HAWAI'I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD
COMMITTEE WORK SESSIONS AND BUSINESS MEETING

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2012
9:00 A.M.
HAWAI'I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD ROOM

MINUTES

PRESENT: Terry Holck

Jonathan Kissida

Justin Mew

Edward Patrick

Barry Wurst

Wray Jose

Arlene Lee-Williams for Don Horner

Beth Pateman for Donald Young

Felicia Villalobos

ABSENT: Louise Cayetano

Kerry Tom for Kathryn Matayoshi

Alvin Parker

Noe Noe Tom

STAFF: Lynn Hammonds, Executive Director

Dwight Uetake, Personnel Specialist

Carolyn Gyuran, Education Specialist

Jill Agena, Secretary

OBSERVERS: Dale Asami, Dept. of Education/OHR

Mary Heller, UHWO

Bernadette Howard, CTE State Office

Margaret Higa, Dyslexia Task Force

Elizabeth Ishii, Dyslexia Task Force

Ken Johnson, Professor Emeritus/UH HCC

Jeff Judd, Leeward CC

Doug Murata, DOE/Assistant Superintendent

Catherine Payne, Charter School Commission

Christine Sorensen, Dyslexia Task Force

Karen Street, Charter School Commission

Gerald Suyama, Dyslexia Task Force

Sue Voit, Dyslexia Task Force

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Holck called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(Jose/Villalobos) The minutes of the October 19, 2012 meeting were approved with one change to delete Dwight Uetake from the absent section.

TOPIC:	**Executive Director's Report**
DISCUSSION:	Executive Director Lynn Hammonds sent her report to the Board with no additions to her report, but wanted to give the board a brief introduction of the new look to HTSB's website, which will be deployed early part of December 2012. Dwight Uetake, Personnel Specialist, gave a report on the delinquent, expired, late payments and non-payment licenses. He reported that letters were sent out in April 2012, and late September 2012. He mentioned that since letters went out, the Non-payment totals are down to 248, delinquent is down to 161, and expired down to 148. Letters were sent out to principals who then pass it down to their teachers. After that process, letters will be sent to the teachers directly followed up with an email thru Lotus Notes and a phone call from our office. He also reported that Kerry Tom from OHR sent us an email explaining that OHR would be flagging in their system, expired licensed teachers. A report would be generated and sent to the school principals. According to Kerry Tom, they will start implementation January 2013. Carolyn Gyuran, Education Specialist, gave a short update on the progress of NBPTS. She reported that the score report from NBPTS should be sent to her sometime this week or early part of December. This delay makes it difficult to prepare for the ceremony in January. However, the room at the Governor's office has been reserved. So far $8,300 in subsidies was provided, 40 people have signed up, and at each session an average of 20 people attend.

TOPIC:	**Legislative and By-Laws Committee**
DISCUSSION:	Kissida reported that the Committee discussed:

- Revision of HAR 8-54-9-13 – more discussion at next meeting
- Eminence credential and expectations
- Discussion with representatives of the Dyslexia Task Force regarding SCR 110
- Military spouses, possible informational event

TOPIC:	**Teacher Education Committee**
DISCUSSION:	Pateman reported that the Committee discussed:

- NBI 12-11: Approval of Leeward Community College Career and Technical Education State Approved Teacher Education Program – recommends approval

- NBI 12-12: Amendment of State Approval for the University of Hawaii-West Oahu Teacher Education Programs – recommends approval
- NBI 12-13: Amendment of State Approval for the University of Phoenix-Hawaii Teacher Education Programs - withdrawn

TOPIC: **Joint Teacher Education and Teacher Standards Committees:**
DISCUSSION: Jose reported that the committees discussed:
- Meeting with representatives from the State Induction and mentoring center
- Tiered Licensure
- License renewal and renewal audit – update from Dwight Uetake
- Validation of basic skills and content knowledge expertise for licensure
- Annual report draft review

TOPIC: **Committee of the Whole**
DISCUSSION: Holck reported that the committee had a discussion with representatives of the Board of Education, Office of the Superintendent and Charter School Commission.

TESTIMONY, PETITION FROM THE PUBLIC: None**.**

NEW BUSINESS APPROVED: (See Attachments)

1. **NBI 12-10: Ratification of Hawaii Provisional Licenses, Standard Licenses, Advanced Licenses, Added Fields to Existing Licenses, Renewed Licenses, and Career and Technical Education Special Permits**
   (Holck reported out approved in executive session)

2. **NBI 12-11: Approval of Leeward Community College Career and Technical Education State Approved Teacher Education Program**
   (Pateman on behalf of the Teacher Education Committee)

3. **NBI 12-12: Amendment of State Approval for the University of Hawaii-West Oahu Teacher Education Programs**
   (Pateman on behalf of the Teacher Education Committee)

MOTIONS:

1. (Jose/Lee-Williams) Motion to move into executive session to review license Ratification list for approval and to discuss the report of legal issues from Deputy Attorney General Murakami.

2. (Jose/Villalobos) Motion to rise out of executive session.

ADJOURNMENT:

      Chairperson Holck adjourned the meeting at 2:57p.m.

RECORDER: _____   **DATE:** <u>November 9, 2012</u>
               Jill Agena

TITLE: Ratification of Hawaii Provisional Licenses, Standard Licenses, Advanced Licenses, Added Fields to Existing Licenses, Renewed Licenses, and Career and Technical Education Special Permits

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board ratifies the issuance of Provisional Hawaii licenses, Standard Hawaii licenses, Advanced licenses, Added Fields to existing licenses, and Career and Technical Education Permits as indicated on the attached list.

The Board ratifies the issuance of a renewed license for teachers as indicated on the attached list showing those who have met the criteria.

Submitted by: Terry Lynn Holck

Referred to: Committee of the Whole

NOVEMBER 2012 LICENSE LIST

STANDARDS LICENSES

License Type	First Name	Last Name	Teaching Field(s)	Effective Date	Expiration Date
SL	Najib Hamza	Al-Alami	Social Studies 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	David Christopher	Alsup	Mathematics 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Caitlyn Marie	Andrus	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Daniel	Bobrowski	Science 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Jeremy M.	Booth	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 7 - 12	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Kimberlee Anne	Brown	Mathematics 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Erika Sayuri	Brush	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Thomas Brendan	Carroll	SPED - Mild/Moderate K - 12	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Joseph K.	Cho	Physical Education K - 12, Social Studies 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Anne Louise	Clark	Special Education K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Brett B	Cornelison	Science 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Kehaulani E.	Crawford	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Jaimelynne	Cruz	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Justine Alyssa	Eshleman	English 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Sara	Goodwin	Elementary Education K - 6, Social Studies 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Kari	Graydon	School Counselor K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Paige Luann	Hayes	SPED - Mild/Moderate K - 12, Special Education K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Adrienne C	Ishida	Elementary Education K - 6	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Melody Del Rosario	Madarang	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Janna	Mahfoud	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Joseph E	Manfre	Mathematics 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Stacey Dawn	Martin	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Shannon B.	McNamara	Elementary Education K - 6, Special Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Kara	Miller	Elementary Education K - 6,	10/01/2012	06/30/2018

Approved Minutes for November 9, 2012

License Type	First Name	Last Name	Teaching Fields	Effective Date	Expiration Date
			English 5 - 9		
SL	Barbara S.	Mostofi	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Stephanie	Murayama	Mathematics 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Natalie	Nakai	Elementary Education K-6	11/1/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Erin	Ogawa	School Counselor K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Megan Justine	Pagett	Art K - 12, Special Education K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Lauren Patricia	Pell	Science 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Ashley M	Picillo	SPED - Mild/Moderate K - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Johnnetta J.	Piper	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Meghan P	Radonis	Elementary Education K - 6, Special Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Lynda	Rainey	Early Childhood Education PK - 3, Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Shyla	Russell	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Joey Shinji	Salmoiraghi	Social Studies 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Trisha L	Shimabuku-Fish	SPED - Mild/Moderate K - 12	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Carla Anne	Stewart	SPED - Mild/Moderate K - 12, SPED - Severe/Profound K - 12, Special Education K - 12	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Mallory Quinn	Stinger	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Jeremiah Gary	Thomas	CTE-Arts and Communication 7-12, CTE-Business 7-12, English 5 - 9, Social Studies 5 - 9	11/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Sophie	Tilla	Reading K - 12, Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Merlynda	Uekawa	Elementary K-6, Special Education K-6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Brandie	Vea	Elementary Education K - 6	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
SL	Janice K. Y. H.	Vierra	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 7 - 12	10/01/2012	06/30/2018
			ADD A FIELDS		
License Type	**First Name**	**Last Name**	**Teaching Fields**	**Effective Date**	**Expiration Date**
AAF	Ann	Cornwall	Teaching English to SOL K-	10/1/2012	6/30/2018

License Type	First Name	Last Name	Teaching Fields	Effective Date	Expiration Date
			12 and Reading K-12		
AAF	Danielle	Hartwick	Special Education PK-3	10/1/2012	6/30/2017
AAF	Verzon	Johnny	Social Studies 5-9	10/1/2012	6/30/2016
AAF	Chad	Lawson	English 5-9	10/1/2012	5/31/2015
AAF	Bernadette	Lopez	Special Education K-12	10/1/2012	6/30/2017
AAF	Franklin	Marcia	Art K-6	10/1/2012	11/4/2013
AAF	Clayton	Nishimoto	Mathematics 7-12	10/1/2012	6/30/2017
AAF	Theresa	Quiocho	English 5-9	10/1/2012	6/30/2017
AAF	Francis T.	Ryan	Mathematics 5-9	11/1/2012	7/31/2015
AAF	James	Winquist	English 5-9, Special Education 5-9	10/1/2012	12/28/2014
AAF	Jean	Wynne	TESOL K-12 and Level K-12 Reading	10/1/2012	6/30/2017
			SPECIAL PERMITS		
License Type	**First Name**	**Last Name**	**Teaching Fields**	**Effective Date**	**Expiration Date**
SP	Paul Bernard	Weckmann	Career and Technical Education	10/01/2012	09/30/2013
			ADVANCED LICENSES		
License Type	**First Name**	**Last Name**	**Teaching Fields**	**Effective Date**	**Expiration Date**
			None		
			PROVISIONAL LICENSES		
License Type	**First Name**	**Last Name**	**Teaching Fields**	**Effective Date**	**Expiration Date**
			None		

TITLE: Approval of Leeward Community College Career and Technical Education State Approved Teacher Education Program

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board approves the following recommendations of its State Approved Teacher Education (SATE) Unit and Program Review Team for Leeward Community College:

o   The Leeward Community College's Career and Technical Education (CTE) Program is granted Provisional Approval with the following conditions, effective December 1, 2012 through November 30, 2015. The unit may recommend candidates for licensure in CTE Arts and Communications 7-12, CTE Business 7-12, CTE Industrial and Engineering Technology 7-12, CTE Natural Resources 7-12, and CTE Public and Human Services 7-12.

By August 1, 2013, the Leeward Community College CTE program must submit to the HTSB:

1. A single list that clearly identifies the professional dispositions that are expected of candidates and the instrument and accompanying scoring guide/rubric that systematically assesses these dispositions.

2. Copies of the key assessments and their rubrics/scoring guides. The rubrics/scoring guides must be clearly organized by standard.

3. A rubric for the Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation (Formal Observations) that clearly describes the differences between the levels of performance. Include a detailed description of how the evaluators are to determine the summary ratings.

4. Course syllabi and assignments that show evidence that the program is preparing candidates to incorporate Native Hawaiian culture, history and language into their instruction in the classroom.

5. A detailed description of how P-12 student understanding of Native Hawaiian culture, history and language will be enhanced by teacher candidates.

6. A clear and detailed description on how the program's school partners participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences.

7. A detailed explanation of the role of the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty in the assessment of candidate performance during clinical practice. Provide the roles and responsibilities of school faculty and the professional education faculty in terms of assessment of candidate performance during clinical practice for both those candidates who are the teacher of record and for those who are not teacher of record.

8. A detailed explanation of how school based clinical LCC faculty members are systematically and regularly evaluated. Submit the evaluation tool and accompanying scoring guide that will be used to formally evaluate the faculty. Explain when and how they will be evaluated.

9. A detailed description of how the professional community is involved in the development and evaluation of its assessment system.

10. A description of the follow up studies of graduates and employers and how they are aligned with the assessment of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and dispositions. Submit copies of the Exit Survey, the Follow-Up Survey, and the Employer Survey.

Should the program fail to submit any report or verification required above their provisional approval will lapse on the date following the missed deadline.

Leeward Community College CTE program must prepare and submit an application to a national teacher education accrediting body approved by the U. S. Department of Education and by HTSB by April1, 2013.

Leeward Community College will submit documentation to HTSB by July 1, 2013, January 1, 2014, and July 1, 2014, January 1, 2015 on their progress towards national accreditation.

The Unit must explain any changes to this program in the Unit's Annual Report due each year to HTSB.

A letter shall be sent to Leeward Community College on behalf of the Board to communicate this decision.

Submitted by: Terry Lynn Holck

Referred to: Teacher Education Committee

HAWAIʻI TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD
SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Dr. Christine Sorenson, Bryant Ching   9/7/2012
Reviewer(s)

Date of review: 9/07/2012

Program(s) included in this Review	Program Type	Degree or Award
Institution: Leeward Community College Program: Career and Technical Education Grade Level: ☐ PK-3 ☐ K-6 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 7-12 X K-12	Initial teacher license in: CTE- Natural Resources CTE- Business CTE- Arts and Communication CTE- Public and Human Services CTE- Industrial and Engineering Technology	**X** Baccalaureate X Post baccalaureate ☐ Master's ☐ Other (specify) _____

APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION

Your Recommended Approval Decision:

☐ Full Approval
X Full Approval with Conditions
☐ Non-approval
☐ Decision deferred, not enough information

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

SECTION 1 TEST RESULTS

Test Results (from information supplied in Attachment A, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

☐ Yes   ☐ No   **X** Not applicable   ☐ Not able to determine

Pass Rate for the IHE Praxis II content area examination(s):

Comments: Program not yet operational and no test data is available.

The report should identify the specific areas where the Praxis II is available and which areas would need an alternative method of assessing content area. Licensure areas are incorrectly identified in the PSSR.

- CTE Natural Resources (no Praxis content)

- CTE Industrial and Engineering Technology (Technology Education #0050)

- CTE Public and Human Services: Service and Hospitality (Family and Consumer Sciences #0120)

- CTE Arts and Communication (No Praxis content)

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

2.1 Summary of Strengths:

Leeward Community College is preparing to address a critical need in the State of Hawai`i by developing an Alternative Certification Program for Career and Technical Educators.

The alternative route to licensure will consist of two tracks. Track I will lead to standard licensure in CTE for candidates who hold a baccalaureate degree and Track II will lead to a standard license restricted to the CTE field.

There is flexibility in the entrance requirement of validating a candidate's content knowledge.

Leeward Community College recruits from a diverse population.

2.2 Areas for Improvement:

1. Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards.

   Rationale: In assessment #6 (6.2), for example, the language from the professional standards as well as the disciplinary standards are not evident. The standard 6 rubric assesses proficiency of the candidate's ability to describe their artifacts and justify their inclusion rather than assessing candidate proficiency tied to the standards. The criteria should reflect the language of the standards.

2. Assessment of disciplinary content knowledge needs to be clarified.

   Rationale: The transition point matrix indicates content assessment could occur after program completion rather than prior to student teaching.   It is unclear how the industry experience and the 30 hours of coursework would be evaluated to ensure breadth and level of content knowledge. The criteria for industry experience are not specified.

3. The instructions for Assessment #4 must be clarified and expectations for proficiency articulated.

Rationale: It is unclear how the two different forms are to be used in the assessment of the clinical practice. It is unclear how the summary rating is to be derived from the item ratings. There is no indication to candidates on expected level of proficiency.

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

4. The program must clarify how students acquire the technology skills, the beginning reading competencies, and the knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language and how these are assessed.

    Rationale: There is no evidence that candidates are consistently prepared in any of the above areas. There is some limited assessment of technology skills in Assessment #4 but no clear evidence of assessment of candidate knowledge and skills relative to beginning reading and Native Hawaiian culture, history, and language. There is no evidence of candidate assessment of student learning related to Native Hawaiian culture, history, and language.

5. The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment.

    Rationale: There are several lists of dispositions mentioned (CORE, 3 P's, and attachment #4.1, #6.1). There is no evidence of a systematic approach to assessing candidates.

2.3 Concerns for follow-up by onsite unit review team:

N/A

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

SECTION 3 STATUS OF MEETING HTSB STANDARDS

Standard   I: Met

Standard   II. Met

Standard III: Met

Standard IV: Not Met - Insufficient evidence of content

Standard V: Met

Standard VI: Met

Standard VII: Met

Standard VII: Met

Standard IX: Not Met –The area of dispositions lacks clarity

Standard X: Met

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Section 4 EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

4.1-Candidates' knowledge of content:

Note: The organization in the PSSR of evidence to Section 4 made it difficult to assess as the evidence was not organized by content knowledge; professional and pedagogical content knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and effects on student learning.

4.1-Candidates' knowledge of content:

According to the chart beginning on page 34, assessment of candidate content knowledge occurs is key assessments 1, 2, 4, and 6.

For Key Assessment #1 (attachment 1.1), It is unclear where in the program the content assessment occurs for those areas without a content Praxis.   The chart on page 14 identifies the transition points as admission, entry to clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion, and after program completion. The content assessments other than the Praxis II are listed as after program completion and thus not assessed as part of the program.   Currently assessment of content proficiency is required by HTSB rules to occur prior to placement in student teaching/clinical practice. This needs to be clarified in the PSSR. Also note: the transition points are not identified consistently in the PSSR and USSR and it is unclear where the key assessments occur in relationship to the transition points.

Key Assessment #2 is the Multiple Intelligences Unit Plan. The instructions for the assignment (attachment 2.1) reference the CTE content standards but are not specific about which content standards apply for the different license tracks. The rubrics for assessing the unit plan and lesson plans (attachment 2.2) are tied only generically to content standards and do not use the language of the content standards themselves as the basis of assessment. It is likely that the various tracks (i.e. Natural Resources, Arts and Communication, etc.) will use different content standards, thus needing the rubrics to be developed for the different content areas to better align the content measures. Also note: The points identified in the criteria column are inconsistent with the points referenced within the rubrics themselves.

Key Assessment #4 (attachments 4.1. and 4.2). It is unclear how these two different forms are connected. Is 4.1 (Ed295B Observation Form) to be used during the first semester and only for commentary with no assessment score? Is 4.1 to be used only with certain students and not others? Is the commentary on 4.1 to be used as the basis for the scores on 4.2 (Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation)? The bulleted items in 4.1 under the content standards (Standard 4 and Standard 5) are not consistent with the rated items on content knowledge (Section IV and Section V) on 4.2. How are these connected?

Key Assessment #6 (Attachment 6.1) indicates candidates are to provide artifacts that demonstrate content knowledge (standard 4) and application of content (standard 5),

however the rubric is unclear as to how the quality of those artifacts as it relates to content is to be assessed. The checklist appears to provide points for inclusion of items, but does not appear to assess the quality of the items or how well they demonstrate content proficiency.

Note: the information on the chart beginning on page 38 is inconsistent with the previous information related to content assessment or it is unclear whether the knowledge noted is content knowledge or pedagogical and professional content knowledge. According to the matrix beginning on page 38, content is assessed through all 6 key assessments including #3 and #5 (Knowledge measures). Also note within this chart there is inconsistent labeling of key assessments. For example, Practicum Portfolio is referenced as Key Assessment #6 and Key Assessment #5.

4.2-Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions:

If the chart on page 38 is to show evidence of assessment of candidate pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions, then it indicates that these are assessed in all six key assessments. Note: there are inconsistencies in the labeling of the key assessments, particularly Practicum Portfolio is referenced as assessment #5 and #6 in various places within the chart, or else the title is incorrect in some areas.

Knowledge is assessed in:
Key Assessment #1: Content Knowledge (Praxis II or other industry)
Key assessment #2: Multiple Intelligences Unit/Lesson (Unit/lesson criteria 1, 2, 3, 5) Key Assessment # 3: Case Study Informational Guide (criteria 1, 4, 5)
Key assessment #5: Case Study of a Learner (Section 1 criteria 2& 3; Section 4 criteria 1, 2, 3)
Key assessment #6: Practicum Portfolio (contextual event analysis, cultural event analysis, portfolio rubric)

For key assessment #1, this would measure disciplinary content and not pedagogical and professional content knowledge.
For assessment #2, criteria 1 relates to instructional objectives, 2 is related to assessment, 3 is related to instructional activity and supports, and 5 is related to providing a rationale. These would appear to be related to pedagogical and professional content knowledge.
For key assessment #3, criteria 1 is related to understanding target population challenges, 4 is connected to synthesizing current research, and 5 is related to strategies for working with specific populations. These would appear to be connected to pedagogical and professional content knowledge.
For key assessment #5, section1items are about demographic and backgrounds of students and cognitive and social development while section 4 criteria are related to motivational characteristics, instructional plan support, and identification of individual differences. These appear connected to pedagogical and professional content

knowledge.

For key assessment #6, it is unclear what the contextual and cultural event analyses are and the rubric (attachment 6.2) does not appear to be connected to pedagogical and professional content knowledge.

Skills are assessed in:

Key assessment #2: Multiple Intelligences Unit/Lesson (criteria 1, 2, 3, 5) Key Assessment # 3: Case Study Informational Guide (criteria 2, 3, 5)

Key assessment #4: Formal Observations in the Field (criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10)

Key assessment #5: Case Study of a Learner (Section 1, criteria 4; Section 2, criteria 1, 3, 4;

Section 4, criteria 3; Section 5, criteria 1,2,3)

For key assessment #2, the criteria are related to instructional setting instructional objectives, assessment of objectives, instructional activities, and the rationale. These appear to be connected to the candidate's ability to develop a unit/lesson plan. It is unclear how a score would be differentiated between assessing the knowledge and the skill levels since the same rubric items are used to assess both.

For key assessment #3, the criteria relate to development of an action plan, review of professional resources, and instructional strategies for working with specific populations. The first two appear targeted to skills. The last (criteria 5) indicates only development of the strategy and it is unclear whether the skill of delivering the strategy is addressed. Again, criteria 5 is identified as both a measure for knowledge and skill and it is unclear how the two would be differentiated.

For key assessment #4, all criteria are related to skills in practice. It is not known why criteria and 8 were not included as assessments of pedagogical and professional skills.

For key assessment #5, section 1, criteria 4 is either a description and defense of the teaching strategy selected, or style and syntax and spelling. Assuming the latter is a numbering error, it would seem the dormer is a measure of skill. For section 2, the criteria are related to identification of the appropriate standard, appropriateness of the assessment selected, and adequateness of responses to assessment questions. These appear to be related to skills. Section 4, criteria 3 is identification of individual differences – the same item was used to assess knowledge as well. Section 5 criteria are related to teaching and assessing a lesson plan, using assessments for improvements, and re-teaching. These appear to be connected to pedagogical and professional skill.

Dispositions are assessed in:

Key assessment #6: Practicum Portfolio (dispositions rubric criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; portfolio rationale criteria 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

It is unclear what rubric is the dispositions criteria rubric. The portfolio rational rubric is assumed to be attachment 6.2 and there is no indication of assessment of dispositions in the rubric.

4.3. - Candidate effects on P-12 student learning and the creation of environments that support student learning:

According to the information on page 33 in the PSSR, impact on student learning is assessed through Assessment #5: Case Study of a Learner. The description of the assignment indicates the candidate designs and teaches a lesson to an identified student, assesses the results, and then revises the lesson. This would appear to be targeted to looking at student learning. It is unclear how the assessment indicates the pre and post learning achievement of the student.

Section 5 EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program:

Since this is a new program, no assessment results are yet available.

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Evidence that candidates are prepared to address the Hawaii Department of Education areas of special emphasis:

The assessments appear to include measures of the system of standards as the lesson plans require candidates to align their work to standards, although it is not always clear in the assignment itself to which standards they should be aligned.

It is unclear how professionalism, identified as the three Ps (preparation, participation, and punctuality), is measured within the courses; whether each is assessed separately with individual scores, whether a generic score is given separate from the course grade, or whether they are subsumed within the course grade. How they will be identified and reported as data for later review is unclear.

It is unclear how the program will determine that all candidates are prepared in beginning reading. The PSSR indicates that some track II candidates will take ED 291 to meet this requirement and that within that course there is a case study assessment to determine the candidate's proficiency. Other track II candidates may take the PLT, although it is not specified which PLT or how the PLT is aligned to proficiencies for beginning reading. For track I candidates, it is not indicated how their proficiency in this area will be assessed, the PSSR only indicates that they will be mentored.

In terms of technology, it indicates that candidates will be encouraged (but not required) to implement technology in the design and delivery of lessons. Although candidates may take the program via distance education, this would not be an indication of their ability to incorporate technology into instruction. It is unclear how candidates would obtain these skills within the program. The PSSR indicates that formal assessment of technology proficiency will be done through assessment #4 (Practicum). In reviewing the assessment (attachment 4.2) technology skills are referenced in criteria III (promotes responsible learner use of technology), criteria IV (uses supplementary resources and technologies effectively to ensure accessibility and relevance for all students), criteria VI (employs technology to support assessment practice to engage learners and address learner needs), criteria IX (advocates, models, and teaches safe and ethical use of technology), and criteria X (uses technological tools and a variety of communication strategies to build local and global learning communities that engage learners, families, and colleagues).

HAWAI`I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

SECTION 7 NATIVE HAWAIIAN CULTURE, HISTORY AND LANGUAGE

Evidence that candidates are prepared to incorporate Native Hawaiian culture, history and language into their instruction:

The PSSR indicates that candidates in both tracks will take courses in educational psychology, classroom management, and foundations of inclusion as evidence that candidates are prepared to incorporate Native Hawaiian culture, history, and language into instruction. There is insufficient evidence to determine how this is specifically addressed in those courses or candidates are assessed relative to their knowledge and ability in this area. Track II candidates also complete a multicultural education course, but insufficient information is given as to how this area is specifically addressed in the course. Not all candidates will have this course.

Evidence that student understanding of Native Hawaiian culture, history and language has been enhanced by candidates:

The PSSR indicates this will be assessed in Assessment #4 and Assessment #6. A review of Assessments #4 and #6 does not indicate any specific references to Native Hawaiian culture, history or language or evidence that students would be assessed on their knowledge of these areas.

**SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW PROGRAM SELF
STUDY REPORT**

SEPTEMBER 2012

PROGRAM	RECOM-MENDATION	RECOMMENDED AREAS for IMPROVEMENT	LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE
Career and Technical Education Program	Met	1. Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards. 2. Assessment of disciplinary content knowledge needs to be clarified. 3. The instructions for Assessment #4 must be clarified and expectations for proficiency articulated.	Same as USSR To ensure consistency in scoring provide a rubric/scoring guide that clearly defines the following terms: 1 – Well below proficiency (seldom or never observable) 2 –Approaching Proficiency (sometimes observable) 3 – Meets Proficiency (most of the time,

| | | 4. The program must clarify how students acquire the technology skills, the beginning reading competencies, and the knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language and how these are assessed. | Provide syllabi and assignments that require candidates to acquire technology skills, the beginning reading competencies,

 Provide course syllabi and assignments that provide evidence that the program is preparing candidates to incorporate Native Hawaiian culture, history and language into their instruction in the classroom. |
| | | 5. The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment. | Provide evidence of how P-12 student understanding of Native Hawaiian culture, history and language will be enhanced by teacher candidates. |

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: #1a: Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards.

Response to 1a: To clearly link assessments #2, 3, 5, and 6 to the HTSB standards using the criteria language and to establish levels of proficiency, the Unit will include the specific criteria language of the HTSB in the assessment rubric. In this way, if a Candidate scores at a particular level of proficiency on
the rubric, then that score represents the level of proficiency for a particular standard.

An example of this inclusion of the standard language is shown below for Assessment #2: Multiple Intelligences Unit Plan with Standards Based Lesson Plan

Original Rubric Criteria for "Meets With Excellence"	Revised Rubric Criteria for
#1: Instructional Objectives: All instructional objectives are drawn from CTE Standards, are observable and measurable, and are stated in student-friendly language And probably need to combine rationale criteria #5 to combine with this one. **#5: Rationale** Appropriate rationale provided that supports student learning of objective in a relevant and meaningful way.	**#1: Instructional Objectives and #5 Rationale:** All instructional objectives are drawn from CTE Standards, are observable and measurable, "The teacher has a deep knowledge of student content standards and learning progressions in the discipline(s) s/he teaches." (4n), "the teacher understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the discipline(s) s/he teaches" (4j)"understands the ways of knowing his/her discipline…" (5i), and "understands content and content standards and how these are

#2: Assessment:	#2: Assessment:
All assessments accurately measure the instructional objectives and provide clear evidence of students' achievement	All assessments accurately <u>"the teacher understands the range of types and multiple purposes of assessment and how to design, adapt,</u> <u>or select appropriate assessments to address specific learning goals and individual differences,</u> <u>and to minimize source of bias." (6k).</u> measure

	applications of assessment and knows how and when to use each" (6j) and provide clear evidence of students' achievement ("the teacher knows how to analyze assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning, to guide planning and instruction, and to provide meaningful feedback to all learners" (6l)
#3: Instructional Activity supports MI The purpose of the instructional activity(s) is clearly stated, relevant, and supports each MI.	**#3: Instructional Activity supports MI** The purpose of the instructional activity(s) is clearly stated, relevant, and supports each MI. "The teacher effectively uses multiple presentations and explanations that capture key ideas in the discipline, guide learners through learning progressions, and promote each learner's

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: Clarification of assessment of disciplinary content knowledge

Candidates applying to Leeward Community College for the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program will be evaluated by the Unit program counselor and a panel of CTE content experts in order to ensure entrance requirements have been met. The program counselor and panel will require documentation of successful completion of the Praxis I exam and will complete an assessment of degree attainment, content related coursework and/or specific experience in the career and technical field. Once the assessment has been completed the candidate's packet will be sent to the Admissions and Records office for official entry to Leeward Community College.

Candidates entering the program will follow one of two tracks:

Track I: Candidates entering the Alternative Certification program with a baccalaureate degree do not have to demonstrate industry experience upon entry, however, an evaluation of their credentials will guide a course of study which will include determining the method of documenting content knowledge prior to student teaching in the second semester. Assessments in each education course will demonstrate the practical application of career and technical content knowledge driven by Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) which are aligned with HTSB standards. In addition, content knowledge will be assessed prior to student teaching in one of the following ways:

- A passing score on the Praxis in the content area, if available; Or,
- Current valid National Industry Certification in the teaching license field; Or,
- Professional certification from a national organization or association; Or,
- Current journey worker status in a specific field, verified by current licensed employer; Or,
- Valid industry license in the teaching license field; Or
- 30 hours of coursework in the content area; Or
- If none of the previous options exist, documentation of 5 years of successful industry experience related to the content area. This experience must be aligned with the CTE content for licensure. For instance, if a candidate is seeking licensure in the culinary arts, he/she must have documented experience as a chef, not just working as a busboy in a restaurant.

Track II: Candidates entering the Alternative Certification program with an Associate of Arts degree must demonstrate a minimum of 3 years of industry experience specific to the CTE licensure field. In addition, content knowledge will be determined prior to student teaching in one of the following ways:

- Praxis in the content area, if available; Or,
- Current valid National Industry Certification in the teaching license field; Or,
- Professional certification from a national organization or association; Or,
- Current journey worker status in a specific field, verified by current licensed employer; Or,
- Valid industry license in the teaching license field; Or
- 30 hours of coursework in the content area; Or

The design of the Alternative Certification program is informed by the Hawai`i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) approved new business item 09-41 App.1/28/10 entitled: "HTSB Career and Technical Education Work Group Report and Recommendations" and 10-42 Rev. App. 1/24/11, entitled: "Alternative Route to Licensure for Career and Technical Education License Fields

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to describe the steps it has taken to eliminate bias in assessments and describe the processes to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment instruments and procedures.

To eliminate bias in assessments, the Unit developed assessments that are accurate, consistent, and fair. To ensure accurate assessments, the Unit based all assessments on the specific criteria outlined in the Disciplinary and HTSB Standards and incorporated the specific language of each standard into assessment rubric criteria. In addition, each assessment rubric includes four levels of proficiency in order to ensure that it is clear to the Candidate the highest levels of effort and skill required by the standards and the teaching profession.

To ensure consistent assessments, each faculty member of the Unit is trained on how to score and rate each assessment (through discussion) to ensure agreement of results. Each of the Candidate's key assessments is scored by at least 2 faculty members. To ensure fair assessments, the key assessments were developed as a group and faculty members actively looked for any assignments that might favor one type of learner over another.

In addition, to minimize the bias of the assessment as a result of the Candidate's background or the context of the learning environment, the Unit developed assessments that allow the Candidate to communicate his or her assignments in a medium that best suits his or her strengths and to provide multiple opportunities for Candidates to improve their score on those assessments. In this way, Candidates are assured that the key assessments that determine their level of proficiency as a CTE teacher are clearly tied to disciplinary and teaching standards (accuracy), scored by rubrics using multiple instructors (consistency), and developed to support and reflect the diversity and strengths of all learners (fairness).

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The instructions for Assessment #4 must be clarified and expectations for proficiency articulated.

ED295B Practicum - OBSERVATION FORM

The Observation form, attachment 4.1, will be used by the Faculty Evaluator as he/she completes 5 formal evaluations in the Student Teaching semester (ED 295B) for the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure Program. The evaluator will use this form to record observational notes focusing on the alignment with HTSB standards. This form is to be used for commentary with no assessment score. The Evaluator will use this form with all students.

The Evaluator will use the recorded information (the commentary) on 4.1 as the basis for the scores on 4.2, the Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation, which is the assessment tool used in the student teaching or clinical practice experience.

In response to the reviewers comment regarding the inconsistency of the alignment of bulleted items in 4.1 (ED 295B Observation Form) under the content standards (Standard 4 and Standard 5) with the content knowledge on 4.2 (Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation) (Section IV and Section V). The two forms are consistent, both coming directly from each of the HTSB/INTASC standards. They are measuring two different areas of each standard: Performances and Critical Dispositions.

The Dispositions Observation Form 4.1 was created as a response to the conversation among colleagues at the NCATE conference in Las Vegas as well as by our Unit faculty related to whether or not one can measure if a candidate possesses/embodies/exemplifies dispositions. Form 4.1 is to be used by the faculty evaluator to simply notate during field observation whether/how/when/where the candidate exemplifies or demonstrates the disposition. The form was created to address the need of measuring or recording whether the candidate demonstrates each of the 10 inTASC dispositions.

The evaluation form (4.2) (with numerical evaluation 1-4) measures the Performance Standards also taken directly from the HTSB/INTASC standards.

In addition the following statement has been added to the Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation (Attachment 4.2) regarding expectations for proficiency.

Directions: Please evaluate the candidate's performance *in each box* **using the following key:**

1 – Well below proficiency (seldom or never observable)
2 –Approaching Proficiency (sometimes observable)
3 – Meets Proficiency (most of the time, observable)
4 –Meets with Excellence (always observable)
NA – No opportunity to judge

*Candidates must demonstrate proficiency by scoring a summary rating of 3; Meets Proficiency, Or 4; Meets with Excellence, in areas I – X.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The program must clarify how students acquire the technology skills, the beginning reading competencies, and the knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language and how these are assessed.

Candidates in the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program will complete a full year of Practicum. ED 295A (first semester of study) will be field experience or Observation and Participation (O&P) and ED 295B (Student Teaching or Clinical Practice with 5 formal observations).

When enrolled in ED 295A, Field Experience Practicum (first semester of study), Candidates will acquire the technology skills, the beginning reading competencies, and the knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language through the Field Experience Practicum Seminar (which is the coursework for ED 295A). With content delivered through Laulima (the distance education site used by the University of Hawai`i system), modules will be delivered and assessed by Unit faculty who has expertise in these specific areas as follows:

In a 16 week semester course of study:

Weeks 1-5: Candidates will acquire technology skills and will be assessed through online forum discussions, activities and an Observation & Participation report related to using and/or observing the integration of technology in a classroom. This segment will also provide instruction and tutorials in the use of Laulima and other online tools.

Weeks 6-10: Candidates will acquire beginning reading competencies through content specific modules and will be assessed through online forum discussions and an Observation & Participation report related to using and/or observing reading/writing strategies to support the successful literacy development of all students.

Weeks 11- 16: Candidates will acquire knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language through content specific modules and will be assessed through online forum discussions and an Observation & Participation report related to using and/or observing strategies to support the learning styles of Native Hawaiian students.

Observation & Participation (3 reports) The purpose of pre-student teaching field experiences (O&P) is to provide candidates pursuing the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure, a systematic, planned sequence of experiences in the Career and Technical high school classroom. These experiences are designed to familiarize students with principles of classroom management and the teaching-learning process with special emphasis on the use of technology, beginning reading competencies and knowledge related to Native Hawaiian culture, history and language. Through in class observation and participation candidates will be able to blend theory and practice as it is applied in real school environments.

Candidates will complete three Observation & Participation reports during the semester and will be assessed on the following:

Content of Reports – Three Parts:

Part One - Describe the context without using names of students or teachers (give grade level and type of school, general description of students). Help your readers visualize the class.

Part Two - Select one of the following questions. Let the reader know which question you have chosen and why. Use a different question for each of your 3 reports. Notice that these questions work for any content area.

Unit 1: Technology

> 1. Describe the ways in which technology was used or could have been used effectively in the class you observed.
>
> 2. Summarize what you saw or experienced happening during each phase of a lesson. Evaluate the lesson focusing on what worked and what might the teacher or yourself have done differently related to the integration of technology?

Unit 2: Beginning reading competencies:

> 1. Motivation is a major factor in learning. Describe the levels of motivation you observed or implemented, and what the teacher/ or yourself, did to direct student motivation toward the outcome of the lesson. Please focus on the components of balanced literacy; reading, writing, listening and speaking.
>
> 2. If the class you observe includes students with literacy challenges what differentiation or accommodations do you see regarding the instruction?
>
> 3. To what extent do you see evidence of Cambourne's Conditions of Learning? These are summarized below.

Unit 3: Knowledge related to native Hawaiian culture, history and language:

> 1. Describe the ways in which strategies to support the learning styles of Native Hawaiian students was used or could have been used effectively in the class you observed.

Part Three

- Evaluate the lesson by making connections to the content of this course. Give your specific ideas on what could have been done differently to enhance learning for the whole class and/or particular students. Include at least one reference citing specific information from the content module. If it seems perfect as is, what do you suggest for the following lessons? The goal of this part of the assignment is to make connections with course content, and to reflect on what you have observed.

I. Cambourne's Conditions for Learning (adapted for the Alternative Certification candidate)

Brian Cambourne is an Australian educator whose work is based on many years of classroom observations. This may be useful in your reflections on classroom observations.

- **Immersion** – Learners need to be immersed in a wide range of activities

- **Demonstration** – Learners benefit from demonstrations—that is, from explanations and models which enable them to see how content is conceived, constructed, used.

- **Expectation** – Learners are influenced—either stimulated or inhibited—by the expectations of those around them, mainly by adults or peers they respect.

- **Responsibility** – Learners grow in self-reliance if allowed to make their own decisions about the when-how-what of their learning tasks.

- **Employment** – Learners must have time and opportunities, in realistic situations, to practice or employ their developing control over what they are learning.

- **Approximation** – Learners work confidently when assured that learning is not copied "correctness" but "approximation", trial-and-error improvement.

- **Response** – Learners are upheld in their efforts – acknowledged and supported when those around them respond with interest to their words and work.

- **Engagement** – These conditions contribute to active learning, not mechanically, but as factors in the interaction between students and a teacher who demonstrates an enjoyment of the students, the subject and teaching itself.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment.

Assessment #6.2: Two assessments are used by the Unit to measure the candidate's disposition as a teaching professional: (1) five formal classroom visits to observe the candidate's dispositions as determined by scores on the disposition's rubric criteria #1-10 and (2) twenty written rationales that require the candidate to self-evaluate and defend how a particular teaching artifact provides evidence that he or she demonstrates a particular disposition as determined by scores on the written rationale rubric. The Unit believes that multiple measures are needed for the assessment of candidate's dispositions as a teaching professional and these measures should not only be derived from direct observations in the field but also from the Candidate's own reflection and self-evaluation.

The review committee commented that the rubric criteria for the second assessment (written rationales) appears to measure only the justification for the candidate inclusion of the teaching artifact and does not measure the candidate's disposition or the level of proficiency. The Unit does agree that the current rubric lacks enough detail to make this connection between teaching artifact and Candidate disposition explicit.

To address this issue with the second assessment, the rubric for the written rationale was expanded to include extra criterion that measures the candidate's ability to:
• (1) include and connect specific language of a particular disciplinary and HTSB disposition standard to a particular teaching artifact.

• (2) provide appropriate, sufficient, and in-depth evidence using specific examples from a particular teaching artifact on how it demonstrates a particular disciplinary and HTSB disposition standard.

Here, the Unit's rationale for this extra criterion is that an in-depth evidentiary defense based on specific professional language connected to specific examples of how the teaching artifact demonstrates a particular disciplinary and disposition standard is evidence for the Unit that the Candidate has demonstrated that standard. The level of proficiency for a particular standard is determined by the level of proficiency scored on the rubric overall.

For example, an automotive teacher wishes to demonstrate the disciplinary content standard of "bleeding a brake system" (CTE Standard Automotive 5b) and his or her disposition to "respect learner's differing strengths and needs" [Dispositions HTSB standard 1(a)] by choosing a "fixing brake systems" lesson plan as a teaching portfolio artifact. To "Meet with Excellence" on the written rationale rubric, the Candidate will need to clearly describe the fixing brake system's lesson objectives, include the specific disciplinary and disposition standard it represents by including the specific language of those standards, and then use specific examples from the lesson plan to provide the breadth and depth needed for the Candidate to make the case that he or she demonstrated that disciplinary and disposition standard. It is the Unit's belief that if a Candidate fully demonstrates all three criteria listed above, then he or she has the demonstrated the particular disciplinary and disposition standard with the highest level of proficiency as shown on the rubric's "Meets with Excellence".

.

Hawaii Teacher Standards Board
State Approval of Teacher Education
Unit Self Study Report Template

Leeward Community College Career and Technical Education Program

Team:

Dr. Christine Sorensen

Bryant Ching

S.A.T.E. Consultant:
Carolyn Gyuran

Type of Visit:

X First

TABLEOFCONTENTS

Page

SUMMARYFORPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution: Leeward Community College

- Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	**Advanced**
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	M	N/A
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	NM	N/A
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	N/A
4	Diversity	M	N/A
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	N/A
6	Unit Governance and Resources	M	N/A

M =Standard Met
NM =Standard Not Met
NA =Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I.   INTRODUCTION

Leeward Community College (LCC) is part of the University of Hawaii system and is located on the Leeward side of the island of Oahu. As an open access institution with about 8,000 students enrolled, LCC provides technical training and programs that lead to transfer to four- year institutions. LCC provides instruction at its main campus in Pearl City as well as at a satellite campus in Waianae and via distance education.

LCC began offering education courses in 2006 and the Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) degree was permanently approved in 2009. The 62-hour AAT prepares candidates to serve as educational assistants in schools or to transfer to a four-year program to complete teacher training. As of 2011, the AAT had approximately 400 candidates enrolled. The CTE program is being developed as a track within the AAT program and will be offered entirely via distance learning to accommodate working adults and is designed to be completed in one year.

Responding to a need in the state, LCC began development of the CTE program. No other institutions in the state offer an approved program in CTE. The program is designed to serve two populations: those with a baccalaureate degree who wish to return to some post-baccalaureate training to become a licensed teacher (an 11 credit program) and those who have an associate's degree and relevant industry experience who wish to acquire a limited license to teach only in a CTE field (a 17 hour program). The CTE program is designed to be an alternate route to licensure.

Faculty in the AAT program include 3 assistant professors and 2 instructors who are full time, one part-time instructor and 2 lecturers.

II.   CONCEPTUALFRAMEWORK

Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The Conceptual Framework of CORE (Collaborative, Oriented to Students, Relevant, and Effective) focuses on developing community focused educators who believe all students can learn. The CORE framework crosses all AAT areas, although the unit does not indicate how these are assessed across the AAT. The same conceptual framework provides guidance for the CTE alternative route. The conceptual framework is grounded in the work of such authors and theorists as Gilligan, Wenger, Dewey, Vygotsky, Gardner, Ladson-Billings, Gay, Kincheloe, Kana'iaupuni, Hong,et. Al., Ginott, Zeichner, Tharp et.al, Counts, and Friere. The CORE principles are aligned with HTSB standards. The conceptual framework is aligned with the institutional vision and mission.

It is unclear how the conceptual framework is assessed through the assessment cycle of plan, assess, analyze, and improve and the assessment system itself is not well described in the conceptual framework segment of the USSR.

The framework itself is reported to have been developed by Judith Kappenberg in 2005 with the cooperation of Hawaii Department of Education, College of Education faculty at the University of Hawaii at Manoa and Leeward Community College Administration. It was

further developed with input from the Unit program director and instructors. The USSR indicates that the Unit advisory board members (comprised of educators and community leaders) also contributed to the framework. It is unclear who the members of the advisory board are or how frequently the meet or the method by which they provided input to the framework.

III. STANDARDS

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Some of the information in the USSR is inconsistent with what is presented in the PSSR. These differences need clarification. For example, on page 31, it indicates content knowledge is assessed via Praxis content tests or experience in item 1, however, item 2 references only back to item 1. In the PSSR there are a number of other assessments that purport to assess candidate content knowledge in addition to the Praxis content and experience. The graduate and employer follow-up information provided on page 32 in the USSR is not referenced in the PSSR and not listed in the transition point measures. The USSR indicates candidate pedagogical content knowledge is assessed in the Multiple Intelligences Unit/Lesson plan (key assessment #2 in the PSSR) and the Practicum Portfolio (key assessment #4 in the PSSR).   This is not consistent with the information presented in the PSSR under the section on measures of pedagogical content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.   The assessments in the USSR indicated as measuring candidate pedagogical skills include the practicum portfolio, the student teaching assessments, the case study of a learner, and the case informational guide. This is inconsistent with the information in the PSSR. Data to assess candidate impact on student learning is reported in the USSR to be collected via the student teaching evaluations, the case study of a learner, and the multiple intelligences unit/lesson plans. This is inconsistent with information in the PSSR. Dispositions are listed in the PSSR that are inconsistent with the information in the USSR. The USSR indicates that the dispositions and learning outcomes are one and the same (CORE). The USSR indicates dispositions are assessed in the practicum portfolio and in student teaching observations. This is inconsistent with information in the PSSR.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation			

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Content is assessed via the PRAXIS II or documentation of experience (industry certification, professional certification, journey worker status, industry license, 30 hours of coursework, or five years of successful industry experience). It is unclear how the 30 hours of coursework and the 5 years of industry experience will be evaluated to indicate current content proficiency. It is not entirely clear when this assessment would occur during the program. No other key assessments for content are noted in the USSR. There are, however, additional indicators listed in the PSSR (see PSSR report). These need to be described in the USSR. An exit survey is indicated as a measure of content preparation for graduate follow-up studies. Exit interviews would not be an appropriate indicator for follow-up studies which imply gathering information from completers after they have had post-program experience in the field. The USSR indicates that exit interviews will focus on short and long term goals and perceptions of the program rather than focusing on whether the candidates perceive that they were adequately prepared in the content area for their experience in the field. While the report indicates that employers will be contacted by phone to gather follow up information, it is not clear how this will occur or what questions will be asked.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills for Teacher Candidates –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills for Teacher Candidates –Advanced Teacher Preparation			

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The key assessments for pedagogical content knowledge and skills listed in the USSR are the Multiple Intelligences Unit/Lesson plans and the Practicum portfolio. This is inconsistent with the PSSR. However, the PSSR does list assessments that would seem to measure pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Technology integration is assessed during student teaching. The rubrics in the PSSR for the student teaching observation have a limited number of items that assess technology.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: NA

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation			

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

While the descriptions of the assessments in the USSR for this area are insufficient and inconsistent with the PSSR, overall the assessments seem to address general pedagogical knowledge and skills. The assessment of disciplinary specific pedagogical knowledge and skills is not evident.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: NA

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation			

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The USSR indicates that student learning is assessed in student teaching and in the case study. The PSSR indicates this is assessed in the Case Study only. The Case Study focuses on selecting one student, designing a lesson, teaching the lesson, assessing the student's knowledge, and adjusting instruction.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: NA

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1e. Knowledge & Skills for Other School Professionals			

Summary of Findings: NA

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals			

Summary of Findings: NA

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation			
1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Other School Professionals			

Summary of Findings:

The dispositions to be assessed are unclear and differ in the USSR and PSSR. The USSR lists the dispositions as the same as the conceptual framework program outcomes (CORE). Other listings of dispositions include the 3P's, and the rubrics in 4.1 and 6.2. How the dispositions are to be assessed is equally unclear. The USSR indicates assessment will occur in the practicum portfolio, however, the rubric for assessing the portfolio is not aligned with dispositions. The USSR also indicates dispositions will be assessed via the Alternative Certification Candidate Evaluation Form. This appears to be the form associated with the student teaching observations. How this form is aligned with dispositions is unclear. The PSSR indicates there is a dispositions rubric, but no such rubric was found in the PSSR. The PSSR also indicate the three P's will be assessed, although it is not clear if these are identified as dispositions or how they will be measured. Other items listed in the USSR as providing evidence that candidates have professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all children can learn include a philosophy paper, reflective writing papers, standards-based lesson plans, formal student teaching observations, and informal observations that are included in the candidate's practicum portfolio. The PSSR does not identify several of these items as required components of the portfolio, nor does the portfolio rubric clearly articulate how dispositions would be assessed.

Overall Assessment of Standard: While overall the program does appear to offer assessments tied to measurement of disciplinary content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, there are great inconsistencies between the information provided in the USSR and in the PSSR. Several of the rubrics are insufficiently developed and tied directly to the areas to be assessed. Clarification is needed on the identification of candidate dispositions and how they would be assessed.

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level)

NA

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:
1. Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards.

   Rationale: For example the assessment #6 (6.2) the language from the professional standards as well as the disciplinary standards are not evident. The standard 6 rubric only assesses proficiency of the candidate in describing their artifacts and justifying its inclusion rather than assessing candidate proficiency tied to the standards. The criteria should reflect the language of the standards.

2. The Unit must clarify the follow up studies of graduates and employers and how they are aligned with the assessment of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and dispositions.

   Rationale: There is no description of either of the above mentioned components. An exit survey is not the same as a graduate follow-up survey.

3. The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment.

   Rationale: There are several lists of dispositions mentioned (CORE, 3 P's, and attachment #4.1, #6.1) and there is no evidence of a systematic approach to assessing candidates.

Recommendation: Standard 1 is met (with areas for improvement)

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2a. Assessment System –Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
2a. Assessment System –Advanced Preparation			
Summary of Findings:			

It is not clear how the professional community was involved in the development of the assessment system. The USSR provides insufficient information about how the assessment system is linked to the conceptual framework and professional and state standards. Candidates are assessed using multiple measures, however, transition points need to be better defined and when key assessments are collected in relationship to the transition points explicated. Transition points are described inconsistently within the report. Program assessment is largely based on Annual Program Review. While candidate progress is clearly monitored, how the candidate data contributes to the program review is unclear. Specific measures of unit operations are not well defined and it is also unclear how course evaluations are used as part of program review. Participating in the institution's curriculum process itself is not an assessment of the curriculum and its effectiveness in preparing candidates. The unit has not assessed bias in its assessments nor made an effort to establish fairness, accuracy and consistency of assessment procedures and unit operations. The USSR indicates only that candidates will be informed about the assessments, provided clear assignments and rubrics, and given samples. None of these strategies address issues of bias, fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment. The fact of using rubrics is not sufficient to determine whether the rubrics are unbiased, and applied fairly, accurately and with consistency.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, &Evaluation–Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, &Evaluation– Advanced Preparation			
Summary of Findings:			

The timelines and processes for collecting, compiling, aggregating, analyzing and summarizing candidate data, unit operations data, and program quality data are not well articulated. The information technologies used to collect and maintain these data are not well described. The description of recording candidate complaints is restricted to course grade appeals and does not address other grievances candidates might bring forward. In addition, the response does not indicate where the records of complaints are kept.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation			

> **Summary of Findings:**
>
> No data are yet available for the program and thus it is difficult to determine how data will be used for program improvement.

Overall Assessment of Standard: The unit has not clearly articulated the assessment system and its components and the process for implementation. Differentiation between candidate assessment, program assessment, and unit operations is not well defined. Transition points are identified inconsistently and it is not clear how key assessments of candidates in the PSSR and other measures identified in the USSR are aligned with the transition points. Issues of bias in the assessments and the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment have not been addressed sufficiently.

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level): NA

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

1. The Unit must describe how the professional community is involved in the development and evaluation of its assessment system regularly and systematically.

   Rationale: It is not evident that the professional community provides input into the development and evaluation of the assessment system.

2. The unit needs to describe the steps it has taken to eliminate bias in assessments and describe the processes to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment instruments and procedures.

   Rationale: There is no evidence of how these are addressed.

3. The unit needs to better describe the measures used to assess unit operations.

   Rationale: The Unit operations and program quality measures are not clearly articulated.

4. The unit needs to describe how they maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions. a method to document complaints and their resolutions.

   Rationale: The USSR describes only the grade appeal process and does not address the maintenance of records

Recommendation: Standard 2 is not met.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3a. Collaboration between Unit &School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
3a. Collaboration between Unit &School Partners– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

It is clear that the unit has established working relationships with partners in the field. However, it is unclear how the field partners (mentor teachers and principals) have provided input into the design, delivery, and evaluation of the field experiences. The USSR notes that a luncheon is held to provide updates for principals, but their role in providing input into the program is not described. The role of the mentor teacher or mentor principal in the evaluation of the candidate is also not clear, partly because there is not adequate description of the responsibilities of the field-based mentors versus the faculty evaluator. The unit and the field partners jointly place students.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences &Clinical Practice–Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
3b. Design ,Implementation, &Evaluation of Field Experiences &Clinical Practice–Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

The field requirements are articulated and assessed via observations. Entry and exit requirements for clinical practice could be better described. It is unclear how the unit ensures that all candidates are prepared to use information technology to support teaching and learning. There is inconsistency in the description of the criteria for selecting school-based faculty. For candidates who are not hired as teachers of record, it is assumed they will be in classrooms with mentor teachers. For candidates who are hired as teachers of record, it is assumed they will be mentored by someone at the school site (principal or teacher). Both of these categories would be defined as school-based faculty. On page 49 it indicates adjunct mentors/evaluators will be selected and trained and requirements will include a master's degree in education and middle or secondary teaching experience. Knowledge and experience in CTE is only recommended and not required. It is unclear if these adjuncts are serving as university supervisors or school-based mentors. On page 52, however, there is no description of criteria for school-based clinical faculty and no criteria noted that are related to their accomplishments as school professionals. While these school based clinical faculty may not yet be in place for CTE, it is assumed they are in place in the unit (AAT) and that there is professional development available to support them in their roles. Even if they are not in place for CTE, the unit could identify professional development they plan to make available and whether this is different from the training described on page 49 for the mentors/evaluators.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3c. Candidates' Development &Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, &Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn–Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
3c. Candidates' Development &Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, &Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Entry requirements for clinical practice are limited. The descriptions of the assessments used to demonstrate candidate development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions is inconsistently described between the USSR and PSSR. However, the PSSR does provide an indication that candidate knowledge and skills are assessed. The dispositions assessment is not clearly addressed. There are references to assessments in the USSR that do not appear elsewhere and are not defined. The candidate self-reflection noted in the USSR is not defined elsewhere. The roles of the school mentor, principal, and university supervisor are not well articulated and differentiated.

Overall Assessment of Standard: While overall Field Experiences and Clinical Practice are addressed and candidate knowledge and skills assessed, there is insufficient information in several areas and inconsistent information between the USSR and the PSSR. While candidates are summatively assessed in their second semester (student teaching experience), during the first semester only formative feedback is provided. Clarity is lacking as to the roles and responsibilities for the school-based faculty as well as the faculty evaluator. The role and involvement of the professional community in designing, delivering, and evaluation field and clinical experiences is unclear.

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level): NA

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

1. The Unit needs to describe how the unit's school partners participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences.

   Rationale: There is limited and unclear evidence that the school partners participate in this process.

2. The Unit needs to clearly articulate criteria for school-based faculty and how they meet state requirements for content expertise.

   Rationale: CTE experience is recommended and not required.

3. The Unit needs to clearly define how candidates are provided adequate opportunities in clinical practice to systematically use technology to support teaching and learning.

Rationale: Candidate use of technology is only mentioned during practicum and not identified as required in lesson/unit plan development.

4. The Unit needs to clearly define the role of the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty in the assessment of candidate performance during clinical practice.

Rationale: It is unclear who assesses candidate performance.

Recommendation: Standard 3 is met (with areas for improvement)

Standard 4: *Diversity*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4a. Design, Implementation, &Evaluation of Curriculum &Experiences –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
4a. Design, Implementation, &Evaluation of Curriculum &Experiences – Advanced Preparation			
Summary of Findings: CORE is connected to diversity competencies. Assignments are described in the PSSR that are directed to ensuring candidates are prepared to address the needs of diverse learners.			

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty– Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty– Advanced Preparation			
Summary of Findings: The faculty members include two Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders, three Caucasians, and one faculty member of mixed race and an equal number of male and female faculty. Information is not provided related to the potential diversity of school-based faculty in the partner schools. Several of the faculty has experiences working with diverse groups.			

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates– Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates– Advanced Preparation			
Summary of Findings: Students in the unit are diverse and the unit serves a diverse community.			

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

The Unit's school partners have diverse student populations, including students from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds as well as special education students/

Overall Assessment of Standard: The unit provides adequate opportunities for candidates to work with diverse faculty, peers and students.

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level): NA

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

Recommendation: Standard 4 is met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5a. Qualified Faculty–Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
5a. Qualified Faculty– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

It is not clear who comprises the Unit faculty. There is inconsistent information: table 1 (pg.9) indicates there are 8 full and part time faculty in the Unit, table #8 (pg. 60) indicates there are 6 faculty who work with candidates, and the information in Standard 5, section 5a, indicates there are 5 full and part time faculty. It is unclear that all school-based faculty will have licensure in the level and field for which they will be mentoring. One LCC-based faculty member has secondary experience and two have middle school level experience (graded 6-8). None are licensed in the CTE field. Only one faculty member has a doctorate. The others have school-based experience, but none in CTE. The 5 faculty appear to have experience in K-12 schools, however, the amount of experience for two of the faculty is unclear and the recency of the experience is not described. Because the program is at a community college, doctoral degrees are not the norm. Whether the LCC faculty have contemporary experiences in school settings is difficult to assess from the information provided.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Course assignments reflect well regarded practices. Faculty are evaluated regularly.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Scholarship is not defined. It appears faculty are engaged in scholarship reflective of their positions at a community college.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service– Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Faculty members are engaged in service at a level expected in their roles at a community college.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance–Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Regular faculty are systematically evaluated per union contract and system requirements. It is unclear how adjunct and school-based faculty are evaluated.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Professional development opportunities are made available.

Overall Assessment of Standard: The professional education faculty do not appear to have the expertise and contemporary professional experiences needed for their assignments. Although scholarship is not defined, faculty appear to be engaged in different types of scholarly work as well as providing service to the college and broader community. The Unit conducts systematic evaluations of faculty and professional development activities are provided.

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level): NA

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

1. The Unit needs to ensure that all school based faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise.

   Rationale: The USSR indicates that licensure in CTE is recommended but not required.

2. The Unit needs to clearly explain how it ensures that all professional education faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise.

   Rationale: Recency of their experiences in P-12 settings is not evident.

3. The Unit needs to articulate how it systematically and regularly evaluates school based clinical and part-time professional education faculty members.

   Rationale: While the evaluation process for LCC full time faculty is described there is no information provided on how filed based faculty and part-time faculty are evaluated.

Recommendation: Standard 5 is met (with areas for improvement)

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6a. Unit Leadership &Authority–Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6a. Unit Leadership &Authority– Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

The Unit has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate its programs of study. The admission requirements for LCC are described. They reach out to potential candidates using both social networking and face to face information sessions in various venues. It is unclear how distance students access campus based services. There is insufficient evidence that the Unit effectively engages cooperating P–12 teachers and other practicing professionals in program design, implementation, and evaluation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6b. Unit Budget –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

It is unclear whether the Unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations at least proportional to other units on campus with clinical components or similar units at other campuses. It is unclear how the budget adequately supports clinical components.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6c. Personnel –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

Full time faculty teach 15 credits one semester and 12 the following. Time is assigned for administrative duties. Workload policies follow union regulations. No information is provided to ensure that full time faculty supervising clinical practice have no more than 18 candidates per semester, however it is unlikely this will be an issue for this program. Professional development is available for faculty and support personnel are provided.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6d. Unit Facilities –Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

The unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards. The facilities support faculty and candidate use of information technology in instruction.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6e. Unit Resources including Technology–Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6e. Unit Resources including Technology–Advanced Preparation			

Summary of Findings:

The Unit uses TK-20 for monitoring candidate performance. Distance education infrastructure is available. Access is provided and adequate for candidate resources such as the library.

Overall Assessment of Standard: In general the Unit provides adequate resources and facilities to support the program

Summary of Strengths (Areas Addressed at the Target Level): Areas

for Improvement and Rationales:

1. The Unit needs to provide more detailed budget information.

Rationale: No information is provided to show the consistence of support for this program relative to other programs. No information is provided on how the budget supports the clinical components of the program.

Recommendation: Standard 6 is met

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: NA

SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP
REVIEWS
UNIT SELF STUDY REPORT
September, 2012

TEAM FINDINGS

STANDARD	RECOMMENDATION	RECOMMENDED AREAS for IMPROVEMENT	LCC RESPONSE
1. Candidate Knowledge , Skills, and Professional Dispositions 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Met	1a. Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards. 1a. The Unit must clarify the follow up studies of graduates and employers and how they are aligned with the assessment of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and dispositions. 1.g The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment.	

2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Met		
2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation		2a. The Unit must describe how the professional community is involved in the development and evaluation of its assessment system regularly and systematically.	
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, &Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation		2b. The unit needs to describe the steps it has taken to eliminate bias in assessments and describe the processes to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment instruments and procedures.	
		2b. The unit needs to better describe the measures used to assess unit operations.	
		2b. The unit needs to describe how they maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions. a method to document complaints and their resolutions.	

3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met		
3a. Collaboration between Unit &School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation		3a. The Unit needs to describe how the unit's school partners participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences.	
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences &Clinical Practice– Initial Teacher Preparation		3b. The Unit needs to clearly articulate criteria for school-based faculty and how they meet state requirements for content expertise. 3b. The Unit needs to clearly define how candidates are provided adequate opportunities in clinical practice to systematically use technology to support teaching and learning.	
3c. Candidates' Development &Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, &Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn–Initial Teacher		3c. The Unit needs to clearly define the role of the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty in the assessment of candidate performance during clinical practice.	

4. Diversity	Met		
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development 5a. Qualified Faculty– Initial Teacher Preparation	Met	5a. The Unit needs to ensure that all school based faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise. 5a. The Unit needs to clearly explain how it ensures that all professional education faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise.	
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance –Initial Teacher Preparation		5e. The Unit needs to articulate how it systematically and regularly evaluates school based clinical and part-time professional education faculty members.	
6. Unit Governance and Resources 6b. Unit Budget –Initial Teacher Preparation	Met	6b. The Unit needs to provide more detailed budget information.	

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: #1a: Assessment Rubrics for assessments #2, #3, #5, and #6 must be clearly linked to the standards within the criteria language and linked to levels of proficiency on the standards.

Response to 1a: To clearly link assessments #2, 3, 5, and 6 to the HTSB standards using the criteria language and to establish levels of proficiency, the Unit will include the specific criteria language of the HTSB in the assessment rubric. In this way, if a Candidate scores at a particular level of proficiency on
the rubric, then that score represents the level of proficiency for a particular standard.

An example of this inclusion of the standard language is shown below for Assessment #2: Multiple Intelligences Unit Plan with Standards Based Lesson Plan

Original Rubric Criteria for "Meets With Excellence"	Revised Rubric Criteria for
#1: Instructional Objectives: All instructional objectives are drawn from CTE Standards, are observable and measurable, and are stated in student-friendly language And probably need to combine rationale criteria #5 to combine with this one. **#5: Rationale** Appropriate rationale provided that supports student learning of objective in a relevant and meaningful way.	**#1: Instructional Objectives and #5 Rationale:** All instructional objectives are drawn from CTE Standards, are observable and measurable, "The teacher has a deep knowledge of student content standards and learning progressions in the discipline(s) s/he teaches." (4n), "the teacher understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the discipline(s) s/he teaches" (4j)"understands the ways of knowing his/her discipline…" (5i), and "understands content and content standards and how these are

#2: Assessment:	#2: Assessment:
All assessments accurately measure the instructional objectives and provide clear evidence of students' achievement	All assessments accurately <u>"the teacher understands the range of types and multiple purposes of assessment and how to design, adapt,</u> <u>or select appropriate assessments to address specific learning goals and individual differences,</u>

	the difference between formative and summative applications of assessment and knows how and when to use each" (6j) and provide clear evidence of students' achievement ("the teacher knows how to analyze assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning, to guide planning and instruction, and to provide meaningful feedback to all learners" (6l)
#3: Instructional Activity supports MI The purpose of the instructional activity(s) is clearly stated, relevant, and supports each MI.	**#3: Instructional Activity supports MI** The purpose of the instructional activity(s) is clearly stated, relevant, and supports each MI. "The teacher effectively uses multiple presentations and explanations that capture key ideas in the discipline, guide learners through learning progressions, and promote each learner's

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit must clarify the follow

up studies of
graduates and employers and how they are aligned with the assessment of
content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and
dispositions.

The Unit has created a database which will track Candidates and collect the results of their key assessments for the Alternative Certification Degree. During the last semester of attendance, the Candidates will complete an "Exit Survey" which provides feedback from the Candidate on current employment, future goals, and their perception of the Unit's preparation of the ten HTSB standards. After graduation, the CTE candidate will be contacted a year later and asked to participate in a "Follow-up survey" This survey essentially asks the same types of questions as the Exit Survey, but proficiency of the 10 HTSB standards is in the context of the Candidate in his/her current teaching job. An additional survey will be completed by each Candidate's employer, which again asks the same questions for the 10 HTSB standards as the Exit Survey, but in the context of the employer of the Candidate.

To collect information from alumni and employers about graduates' professional dispositions, assessment of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge and skills, the program will use a graduate follow-up survey which will document candidate's perceptions of the program. Through an online survey, graduates will reflect on the level of preparation and rate the program on a scale as follows:

Alumni Follow-up Survey (Example)

This survey is in development and will be expanded to include all questions to measure the ten HTSB/inTASC standards….for example: a question on Learner Development,

1. The Alternative Certification for CTE licensure program prepared me to have an understanding of the learner's development. The survey will also include a question on current employment with contact information.

Name _____

The Alternative program provided an in-depth knowledge of the course content. | Strongly Agree ▼ |

The CORE classes were rigorous and were designed to make meaningful connections in my course of study.

[Strongly Agree ▼]

The Signature Assignments had me demonstrate that as an experienced CTE professional I could extend my own

knowledge and improve other's learning. [Strongly Agree ▼]

The Practicum portfolio extended my reflection of professional responsibilities aligned with InTASC standards.

[Strongly Agree ▼]

In what areas of your educational preparation would you have liked to have had more instruction?

In what ways did your program prepare you to work more effectively with students?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your feedback is very important.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The expected dispositions must be clarified and evidence provided of their systematic assessment.

The expected dispositions that candidates in the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program will demonstrate are the ten HTSB/InTASC teacher dispositions.

Assessment #6.2: Two assessments are used by the Unit to measure the candidate's disposition as a teaching professional: (1) five formal classroom visits to observe the candidate's dispositions as determined by scores on the disposition's rubric criteria #1-10 and (2) twenty written rationales that require the candidate to self-evaluate and defend how a particular teaching artifact provides evidence that he or she demonstrates a particular disposition as determined by scores on the written rationale rubric. The Unit believes that multiple measures are needed for the assessment of candidate's dispositions as a teaching professional and these measures should not only be derived from direct observations in the field but also from the Candidate's own reflection and self-evaluation.

The review committee commented that the rubric criteria for the second assessment (written rationales) appears to measure only the justification for the candidate inclusion of the teaching artifact and does not measure the candidate's disposition or the level of proficiency. The Unit does agree that the current rubric lacks enough detail to make this connection between teaching artifact and Candidate disposition explicit.

To address this issue with the second assessment, the rubric for the written rationale was expanded to include extra criterion that measures the candidate's ability to:
• (1) include and connect specific language of a particular disciplinary and HTSB disposition standard to a particular teaching artifact.

• (2) provide appropriate, sufficient, and in-depth evidence using specific examples from a particular teaching artifact on how it demonstrates a particular disciplinary and HTSB disposition standard.

Here, the Unit's rationale for this extra criterion is that an in-depth evidentiary defense based on specific professional language connected to specific examples of how the teaching artifact demonstrates a particular disciplinary and disposition standard is evidence for the Unit that the Candidate has demonstrated that standard. The level of proficiency for a particular standard is determined by the level of proficiency scored on the rubric overall.

For example, an automotive teacher wishes to demonstrate the disciplinary content standard of "bleeding a brake system" (CTE Standard Automotive 5b) and his or her disposition to "respect learner's differing strengths and needs" [Dispositions HTSB standard 1(a)] by choosing a "fixing brake systems" lesson plan as a teaching portfolio artifact. To "Meet with Excellence" on the written rationale rubric, the Candidate will need to clearly describe the fixing brake system's lesson objectives, include the specific disciplinary and disposition standard it represents by including the specific language of those standards, and then use specific examples from the lesson plan to provide the breadth and depth needed for the Candidate to make the case that he or she demonstrated that disciplinary and disposition standard. It is the Unit's belief that if a Candidate fully demonstrates all three criteria listed above, then he or she has the demonstrated the particular disciplinary and disposition standard with the highest level of proficiency as shown on the rubric's "Meets with Excellence".

.

Attachment 2a.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit must describe how the professional community is involved in the development and evaluation of its assessment system regularly and systematically.

Members of the professional community have been involved in the development and evaluation of the Unit's assessment system since the initial development began. When the education courses for the Associate of Arts in Teaching program (the Unit) were in development, planning meetings regularly occurred between the Coordinator (Bobbie Martel) and University of Hawaii administration. Syllabi from UH Manoa's education courses became the guide for the development of the core education courses in the program. System wide meetings with representatives from the COE at UH Manoa, UH West Oahu and UH Hilo were an excellent way to evaluate the Unit's courses and assessment systems in relation to the IHE's.

During articulation meetings with the Dean and faculty at Chaminade University and University of Hawaii Manoa, the Unit's courses and assessments were discussed, evaluated and approved for degree articulation.

With emphasis on the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program, Dr. Kenneth Johnson, former Cooperative Education Coordinator for the University of Hawaii, Honolulu Community College and now Professor Emeritus, has been, and continues to be, an excellent mentor. His many years of research on alternative pathways and advocacy for career and technical education provided a wealth of information that influenced the structure of the course of study and assessment systems.

In addition, regular meetings with key figures, such as Bernadette Howard, Hawaii State Director for the National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium, and Sherilyn Lau, the CTE State Resource Teacher for the DOE, amongst others in the CTE fields, will continue to guide and evaluate the continued success of the program.

<div align="center">

Attachment 2b(2).

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

</div>

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to describe the steps it has taken to eliminate bias in assessments and describe the processes to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment instruments and procedures.

To eliminate bias in assessments, the Unit developed assessments that are accurate, consistent, and fair. To ensure accurate assessments, the Unit based all assessments on the specific criteria outlined in the Disciplinary and HTSB Standards and incorporated the specific language of each standard into assessment rubric criteria. In addition, each assessment rubric includes four levels of proficiency in order to ensure that it is clear to the Candidate the highest levels of effort and skill required by the standards and the teaching profession.

To ensure consistent assessments, each faculty member of the Unit is trained on how to score and rate each assessment (through discussion) to ensure agreement of results. Each of the Candidate's key assessments is scored by at least 2 faculty members. To ensure fair assessments, the key assessments were developed as a group and faculty members actively looked for any assignments that might favor one type of learner over another.

In addition, to minimize the bias of the assessment as a result of the Candidate's background or the context of the learning environment, the Unit developed assessments that allow the Candidate to communicate his or her assignments in a medium that best suits his or her strengths and to provide multiple opportunities for Candidates to improve their score on those assessments. In this way, Candidates are assured that the key assessments that determine their level of proficiency as a CTE teacher are clearly tied to disciplinary and teaching standards (accuracy), scored by rubrics using multiple instructors (consistency), and developed to support and reflect the diversity and strengths of all learners (fairness).

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to describe how they maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions, a method to document complaints and their resolutions.

Leeward Community College has a clearly defined method for documenting complaints and resolutions. The actions available are outlined in the Academic Grievance Procedures.
The Unit has not experienced a formal complaint to date, candidates are aware that they can approach faculty with any concerns, followed by a meeting with the Unit counselor and Coordinator (if necessary) and a resolution is agreed upon informally. When the complaint is solved within the Unit, a record of the concern and resolution is kept by the Unit Counselor and logged in SARS, the online program used for documentation and tracking for the counseling division.

 Unit candidates who have concern regarding an assignment or a course grade have the right to appeal. A Unit candidate who seeks to appeal must complete the following steps:

- First discuss the concern with the course instructor.
- If the candidate is not satisfied with the outcome with the course instructor, they can appeal to the Social Science Division Chair. Within fourteen calendar days of receipt of the student's report, the Division Chair will complete any consultation and shall notify the faculty member and the student in writing of his conclusion(s) and recommendation(s).
- Failing to achieve satisfactory resolution of an appeal of a final grade, the student may file an academic grievance, in writing, with the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate Student Committee.
- Copies of the Academic Grievance Procedures are available through the Office of the Dean of Student Services and on-line at http://www.leeward.hawaii.edu/files/StuPol_Acad_Grievance_Procedures__April2009.pdf
- Records of formal complaints and their resolutions are kept in the Student Services office.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to describe how the unit's school partners participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences.

The Unit has established working partnerships with multiple high schools on O`ahu and will continue to build partnerships State-wide. Administrators have embraced the mission of the alternative program and will welcome candidates to observe and participate through practicum in their CTE classrooms.

At this time, the design of the clinical practice assessments (for Observation & Participation as well as student teaching) has been developed by the Unit and is aligned with HTSB/InTASC standards. The Unit Coordinator serves as the liaison between Leeward Community College and the school partners.

Candidates who are employed by the DOE as interns in their own classrooms will not have a in class school-based lead teacher, but will be observed and evaluated by the faculty evaluator and a site supervisor (i.e., principal, vice principal, complex superintendent). Candidates who are not yet hired in a DOE school will be placed in a CTE content specific classroom.

An initial meeting between the Unit Coordinator, Unit faculty mentor/evaluator and the school partners takes place at the beginning of the Practicum semester (ED 295A Field Experience/O&P). During this meeting the requirements for field experience (first semester of the Practicum, candidates are not formally evaluated) and student teaching will be discussed.

Input from the school partners is critical in supporting the success of the candidate, therefore the system for evaluation completed by the school partners needs to be determined. Presently, a working group has been assembled to discuss and refine the design, delivery and evaluation for the clinical practice. This group consists of Dr. Kenneth Johnson and Bernadette Howard and Sherilyn Lau representing the DOE Career Pathways. Clearly, this is a work in progress to ensure the success of the program and its candidates.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to articulate criteria for school-based faculty and how they met state requirements for content expertise.

A focus of the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program is to ensure that candidates who are hired as teachers of record will be mentored by a school-based faulty (i.e., principal, vice principal, CTE lead teacher or CTE Resource teacher). This mentoring is critical for the success of a new teacher. Candidates who are not hired as teachers of record will be placed in classrooms with school-based mentor teachers who are licensed in the CTE content field.

In partnership with each complex CTE Resource Teacher, the Unit Coordinator and assigned faculty mentor/evaluator will develop a working relationship and dialogue to polish procedures for evaluation and support of the candidate.

 College mentors/evaluators will consist of Unit full-time faculty and adjunct faculty who will work to mentor and evaluate candidates through the Practicum experience (first semester field experience and second semester student teaching). The College faculty member or adjunct faculty member will be assigned to a candidate for both semesters in order to have a consistent assessment of the candidate's development as a CTE educator. The first semester the candidate will be mentored with no formal evaluation. The mentor is a "cheer leader" or guide as the candidate writes and delivers lesson plans, works one on one, in small groups and full class with students, develops classroom management skills and routines and works polish their skills prior to the student teaching semester.

The ultimate goal for the Alternative program is to hire adjunct faculty who have background knowledge and experience, as well as teaching experience in the CTE content field, to mentor and evaluate candidates. The Unit Coordinator is presently seeking funds in order to support the hiring of these CTE qualified individuals.

Initially, a Unit full-time faculty member will be providing supervision to the candidates. As stated in the USSR, candidates who enter the Alternative program will have content knowledge in a career and technical field; the faculty mentor/evaluator will be assessing the pedagogy for delivery of the content. A working partnership with CTE experts in the DOE system is being established to provide professional development to Unit faculty who will be out in the field.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to clearly define the role of the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty in the assessment of candidate performance during clinical practice.

A focus of the Alternative Certification for CTE Licensure program is to ensure that candidates who are hired as teachers of record will be mentored by a school-based faulty (i.e., principal, vice principal, CTE lead teacher or CTE Resource teacher). This mentoring is critical for the success of a new teacher. Candidates who are not hired as teachers of record will be placed in classrooms with school-based mentor teachers who are licensed in the CTE content field.

College mentors/evaluators will consist of Unit full-time faculty and adjunct faculty who will work to mentor and evaluate candidates through the Practicum experience (first semester field experience and second semester student teaching). The College faculty member or adjunct faculty member will be assigned to a candidate for both semesters in order to have a consistent assessment of the candidate's development as a CTE educator. The first semester the candidate will be mentored with no formal evaluation. The mentor is a "cheer leader" or guide as the candidate writes and delivers lesson plans, works one on one, in small groups and full class with students, infuses technology to enhance instruction and develops classroom management skills and routines while they work to polish their skills prior to the student teaching semester.

The faculty (full-time or adjunct) member will establish a working relationship with the school-based faculty by setting up an initial site-visit to provide an orientation to the Alternative Certification program and discuss the roles that each will play in the support and evaluation of the candidate prior to recommending for licensure. The faculty mentor will complete a minimum of 5 on-site visits first semester during field experience and a minimum of 5 on-site visits during student teaching (second semester) to observe the candidate and will meet with the school based faculty to debrief and check on progress. An outcome of the observations and meetings with school-based faculty will be to develop action plans focused on the development of the candidate in the clinical practice (Practicum).

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to ensure that all school-based faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise.

The Unit will ensure that all school-based faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise. Candidates who are not hired as teachers of record by the DOE will be placed in CTE content specific classrooms with lead teachers who are licensed in the specific content. Working in partnership with complex area CTE Resource Teachers, candidates will be placed with faculty who demonstrate best practice and are licensed in their field.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to clearly explain how it ensures that all professional education faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise.

The full-time Unit faculty who work with candidates is as follows:

Bobbie Martel; Coordinator/Assistant Professor
Dr. Jeffrey Judd; Assistant Professor
Michael Cawdery; Assistant Professor
Kale`a Silva; Instructor

Erin Thompson Loo; Counselor dedicated to the Unit who completes the transcript evaluation for each candidate along with planning the course of study.

Brent Hirata; full-time, Leeward CC faculty member who is part-time in the Unit.

Two adjunct instructors (presently teaching at the CC level as well as in K-12 DOE schools)

One of the Unit's full-time faculty members has a doctoral degree and two are in various stages of completing their doctoral degree. Though none of the faculty have experience in CTE (with the exception of preparing Educational Assistants, PTTs, PPTs), all full-time faculty members have contemporary experience in school settings. Three of the full-time faculty have (or still) supervise student teachers for Chaminade University, two of the faculty are very involved with the CREDE project through UH Manoa and are involved in training and in class observations. One of the full-time faculty continues to provide in-service training for first year DOE teachers for the Campbell/Kapolei complex.

Presently the Unit is writing a grant for Perkins funding in order to hire adjunct faculty who have knowledge and teaching experience in CTE content specific fields. These lecturers will work in unison with the Unit full-time faculty to deliver course content and supervise candidates in their Practicum experience.   A goal for the Unit is to be able to hire a full-time CTE faculty position at the conclusion of the three year cycle of Perkins funding. This will be dependent on the demand for this program.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP REVIEW
PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs to articulate how it systematically and regularly evaluates school based clinical and part-time professional education faculty members.

Full-time faculty and Adjunct faculty are systematically evaluated per union contract and UH system requirements. Faculty members are required to have two peer evaluations each semester along with completing a self- evaluation. The system requires faculty to gain peer reviews from tenured faculty (from within and outside the division). The reviewer writes a summary of the observation followed by a conference to discuss the evaluation. Full-time faculty members submit their peer evaluations for contract renewal, tenure and promotion. Adjunct faculty members submit their evaluations each semester to determine if they will be rehired. The division DPC (Division Personnel Committee) reviews all documents and makes recommendations to the Social Science Division Chair.

(REJOINDER)
SUMMARY FOR LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE SATEP
REVIEW PROGRAM SELF STUDY REPORT
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Areas for Improvement: The Unit needs provide more detailed budget information.

The Unit is part of the Social Science division at Leeward Community College. The Unit's budget of $20,000.00 (an increase as of fall, 2012) is dedicated to the purchase of office supplies, wages for three power mentors, conference registrations for professional development, some marketing and professional dues, some travel expenses. The Leeward CC administration has
been very supportive of the Unit as has the division chair for Social Science. Faculty overloads and the approval for hiring adjunct instructors falls under the approval of the Social Science division chair.

The Unit will follow the compensation procedures for clinical practice supervision that is in place at the College of Education, UH Manoa. Full-time faculty will be assigned a one credit overload each semester to supervise a total of three candidates in the Alternative Certification program.

TITLE: Amendment of State Approval for the University of Hawaii-West Oahu Teacher Education Programs

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board approves granting the University of Hawaii - West Oahu request to extend the provisional approval date for the Baccalaureate Middle-Level and Secondary Teacher Education Programs from December 31, 2012 to December 31, 2015. The institution makes this request due to the fact that the programs have not been implemented. The delay in implementation is attributed to the downturn in the economy, resulting in the lack of adequate resources to staff and maintain these programs. Pending approval of this request, provisional approval for these programs will be extended from December 31, 2012 to December 31, 2015.

Submitted by: Terry Lynn Holck

Referred to: Teacher Education Committee

September 24, 2012

TO: The Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB)

FROM: Dr. Mary F. Heller, Professor & Chair
     Division of Education
     University of Hawai'i West O'ahu (UHWO)

RE: Request for extension of provisional approval:
     UHWO Middle-level & Secondary Teacher Education programs
     NBI 08-44; NBI 08-45; NBI 09-86

I am writing to request a three-year extension of HTSB's provisional approval of the University of Hawai'i West O'ahu's middle-level and secondary teacher education programs. The current approval timeframe is January 29, 2009 through December 31, 2012. Our request would extend provisional approval to December 31, 2015.

The primary reason for this request is the fact that our programs have not yet been implemented. The delay in implementation is attributed to the downturn in the economy, resulting in the lack of adequate resources to staff and maintain these programs. For example, during the past State legislative session, no new FTE faculty positions were given to UHWO.

On February 13, 2012, the UH System Council of Chief Academic Officers endorsed our middle-level and secondary teacher education programs. The final step towards implementation will be presentation to the University of Hawai'i Board of Regents, which we hope to accomplish as soon as State funding for resources is favorably acted upon by the legislature.

The faculty in the Division of Education is excited to begin this new chapter in the development of UHWO teacher preparation programs. The middle-level and secondary education concentrations in English, Math, Science, and the Social Studies are highly anticipated by prospective candidates. In fulfillment of the mission of our division and the institution, we look forward to serving the teacher workforce needs of Central and Leeward O'ahu.

Thank you for your consideration of our

request. cc: Dr. Gene Awakuni, Chancellor
     Dr. Jacque Kilpatrick, Interim Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs
     Lynn Hammonds, Executive Director, HTSB Carolyn Gyuran, Education
     Specialist, HTSB