Social Services. In addition, NMSU is home to New Mexico’s only Honors College, offering our undergraduate students extraordinary opportunities to develop their knowledge and skills through intensive writing and research work with NMSU faculty supervisors and mentors. NMSU offers a variety of graduate degrees through the Graduate School at the master, specialist and doctoral level. NMSU also offers a variety of two-year degrees and certificates in varied academic, and vocational/technical studies, as well as continuing education programs at its four two-year degree-granting community colleges. Since its founding, NMSU has conferred more than 108,000 degrees and currently has 83,000 identified alumni.

Mission

The institution has a single overarching mission that encompasses not only the Las Cruces campus, but the four community college campuses as well, providing the framework for the differentiated missions of the community colleges. The mission statements for NMSU Las Cruces and each of the community college campuses follow.

1) The mission of NMSU Alamogordo is to provide quality learning opportunities for individuals in the diverse community we serve.
2) The mission of NMSU Carlsbad is to provide access to quality education opportunities and to support the economic and cultural life of the people of southeastern New Mexico.
3) The mission of NMSU Dona Ana is to be a responsible and accessible learning-centered community college that provides educational opportunities to a diverse community of learners in support of workforce and economic development.
4) The mission of NMSU Grants is to provide quality instructional and supportive programs at the lowest feasible cost to persons within the Cibola County.
5) The mission of NMSU Las Cruces says the following: New Mexico State University is the state’s land-grant university, serving the educational needs of New Mexico’s diverse population through comprehensive programs of education, research, extension education, and public service.
In July 1999, the following Vision statement was adopted: New Mexico State University will meet the changing needs of New Mexicans through high-quality, affordable education and through the creation and sharing of knowledge in the true spirit of a land-grant university. In 2010, seven presidential goals for success were introduced to help fulfill this vision. See Goals for Success at http://www.nmsu.edu/president/goalsforsuccess.html. In support of this initiative, the university announced a revised strategic plan in 2011 titled Building the Vision http://provost.nmsu.edu/initiatives/building-the-vision/ that is designed to work with faculty and administrators to merge the seven presidential goals for success with the existing Living the Vision plan http://ltv.nmsu.edu/. Through the implementation of the Goals for Success and Building the Vision it is hoped that New Mexico State University will be a premier university as evidenced by demonstrated and quantifiable excellence in teaching, research and service relative to its peer institutions by 2020.

**Contexts and Characteristics**

NMSU is the state’s land-grant university, serving the educational needs of New Mexico’s diverse population through comprehensive programs of education, research, extension education, and public service. The New Mexico State University System consists of a comprehensive, doctoral level university and four community colleges: NMSU Alamogordo, NMSU Carlsbad, NMSU Doña Ana and NMSU Grants. As a system, NMSU continues to work for greater efficiency, effectiveness and cohesiveness as it builds a “One University” culture statewide.

NMSU’s diverse community of faculty, staff and students is broadly reflective of the diversity within the state of New Mexico, which has historically been a meeting place for many cultural, ethnic and racial groups. See NMSU 2011-2012 Factbook http://irpoa.nmsu.edu/QuickFacts/QuickFacts2011_12Web_.pdf. NMSU is a minority institution under the USDOED Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, CFDA#. 84.031s, and is an active member of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). NMSU is the only land-grant institution in the nation that is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a doctoral university with high research activity that is also ranked in the top 100 universities and colleges on research and development by the National Science Foundation (2006), while also being classified as Hispanic-Serving.

**The Unit**

The unit’s initial teacher preparation and school professional programs involve four NMSU campuses (Las Cruces, Alamogordo, Carlsbad, and Grants) and 3 Las Cruces campus colleges (Education, Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences, and Arts and Sciences). The largest percentage of the unit’s initial and advanced teacher education candidates is enrolled in programs offered by the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) department.

Teacher education at NMSU is a university-wide responsibility, so matters requiring decisions about the Teacher Education Program and other professional education programs are referred from the Provost’s office to the Dean of College of Education (CoED) for action. The CoED Dean is directly responsible for programs in teacher education and all education licensure areas whether graduate or undergraduate. See Letter from the Provost. In secondary education, exceptions exist in four areas: Agricultural Extension, Family and Consumer Science, Music, and Business Education. In these areas, the CoED Dean and Associate Dean for Students and Programs work collaboratively with the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences, and Business. Music as a teaching field is jointly administered by the Music Department and the CoED, with the degree being granted by the College of Arts and Sciences. Methods courses and supervision of student teachers in the Departments of Agricultural and...
Extension Education and Family and Consumer Sciences Education are taught or supervised by the personnel in the college.

Table 1

Professional Education Faculty
For the 2008-2009 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Part-time at the Institution &amp; the Unit (e.g. adjunct faculty)</th>
<th>Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Total # of Professional Education Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers do not include faculty from nationally accredited programs (CD, CEP, and Music) or Arts and Sciences faculty who teach content courses. They do include faculty from Agricultural Education and Family and Consumer Sciences Education.
### Table 2

**Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and their Review Status**

For the 2010-2011 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor’s or Master’s)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. Of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Childhood Education</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-218 S-198</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Education</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-688 S-657</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EED: Language Arts Teaching Field</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-79 S-85</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EED: Mathematics Teaching Field</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-20 S-31</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EED: Social Studies Teaching Field</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-23 S-48</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EED: General Science Teaching Field</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-7 S-14</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-353 S-311</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Modern and Classical Languages Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-4 S-7</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Science Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-4 S-7</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-3 S-7</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-10 S-12</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Physical Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-6 S-10</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Language Arts Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-4 S-9</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED: Business Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-1 S-1</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-70 S-60</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED: Elementary Education Dual License</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-60 S-60</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED: Secondary Education Dual License</td>
<td>Bachelor’s, Post-Bacc, and Master’s</td>
<td>F-20 S-22</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>F-44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Master’s</td>
<td>S-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Technology Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>F-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Master’s</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>F-122</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Master’s</td>
<td>S-109</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>F-106</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-89</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>F-187</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-198</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **NMPED:** National Multicultural Program Educational Directory
- **NSCA:** National Strength and Conditioning Association
- **JRC-AT and CAATE:** Joint Review Committee on Athletic Training and Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training
- **NSCA (subset of Kinesiology recognized by NSCA):** National Strength and Conditioning Association (subset of Kinesiology recognized by NSCA)
### Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Master’s or Doctorate)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. Of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g. approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration (Pk-12)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-8 S-7</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration (Higher Education)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-58 S-60</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>F-0 S-0</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-34 S-32</td>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized by CACREP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>F-32 S-33</td>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized by NASP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>F-32 S-32</td>
<td>APA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized by APA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Diagnosticist</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>F-12 S-12</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Pathology</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-52</td>
<td>CAA/ASHA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized by ASHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Literacy Endorsement</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-2 S-7</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Technologies Endorsement</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-2 S-4</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Endorsement</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F-3 S-3</td>
<td>NMPED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Off-campus, Distance and Alternate Route Programs:

The initial teacher preparation program in Elementary Education (Bachelor of Science) is offered off-campus at the Alamogordo, Carlsbad, and Grants campuses. At these campuses, a graduate candidate can receive a Master's degree plus licensure in Elementary Education leading to initial teacher preparation.

Candidates with a bachelor’s degree and teaching license can acquire advanced preparation through distance learning technologies leading to a Master of Arts degree with an emphasis in Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood Education, and/or Educational Learning Technologies. Advanced candidates can obtain a reading endorsement online. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction also offers online a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) in Science and a MAT in Mathematics and Science through a hybrid program (online and off-campus). This latter program is in partnership with Los Alamos National Lab.

The unit has developed an alternative licensure process for persons who hold at least a baccalaureate degree, but have not completed an educator preparation program. In order to qualify, candidates must have a contract with a New Mexico district as an elementary or secondary-level teacher. Course work for Elementary Education (EED) or Secondary Education (SED) alternative licensure is comprised of 21 post-baccalaureate semester hours. Candidates who complete the alternative program and meet all other state requirements (e.g., pass all state licensure exams) are eligible for licensure by the state of New Mexico. The alternative licensure program in Special Education is offered completely online through the distance education program in the College of Education.
Program Changes

There have been two changes in the organization of the unit since the last NCATE visit. Dr. Michael Morehead was named a Dean of the College of Education after serving as Interim Dean and Dr. Robert Rhodes was named as Associate Dean after serving as Interim Associate Dean. As detailed in Standard 2, the unit has significantly altered the unit assessment system and has integrated the comments and recommendations made by the BOE team to address the AFI’s for this standard.

Between 2002 and 2009, the unit added 18 faculty positions. A field-based Bilingual program and Alternative Licensure programs in Elementary, Secondary and Special Education were developed. Myrna’s Children’s Village: An Early Childhood Lab School (MCV) was established in 2005 and offers several preschool programs that not only serve the community and greatly expand the unit’s collaborations with the Las Cruces Public Schools and state and federally-funded programs, but also provide field experiences for candidates in Early Childhood Education. In 2005, the Alliance for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning was developed to coordinate outreach initiatives by bringing together the resources of the university, 13 partner districts, and regional educational service centers. The Alliance provides support for K-12 schools and facilitates their collaboration. In 2007, the unit’s School Psychology program became nationally accredited. In 2008, the Early College High School Las Cruces Initiative was formed to help students transition from high school to the workforce or higher education. This initiative opened in Fall 2011. In the past 5 years, the unit has experienced a significant increase in the number of web-based courses that are offered: from 5% to 25%. Undergraduate enrollment in the College of Education has increased from 1,538 in 2002 to 1,676 in 2009; while graduate enrollment has increased from 688 to 912.

Enrollment Trends Table by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enrollment Figures collected from IRPOA Fact Sheets and Quick Facts at http://irpoa.nmsu.edu/QuickFacts/Factsheets.html

In 2008, the following substantive changes occurred: in April, the institution was reviewed by and received 10-year accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission; with the departure of President Michael Martin in July, Executive Vice President and Provost Waded Cruzado became the Interim President. In June 2009, Dr. Manuel T. Pacheco was named Interim President and Dr. Cruzado re-assumed her position as Executive Vice President and Provost. The Dean of the College of Education, Robert Moulton, served as Interim Executive Vice President and Provost for a year before accepting a position at the Higher Colleges of Technology in the Dubai, United Arab Emirates. From summer 2008 until the time of the most recent visit, Associate Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Michael Morehead served as the Interim Dean of the College of Education. In Fall 2008, Dr. Robert Rhodes was appointed as Interim Associate Dean until his assignment external to the college. In Spring 2009, Dr Dana Christman served as Interim Associate Dean. Dr. Rhodes re-assumed the position of Interim Associate Dean in July 2009. The unit’s facilities have seen extensive dramatic improvements, with the renovation of both O’Donnell Hall and the Edgar R. Garrett Speech and Hearing Center. Both projects were completed in Fall 2008.
Conceptual Framework

The unit’s mission is to serve the people of New Mexico through education, research, extension education, and public service with specific emphasis on innovative practices, overcoming barriers to learning, international activities, technology, and literacy for the diverse populations of New Mexico, surrounding states and border communities. NMSU’s geographic location and status as a land-grant institution drive the unit’s purpose, which is consistent with the University's mission. As a result, the unit serves constituents in both urban and rural settings, and responds to border issues because of its proximity to Mexico.

The unit’s Conceptual Framework was developed in alignment with the unit’s mission and to inform the goals and outcomes for its program completers. The revised Strategic Plan (2009-2014) for the College of Education was developed to align with the Conceptual Framework. See Strategic Plan 2009-2014.

PREPARED is the acronym for the unit’s conceptual framework theme; its components are as follows:

**Practitioners, Clinicians and Leaders:** The unit not only prepares candidates to teach, but it also prepares principals, school psychologists, counselors, mental health professionals, speech language pathologists, and physical education specialists for a broad range of professional roles in education. It also provides professional development opportunities for practicing teachers.

**Reflection:** The unit provides opportunities for candidates to be meta-cognitive and engage in thoughtful questioning and problems-based learning.

**Effectiveness:** This is realized through the content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that candidates utilize to ensure that all students learn.

**Pedagogy:** The unit’s and the candidate’s educational and clinical practices are grounded in the general concepts, theories and research pertaining to effective teaching.

**Assessment:** This encompasses the formal and informal procedures for eliciting evidence related to unit effectiveness, and both candidate and student learning. The unit’s assessment system is based on professional, state and institutional standards whereby data are collected at predetermined transitional points in order to predict candidate success and improve programs. Candidates also gain expertise in the principles of classroom assessment.

**Research:** Theories, investigations, and policies drive the work of the unit and support candidate preparation and practice.

**Evaluation:** This is the continuous process for determining the unit’s realization of its stated mission, goals and outcomes. Both the unit and candidates use rubrics to evaluate their effectiveness.

**Diversity:** Candidates, faculty, and students represent differences in gender, ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, language, religion, sexual preference, regional culture, and ability-level. The unit provides opportunities for candidates to work with diverse students and to demonstrate dispositions that value fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

The unit’s beliefs about teaching and learning are reflected in its goals and outcomes for its program completers. By participating in and progressing through teacher preparation programs whose content is informed by the unit’s Conceptual Framework, they become Grounded Thinkers, Critical Thinkers, Content Specialists, Effective Practitioners, Reflective Practitioners, Problem Solvers, and Technology Proficient Educators.
The **Grounded Thinker** is mathematically literate; capable of using the spoken and written word to communicate effectively; understands basic principles and concepts in the social, physical, and life sciences; is widely read; is aware of other cultures; and understands something of themselves as people and citizens. Grounded Thinkers know how to work with others, expect to be held to high standards, and are capable of monitoring and assessing their own progress and goals (Conley, 1996). The unit’s program completers are grounded in the broad knowledge of academic content fields, proficient in language and communication skills, and knowledgeable about events and beliefs, which influence educational change.

The **Critical Thinker** is able to utilize knowledge about the philosophical, sociological, and historical foundations of schooling in order to analyze issues of curriculum planning, governance, policy and practice in education. Professionals emerging from the unit practice the “judicious suspension of belief” when examining schools of thought and prescribed pedagogy (McPeck, 1981). These individuals use their knowledge of educational theory and practice to focus on how and why learners use cognitive processes, how they organize and store information, and assimilate that into meaningful experience (Flavell, 1985). Professionals prepared by the unit understand the effects of language and culture on the students with whom they work, recognizing that these students come to school with a diversity of lifestyles and experiences, and with varying expectations about learning (Heath, 1983).

The **Content Specialist** has preparation in a major academic area sufficient to be able to apply effectively content and pedagogical knowledge in educational and clinical settings. They possess more than narrow subject-matter knowledge plus some “tricks of the trade.” They have both broad general knowledge and an impressive range of knowledge in their own discipline (Noddings, 1996). The unit’s program completers have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach as described in national and state standards. Candidates for school support roles will have a thorough understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their field as outlined in professional and state standards. More importantly, professionals prepared by the unit utilize their content knowledge and skill, and are responsive to diversity in order to help students achieve high standards of learning, to utilize technology, and resolve real-world problems.

The **Effective Practitioner** is able to design, implement and evaluate lesson plans and utilize materials that are responsive to diverse groups, as well as to individual students. They are consumers of educational research and understand its relationship to theory and practice. They are knowledgeable about and address the characteristics and needs of diverse and special needs learners. Not only do they have basic knowledge about the process of learning, but are also able to integrate and apply content and pedagogy in the context of schools and communities, utilize educational software and technology, and employ appropriate evaluation strategies. The Effective Practitioner understands how students learn and how to ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner. The unit’s program completers are prepared to establish educational environments that support student learning.

The **Reflective Practitioner** has in-depth knowledge of the subject matter they plan to teach and they reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning. They seek the advice of others and draw on educational research and scholarship to improve practice. They critique and reflect on work as it relates to student performance. Reflection has several benefits (Spindler & Spindler, 1987). Udall and Rugen (1997) note that researchers have found that significant changes in the beliefs and attitudes of educators depend on their gaining “evidence of change in the learning outcomes...and efficacy of innovation...on their students” (p. 407). The unit’s program completers not only think systematically about their own practice and disposition, but also foster active inquiry, reflection and evaluation of choices and actions in learners as well.
The Problem Solver demonstrates critical analysis, synthesis and personal inquiry. They present content to students in challenging, clear and compelling ways, analyze responses, and make necessary revisions to enhance student learning. They provide multiple explanations and develop strategies so that all students have access to ideas and solutions and encourage students to explore topics, make guesses, and take risks in order to find an answer to a question (Tompkins, 1998). In their own approach to problem resolution, they develop the ability to conduct and apply research, access educational resources, and foster relationships with colleagues, parents/families, and agencies in the larger community. The unit’s program completers seek connections between a problem and its possible causes, consider a set of solution possibilities, analytically assess the options, select and implement a strategy, and assess the outcome (Reutzel & Cooter, 2000).

The Technology Proficient Educator is a knowledgeable and skilled user of computer-based technologies for teaching and learning. They are able to evaluate growing electronic resources for appropriateness; apply the latest theories of technology and learning as part of planning and designing effective technology-enhanced learning environments for all students; use a variety of technologies to gather data and assess learning; and use technology for classroom management, productivity and further professional development. They demonstrate knowledge of specific technology applications and resources appropriate to the content area to be taught.

Candidate Proficiencies

The unit’s Candidate Proficiencies are aligned with both the Conceptual Framework and institutional, state, and national standards. The alignment of goals and outcomes with existing standards ensures that, upon completion of the initial or advanced preparation program, candidates will have developed and demonstrated the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for licensure and degree completion. The unit’s nine Candidate Proficiencies are measured according to specific demonstrations. These are: 1) Assessment of Student Learning (A): The candidate understands principles of assessment and various assessment techniques; 2) Content Knowledge (CK): The candidate demonstrates knowledge of academic content; 3) Classroom Management (CM): The candidate understands principles of classroom management; 4) Dispositions (D): The candidate demonstrates good interpersonal and communication skills; 5) Multiculturalism/Diversity (MC): The candidate understands principles necessary to work with diverse learners; 6) Pedagogical Knowledge (PK): The candidate demonstrates knowledge of different teaching strategies: 7) Pedagogical Skills (PS): The candidate understands the elements of effective teaching; 8) Special Needs (SN): The candidate understands principles necessary to work with students who have exceptional needs; 9) Technology (T): The candidate demonstrates effective technology skills.

Summary of the Assessment System

The Conceptual Framework Theme, PREPARED, and its related Goals and Outcomes provide the foundation for the knowledge, content, dispositions and skills emphasized in the unit’s Teacher Education Programs. Program effectiveness and candidate performance are assessed systematically throughout the various programs. The unit utilizes multiple assessments at key transition points in both initial and advanced programs.

The Outcomes and Goals of the Conceptual Framework are integrated into the design, implementation and evaluation of programs as well. Based on assessment data, programs are modified as needed in order to ensure that candidates are well prepared and services to students in schools and clinical settings are enhanced.

The unit collects and evaluates data using a variety of tools, these are described in the Conceptual Framework and in the Standards that follow. In Fall 2008 the unit began implementing Tk20. This online database and reporting system facilitates faculty review of candidate progress, unit-wide and programmatic assessment of content, pedagogy, professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.
Changes since the Last Visit (Response to the Previous NCATE Report)

No changes have been made to the Conceptual Framework since the recent NCATE visit.
STANDARD 2: THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The CoED initial and advanced programs did not sufficiently meet Standard 2 criteria during NMSU’s regular accreditation visit in the fall of 2009. The BOE team summarized their overall assessment of the standard as follows:

“The unit assessment system is still developing. Efforts have been made to align the conceptual framework and candidate measures. Most programs have identified dispositions and are measuring them, although measures are not routinely aggregated and reported. Transition points have been determined and measures identified for the initial programs and some of the advanced programs. Data collection is occurring, as is some analysis.

Most of the initial programs have received summarized data from the unit and some program decisions have been made based on these data. Some initial programs have begun to use Tk20 as a data collection tool. The initial programs and the unit have a strong collaborative relationship with faculty in the Arts and Sciences. However, data from programs outside the college are not routinely included in the unit system. Advanced program data did not appear to have been incorporated into the unit system, and there was little evidence that the unit was providing summarized data nor requesting feedback from the advanced programs. The advanced programs need to be more fully integrated into the unit assessment system.

The system as described also did not include unit operations information, although evidence on site reveals that these measures are being collected and analyzed. While some evidence existed of multiple readers for portfolios and comprehensive examinations, and multiple reviewers for teaching performance, there appeared to be little attention to issues of consistency, accuracy, fairness, and freedom for bias in considering assessment tools. This was particularly true of the CAFC instrument as a source of performance assessment for the nine proficiencies.

Data reporting was inconsistent, and it was often difficult to determine what data were being collected or how data were being analyzed. Data for several advanced programs was aggregated and not reported by specific program area and did not incorporate measures specific to those areas.”

The following sections of this standard detail the unit’s effort to address the six AFIs noted by the BOE team. Each AFI is reported in the applicable section along with the BOE rationale and the corrective action taken by the unit.

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

AFI 1 – The unit has limited evidence that its assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated assessment and evaluation measures to monitor candidate performance (Advanced)

BOE Rationale – “Data points identified in the transition matrix are not regularly reported for all program areas. It is assumed they are collected, but there is no evidence of unit summarization or aggregation, rather the evidence points to their use as check points for individual candidates in terms of progress in the program.”

The unit’s assessment system has consistently collected information on candidate proficiencies as outlined in the Conceptual Framework, state and professional standards and according to specific transition points. For the past fifteen years, the unit’s assessment system has included the following instruments: GPAs in core courses by program; Teacher Education Program Portfolios (TEPP); New Mexico Teacher Assessments (NMTA) Basic Skills, Content, and Competency test scores; evaluations of Pre-student Teaching Practica (field experiences); Dispositions Evaluations; Student Teacher Orientation Packets (STOP)/Student Teacher Entry Packets (STEP); evaluations of Student Teaching (clinical practice); follow-
up surveys related to satisfaction of unit program completers and their employers; qualifying and comprehensive exams; and theses and dissertations.

See Unit Assessment Structure and Unit Assessment System for Teacher Education Programs

During 2007-2008 and prior to the most recent accreditation visit, the unit developed and piloted a uniform Candidate Assessment Process across programs in order to align practica and course assessments more closely with the Conceptual Framework. The Candidate Assessment Forms for Courses (CAFC) and Pre-student Teaching Practica (CAFP) were based on the nine Candidate Proficiencies that are aligned with the Conceptual Framework and derived directly from NCATE assessment requirements and state competencies for each licensure and endorsement program. Faculty members determined the specific assignments that were used to assess candidates on specific proficiencies. Consequently, in any given course or practicum, candidates were not assessed on all nine proficiencies. Furthermore, there was some variation among individual faculty member interpretation of expected levels of performance for each proficiency. These significant flaws were revealed during the piloting process and were understandably critiqued by the BOE team. Use of the CAFC and CAFP was discontinued and specific performance-based measures, signature assignments, and evaluation rubrics were developed for each initial and advanced program in response to the BOE team feedback and recommendations.

Corrective Action – The BOE findings and associated AFIs were carefully reviewed by initial and advanced program faculty, directors, department heads, and the unit as a whole. Two unit-wide “assessment summits” involving program directors and department heads from all programs were held in the summer and fall of 2010 to review the six AFIs and to develop a collaborative and comprehensive plan of action. It was determined that the desired alterations and additions to the unit assessment system could be best accomplished in planned stages. As the department with the largest number of initial and advanced licensure programs, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction began the process and worked diligently in the fall of 2010 to develop multiple performance-based measures, signature assignments, and evaluation rubrics to increase the authenticity and reliability of the assessment process (see Curriculum and Instruction NCATE Assessment Plan). The department’s work in this area was closely communicated with other departments within the college, partner programs external to the college, distance campuses, and the public schools. Communication venues included the second “assessment summit”, regular unit assessment meetings, Administrative Council, Education Council, Professional Development School Council, and specially scheduled meetings with directors of external and distance campus programs (see agendas and minutes in on-site portfolio).

Faculty in initial and advanced programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction determined that several performance-based assessments aligned with professional and state competencies were needed in order to address the AFI in this subarea. Assessments were developed by faculty in the department’s three teacher education programs, that is, initial programs, which include early childhood education [ECED], elementary education [ELED] and secondary education [SED]. Assessments were also developed by faculty in the MA advanced program areas, which include Early Childhood, Bilingual/TESOL, Learning Technologies, and Language, Literacy, and Culture.

In the initial teacher education programs [ECED, ELED, SED] faculty decided to align assessments with candidate performance expectations in field experiences. Faculty developed key assessments that addressed the core competencies of instruction and implementation. Each program area also designed an assessment for lesson/unit plan development for class instructors to evaluate candidate performance. Likewise, measures were also developed to assess candidates in their practicum placement using a related key assessment. Program faculty in teacher education reviewed existing assessments and developed new assessments for cooperating teachers to complete as necessary. The following assessments were developed by the individual teacher education programs:

Early Childhood Education [ECED]
Midterm/Final Assessment for Early Elementary Practicum
Midterm/Final Assessment for Infant/Toddler and Pre-K Practicum [ECED 220 and ECED 230]
ECED Lesson Plan Rubric
Kid-watching: Literacy Assessment Case Study Rubric RDG 350
Exit ECED Competency Portfolio Assessment Rubric; includes EOSL.

Elementary Teacher Education [ELED]
Elementary Instructional Planning Assessment Scheme [use by instructor]
Elementary Observation Instrument for Instruction [use by field supervisor]
Midterm and Final Practicum Evaluation for Elem Ed Students [use by cooperating teacher]
Elementary Midterm and Final Evaluation Document for Student Teachers

Secondary Teacher Education [SED]
Secondary Alternative Licensure Midterm
Secondary Alternative Licensure Final
Secondary Cooperating Teacher Evaluation: EDUC 381
Secondary Cooperating Teacher Evaluation: Methods/EDUC 4/575
Secondary Education Faculty/Instructor Lesson in a Series
Secondary Practicum Field Experience Evaluation: Individual Instruction
Secondary Practicum Field Experience Evaluation: Mini-lesson
Secondary Practicum Field Experience Evaluation: Lesson in a Series
Secondary Practicum Field Experience Evaluation: Whole Group Pedagogy I
Secondary Practicum Field Experience Evaluation: Whole Group Pedagogy II

There are six advanced program areas in the Curriculum and Instruction Department through which a candidate can receive an MA degree in education: generalist program; early childhood education; bilingual education; learning technologies; language, literacy and culture; and TESOL. [Note: bilingual, learning technologies, language, literacy and culture (reading) and TESOL are programs that meet state competencies for endorsements.] Each program area identified two courses that serve as transition points and three points within the MA program where candidates’ dispositions are assessed. In addition, all candidates must complete either an MA written exam or a research project to exit the advanced program. The following key assessments were developed for the advanced program areas:

MA Bilingual Education
Sheltered Instruction Lesson Plan BIL 522
Signature Assignment Research Project BIL 550

MA Educational Learning Technology
EDLT Project Instructions and Rubric EDLT 520
EDLT Project Instructions and Rubric EDLT 573

MA TESOL Education
Signature Assignment Adult and Family Literacy Research Project EDUC 504
Signature Assignment Assessment Unit EDUC 587

MA Language Literacy & Culture
Family Literacy Signature Assignment: Family Literacy Case Study RDG 510
Socio-psycholinguistics of Reading Signature Assignment: Final Inquiry Project RDG 530

MA Early Childhood Education
Trends and Issues Project Rubric ECED 510
Seminar in Cognitive and Social Development Learning Activity Rubric ECED 520
In spring of 2011, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction’s performance-based measures, signature assignments, and evaluation rubrics for initial and advanced programs were implemented and the first round of data was collected. The Department of Special Education/Communication Disorders began the next planned stage of unit assessment system development at this same time through the review of Curriculum and Instruction program measures and the creation and implementation of complementary key assessments and evaluation rubrics (see Special Education NCATE Assessment Plan). The following key assessments and evaluation rubrics were developed by the special education program:

**Special Education [SPED]**
- Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) Key Assessment and Rubric
- Special Education Screening Process Key Assessment and Rubric

In the summer and fall of 2011, the two departments conducted program level analysis of the outcome-based data generated by these new procedures (see Special Education and Curriculum and Instruction Advanced Program Reviews and Outcomes Reports in 2.b.1 below). The Department of Educational Management and Development mirrored this process in their advanced program and made several changes to the rubric for the evaluation of the internship project/comprehensive examination (see EMD Assessment of Candidate Learning Outcomes and EMD Performance Data Review and Data-Based Program Changes).

Simultaneous to these program and department efforts, the unit’s College of Education Assessment and Accreditation Team produced and distributed a series of data reports examining student teacher surveys, cooperating teacher surveys, undergraduate and graduate program completer surveys, and employer surveys. This information had been routinely collected by the unit but had not been systematically organized and distributed to internal and external programs. Archival data reports and current data reports for these surveys were provided to all programs as well as current initial and advanced program data reports for basic skills, content, and competency test scores, TEP portfolio scores, candidate assessment data, and dispositions (see listing of reports in 2.b.1 below).

**See Curriculum and Instruction Initial Programs Assessment Matrix**
- Curriculum and Instruction Advanced Programs Assessment Matrix
- SPED Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Matrix

The unit’s assessment system is aligned with the Conceptual Framework and the standards, goals, and outcomes identified for initial and advanced programs. See Alignment Matrix of CF to Standards, Goals and Outcomes. For an overview of the unit’s assessment instruments and how they align with transitions points, see Table 6 (below).

**2a.2 Table 6: Unit Assessment System**

**Transition Points Assessments by Program**

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

Unit assessment is developed and managed under the direction of the Associate Dean for Students and Programs, who serves as the unit’s NCATE Director, and in collaboration with the Dean, Department Heads, the Administrative Council, the Education Council, Teacher Education Program (TEP) Directors, and faculty. The unit assessment system is reviewed twice per year, in the fall and spring semesters. One external and three internal groups review the assessment system for the purpose of making needed changes and improvements.
External Evaluation
Education Council - The Education Council meets twice each year to review the assessment system and relevant data, share program specific information, review proposed programmatic changes and/or new programs, and communicate about issues impacting Pk-12 education. Education Council membership includes public school representatives, department heads and directors from partner programs across the university, department heads and program directors from within the college, and the college advisement center.

See Education Council Membership and Education Council Minutes.

Internal Evaluation
Program Review - In each teacher education program, a director supports the ongoing development and implementation of the assessment system. Data collected are placed in TK20 [and in Survey Monkey where applicable] at the end of each semester. Teacher Education Directors have access to data beginning the following semester. In each teacher education program, directors and respective instructors meet to review, analyze and discuss the assessment data. Reports of these discussions are initially presented to the members of the Office of Teacher Candidate Preparation [OTCP] for review. Findings and recommendations for assessment system improvement are also presented and discussed at department faculty meetings. In addition, data and recommendations are shared and discussed with other teacher education program areas through the Teacher Education Advisory Committee meetings, Education Council meetings, and Unit Assessment Committee meetings and with public school partners at the Professional Development School council meetings.

Education Assessment Advisory Committee – This committee is comprised of directors from initial and advanced programs internal and external to the college. The Education Assessment Advisory Committee reviews the unit assessment system and makes recommendations for improvements each semester during a regularly scheduled meeting.

Unit Assessment Committee - The Unit Assessment Committee is comprised of the College of Education Dean, Associate Dean for Students and Programs, the Coordinator/Director of Assessment, a department head representative, an initial program director representative, an advanced program representative, and an Education Council representative. This group reviews recommendations for improvement to the unit assessment system made by the other external and internal groups during a regularly scheduled meeting.

See Evaluation of Unit Assessment System

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

AFI 2 – The unit has not implemented sufficient procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance (Initial and Advanced)

BOE Rationale – “The CAFC data has serious deficiencies related to accuracy and consistency. Some limited procedures exist related to consistency (e.g., multiple readers, triad clinical evaluation), but those data are not systematically reviewed. There was heavy reliance on GPAs as indicators of competence, however, only mean scores were reported. There was limited or no information on sample size, medians, or frequency analysis. It was not possible to determine what a particular grade meant in terms of proficiency level or if grades in multiple sections of the course meant the same thing.”

Corrective Action - The procedures utilized to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and freedom from bias have been revised over the past year-and-a-half in response to the BOE team review. Use of the CAFC has been discontinued as has the heavy reliance of GPA as an indicator of performance. Uniform assessment procedures, signature assignments, and established rubrics have been created and implemented for initial and advanced programs (see section 2a.1). Programs have evaluated the results of these new measures for fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias (see for example Program Reviews
and Outcomes Reports in section 2b.1). The Program Reviews and Outcomes Reports have also been reviewed by the College Assessment and Accreditation Team and the Educational Assessment and Advisory Committee. Likewise, the review of fairness, accuracy, consistency and freedom from bias among assessment procedures is now a set agenda item for the Educational Assessment and Advisory Committee, the Education Council, and the Unit Assessment Committee. This process is designed to give various stakeholders the opportunity to review the unit’s assessment procedures for fairness, accuracy, consistency and freedom from bias. See Evaluation of Unit Assessment System.

In addition, in assessing individual candidates, the unit, departments, programs, and the university consistently follow procedures to ensure that all decisions related to student progress are fair, accurate, consistent, and bias-free. Appeals processes are in place at all levels. At the unit, department, and program level valid and reliable standardized measurements are used (e.g., the NMTA, national certification, and licensure exams). All of these have been reviewed and corrected for bias. In addition, in reviewing candidate portfolios for TEP admission, a third reader is assigned if the first two readers disagree on a candidate’s qualifications. Student Teaching Evaluations are reviewed by a Triad, a review team that includes the candidate, his/her cooperating teacher, and his/her faculty supervisor. All three perspectives are valuable in assessing the candidate’s classroom performance. All Master’s exams are scored by two faculty reviewers, and, in the event of divergent scores or an appeal, a third faculty member reviews the exam.

See Safeguards Regarding Bias and Inconsistency section of the Transition Points Assessments by Program for a listing of procedures by program and method of assessment.

When faculty members have concerns about a candidate, they may request a Selective Review. This is a formal meeting that includes faculty, supervisors, and unit administrators to determine what actions need to be taken regarding the candidate’s continuation in a program. Selective reviews are available in the Dean’s Office. At the university-level, appeals processes ensure fairness and consistency and, in 2007, an Ombuds Office was established to assist students. See Appeals and Ombuds.

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

AFI 3 – The unit’s assessment system is limited in its capacity to manage and improve the unit’s operations and programs (Initial and Advanced)

BOE Rationale – “While on-site evidence existed that this was occurring, it was not explicitly represented in the assessment system as described in the IR, and it was unclear with whom the information was shared.”

Corrective Action – The unit employees outcome-based program reports, unit-level assessment of quantitative and qualitative data, university-wide outcome assessment reports, and state-level reports as evaluation methods within the assessment system to manage and improve the unit’s operations and programs. These data-based reports are reviewed in a variety of contexts, including meetings of the College and Administrative Councils, departmental retreats, and meetings with TEP directors and associate directors, department and associate department heads, and faculty. Programs and departments continually modify their offerings and operations based on the review of these data. The annual reports to the university-wide Outcomes Assessment Committee 1 (OAC1) provide the basis of an annual report to the state on each department’s or program’s assessment of student learning outcomes. These reports also include summaries of evidence-based program changes. See Annual Outcomes Assessment Reports for the College of Education http://provost.nmsu.edu/initiatives/academic-program-review/ at http://irpoa.nmsu.edu/OutcomesAssessment/OAC1repsum.htm.

NMSU is currently developing a formalized process for data-based departmental reviews that will be based on key indicators. This process is expected to be in place for the 2012 fall semester. This information will be added to the unit assessment system and review process. See http://provost.nmsu.edu/initiatives/academic-program-review/
At the state level, outcome-based data are reported to the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) and are shared with the New Mexico Public Education Department (PED). Annual reports to the state are made through the New Mexico Education Accountability Reporting System (NM EARS). This report includes candidate demographic data, number of candidates admitted and enrolled, number of program completers, number and types of degrees, credit hour production, revenue generation, cost per credit hour, and percentage of unit budget allocated to teacher education. This data is compared year-to-year within the unit for improvement of unit operations and is available for comparison to other teacher education programs in the state. See NM EARS 2011.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

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

**AFI 4** – The unit does not regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze candidate assessment data to improve candidate performance and program quality (Initial and Advanced)

**BOE Rationale** – “Data were not provided for several of the advanced program areas, and data that were provided were not disaggregated by advanced program area. Data from programs outside the college were difficult to find and were not included in any reports provided for the unit assessment system. Because much of the data were collected within the last 18 months and analyzed and reviewed in the past nine months, a complete cycle for most programs has not yet occurred.”

**Corrective Action** – Previously, the NMSU Banner student data management system did not allow for disaggregated data for advanced programs as the programs were each housed under a single degree with no other official designations. In order to address this concern and allow for unit and university data sharing and consistent coding of student data, the Curriculum and Instruction Department went through the multi-step process necessary to have concentrations officially designated by the NMSU Graduate School for each advanced program. See Department of Curriculum & Instruction Concentration Approvals for Master’s Degrees for a complete listing of approved concentrations. See Bilingual Education Concentration and Language Literacy and Culture Concentration for example approval letters.

Disaggregated data are now provided for all advanced programs as well programs located outside the college. See the Program-Level Reports and Unit-Level Reports listed below for evidence of the extensive data collection and review process implemented for these programs.

**Program-Level Reports**
- Bilingual TESOL Program Review
- Early Childhood Program Review
- Language Literacy and Culture Program Review
- Learning Technologies Program Review
- Elementary Education Program Review
- Secondary Education Program Review
- Special Education Program Review

- Bilingual TESOL Outcomes Report 2011
- Early Childhood Outcomes Report 2011
- Language Literacy and Culture Outcomes Report 2011
- Special Education Outcomes Report 2011

Evaluation of Candidate Learning Outcomes: Comprehensive exams
- EMD 570
- EMD 576
How are the data collected?
See Data Collection Timeline. Key assessment data related to Candidate Proficiencies are collected on a regular basis for Initial and Advanced Programs.

From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?
Every semester, TEPs collect data through surveys, dispositions, course evaluations, standardized tests, and self-reporting from candidates, graduates, faculty, and employers. Each fall semester, data are summarized in annual TEP Data Reports that include the following:

- Candidate Proficiencies Data (presented longitudinally for several academic years)
- GPA Data (presented longitudinally for several academic years)
- NMTA Data (on Basic Skills and Competency Areas)
- Pre-Student Teaching Practicum Evaluation Data
- Student Teacher Evaluation Data
- Post-Graduation Follow-up: Initial Licensure & Advanced Program Completers
- Employer Evaluations of Program Completers

How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
Unit-wide data are summarized as they are received and are shared with programs each semester and compiled in an annual report in the fall semester. University-wide Outcomes Assessment Reports are compiled annually by each department. The implementation of Tk20 and coordination with the NMSU Banner student data management system has allowed for more accurate and comprehensive reporting and analysis of data.

Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
Individual departments and the unit share in the data summarization and analysis responsibilities. Program data is initially collected and analyzed at that level while the College Assessment and Accreditation Team collects and analyzes data received at the unit level such as NMTA scores, program completer surveys, and employer surveys. Initial data reports are shared between the departments and the CAAT and a
A comprehensive summary report is produced by the CAAT for distribution to the various entities within the assessment system.

In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)

What information technologies are used to maintain the unit’s assessment system?

AFI 5 – Technology is not sufficiently used to support the systematic collection and analysis of data at either the program or unit level (Initial and Advanced)

BOE Rationale – “Recent practices have involved collecting paper documents and looking at data by discrete assessments. Survey Monkey was used to store the information. Data are not collected in such a way that candidate information can be reviewed across programs or candidates. While the unit has made a decision to adopt Tk20, adoption is voluntary for programs and individual faculty.”

Corrective Action –

The unit has made great strides in the use of technology to support the systematic collection and analysis of data at the program and unit level. The unit has fully adopted TK20 for the Teacher Education Program and candidates’ must provide proof of account purchase in order to complete their Teacher Education Program application. Data within the TK20 system can be reviewed across programs or candidates by major program areas, endorsements, and other key criteria. The functionality of this system has been significantly enhanced through the adoption of uniform naming conventions across the unit and the NMSU Banner student data system. The approval of graduate concentrations for advanced programs has allowed for the disaggregation of candidates in these programs within TK20 and the Banner student data system. As the unit completes the transition from Survey Monkey to TK20, data from both systems are stored in TK20 for ease of analysis.

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

AFI 6 – The unit does not disaggregate data for its off-campus and distance education programs nor its on-campus secondary programs (Initial and Advanced)

BOE Rationale – “Although the unit reports a variety of data in the IR, for secondary programs there was little reporting of data other than in aggregate form except for the NMTA data. Data for student teaching, clinical practice, and proficiencies were only in the aggregate, although reported in individual program reports. These measures were general and not discipline specific. Candidate data are not disaggregated for off-campus programs or distance learning programs. Data for secondary licensure areas is in general not disaggregated.”

Corrective Action – As detailed in section 2b.1, the unit now disaggregates data for on-campus advanced programs, secondary programs, and off-campus programs.

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

For all programs, records of formal complaints and their resolutions are maintained by the office in which the complaint is resolved. For example, this might be the department or Dean’s office. According to university policy, every effort is made to resolve complaints at the lowest possible level.
NCATE Standard 2

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

The unit continues to make progress in using data to inform program changes and in developing its assessment tools. In regularly scheduled department meetings and retreats, faculty review relevant data that guide their deliberations on program and assessment effectiveness and the means to improve them. University-wide Annual Outcomes Assessment Reports are also reviewed by departmental faculty and are used as the basis for course and program changes within a department. Directors of initial and advanced programs are members of the unit’s Educational Assessment Advisory Committee and review data across programs to evaluate efficiency and recommend changes to courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Likewise, the Unit Assessment Committee is comprised of the College of Education Dean, Associate Dean for Students and Programs, the Coordinator/Director of Assessment, a department head representative, an initial program director representative, an advanced program representative, and an Education Council representative. This group also reviews the outcome-data related to courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

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

See Outcome Reports by Program from section 2b.1 listed below for examples of program-level data driven change since the most recent BOE visit. Unit level review of these outcomes is currently underway.

- Bilingual TESOL Outcomes Report 2011
- Early Childhood Outcomes Report 2011
- Language Literacy and Culture Outcomes Report 2011
- Special Education Outcomes Report 2011
- Educational Management and Development Assessment of Candidate Learning Outcomes

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

Faculty have access to candidate assessment data through departmental and unit generated reports that include data on pre-student teaching practicum evaluations, courses, TEP applications, NMTA scores, dispositions, performance on signature assignments, student teaching and internship evaluations, program completer surveys, and employer surveys. With the implementation of Tk20, faculty members are able to input data and run reports related to candidate assessment. They also have access to annual reports prepared by department heads for the university-wide Outcomes Assessment Committee 1 (OAC1). These are posted online through Institutional Research, Planning and Outcomes Assessment.

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

Candidates’ TEP applications, together with dispositions data and clinical practice evaluations, are all used to improve performance. These are reviewed by faculty, advisement staff, or the Triad, and then are discussed with the candidate. Areas of strength and weakness are highlighted, and strategies and resources for improvement are discussed. In addition, some programs give candidates the opportunity to re-write and re-present work if needed. Faculty members and advisors review grading rubrics with candidates. If a candidate fails his/her comprehensive exams, the results are reviewed and discussed, so that improvements may be made. If a student fails a standardized test, tutoring, additional course work, and independent study are available for improving knowledge and skills. At midterm and the end of student teaching, the cooperating teacher, principal, and university supervisor collaboratively assess the candidate. These assessments are used for continuous improvement. In the case of unacceptable performance, a university representative discusses strategies for improvement with the candidate.

Since 1998, department heads have prepared and submitted assessment reports to the university-wide Outcomes Assessment Committee. These reports are broadly available through the Institutional Research, Planning and Outcomes Assessment (IRPOA) website:

http://irpoa.nmsu.edu/OutcomesAssessment/OutcomesAssessmentPlan.html
The Associate Dean for Students and Programs oversees data-sharing not only to departments, programs and faculty, but also to candidates and other stakeholders. Data have been reported in a number of contexts, from faculty retreats to Education Council and Board of Advocates meetings. With the implementation of Tk20, data has become more readily available to faculty, students, and advisors. The implementation of a broad-reaching and comprehensive data dissemination plan is overseen by the College Assessment and Accreditation Team.