The moving historic mission of the College of Education can be traced to its founding as a Normal Department in 1844. The fundamental idea behind the establishment of the department was to offer a program of study dedicated to “instruction in the art and business of a teacher.” The department adopted the signal charge to educate teachers for employment in the primary and preparatory schools of the state that, in the process, set the course for development of a more fully-formed modern institution comprehensively involved in the educational endeavor.

The College’s normal school origins are still evident in its present day work with school practitioners and professionals in allied fields. Teacher education continues to be a front and center matter, as the College remains proudly committed to its historical mandate to deliver first-rate educators to the schools of the state and the nation. The work of the College has also extended its reach into the schools in other ways by, for instance, involving itself with the training and development of school administrators and school-based researchers. These commitments have made the College a modern day site for educational work as it manifests inside and outside of schools. Faculty members in the College today are expected to contribute to the development of teachers and school administrators, to engage the public on matters related to the growth and well-being of children and families, to strengthen institutions serving educational causes, and to produce research and scholarship informing the conduct and policy of schools and other educative agencies. These are the historical pathways that the College has cleared and these are the pathways that continue to mark out its current day strategic plan.

Peter Hlebowitsh, Dean
THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENTS

Curriculum and Instruction
The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is comprised of the following: elementary education programs and the secondary education programs, which include English/ language arts, mathematics, science, second language acquisition and teaching, and social studies, as well as a literacy education program. As a Department, the Unit works to offer exemplary professional programs to prepare educators to be effective decision makers who facilitate student learning. In fulfilling this mission, the department seeks to recruit high quality students and encourages them to become self-directed life-long learners. It also provides comprehensive instructional programs; and fosters education research and service to enhance policy making and professional development at state, regional, national, and international levels. The programs emphasize the contextual basis for learning, particularly within the ever-expanding global community that includes many diverse kinds of learners and educators.

Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies
The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations. The Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies is a full member of the University Council for Educational Administration.

Educational Studies in Research Methodology, Psychology, and Counseling
The primary mission of the Department of Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling is to offer quality graduate programs to an interdisciplinary array of students. The department offers M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in counselor education, a Ph.D. in educational research, a Ph.D./Ed.D. in school psychology, a M.A. in educational psychology, a M.A. in educational psychology with an emphasis in school psychometry, an Ed.S. in educational psychology, an Ed.S. in educational psychology with an emphasis in school psychology or educational research and the Ed.D./Ph.D. in educational psychology. Beyond these formal degrees, the department offers graduate certificate programs in qualitative and quantitative research. The department offers undergraduate service courses for teacher education programs and other undergraduate majors. In addition, the department offers graduate level service courses in foundations and research for students throughout the University. The educational research program develops researchers for the public sector, private sector, and higher education. The educational psychology program provides exemplary graduate training in research, application, and practice related to learning, development, and mental health of children and youth as well as their families, teachers, educators, and other professionals who work with them.

Kinesiology
The Department of Kinesiology has as its mission the preparation of educators, researchers, and citizens who are proficiently prepared and are dedicated to addressing the physical activity needs in school, community, work-site, health, medical, or athletic environments. In this regard, the Department of Kinesiology is committed to diverse cultural, educational, scientific, and cross-disciplinary approaches that emphasize the total person. One vital aspect of these efforts is to understand and educate our students and the public in the science and benefits of human movement. We support a broad multi-disciplinary, technologically sophisticated, integrative perspective that identifies exercise, sport, and skill acquisition as critical factors in preparing children and adults to become healthy, knowledgeable, culturally sensitive, and valued members of society. The Department uses the same multi-disciplinary and integrative approach to address the physical activity issues of an aging, and many times, under-served adult population, emphasizing the role of behaviors in the quality of education, quality of life and prevention of illness. The relationships between physical activity in human beings and various sciences are emphasized. Students will gain an understanding of the development, interpretation, application, and dissemination of knowledge that relates physical activity to human well-being. The degrees in human performance place an emphasis on the attainment of disciplinary knowledge in the anatomical, biomechanical, developmental, physiological, and sociological aspects of physical activity, explore how physical activity relates to human well-being, and offer a choice of an area of emphasis in physical education and exercise and sport science.

Music Education
Music education classes are taught by highly skilled faculty who hold terminal degrees. The Music Education faculty are committed to teaching and research, and they consistently contribute to the national field of music education. Bringing music into school-aged people’s lives is an exciting and rewarding profession. The thorough music training offered by the School of Music, the mastery of skills required in music education courses, and the chance to participate in the finest ensembles in the region are opportunities which set the UA music education programs apart from all others. Graduates of the UA programs are leaders in the profession throughout their careers. At the Bachelor’s level, students may choose an instrumental track, which prepares them to teach middle or high school band or orchestra, as well as elementary general music or they may choose a choral track, which emphasizes middle or high school choral teaching, in addition to elementary general music. After completing the required courses and clinical work, students intern for one semester. Graduate work develops research skills, as well as the acquisition of advanced teaching and conducting techniques. The uniquely high quality preparation at all levels which have characterized the UA Music Education programs for decades have set the standard in Alabama. The faculty welcomes the chance to discuss what our programs have to offer with all prospective students and their families.

Special Education and Multiple Abilities
The Department of Special Education and Multiple Abilities (SPEMA) prepares students to serve as reflective decision makers in instructional settings for exceptional learners. The SPEMA faculty believe that a teacher preparation program should emphasize roles and responsibilities that integrate the strengths of learners, parents, general education teachers, special education teachers, related service professionals, and the community. A combination of learning opportunities include that a coordinated knowledge base, diverse school-based practicums, and internship experiences are designed to facilitate the development of logical, critical, and reflective thinking skills. These skills will enable students to synthesize information and conceptualize knowledge that prepare them as future educators to effectively plan, develop, problem solve, and implement programs for diverse learners. Based on the fundamental belief that success is a function of the interaction between the individual and the environment, the over-arching goal of teacher education programs offered by the Program in Special Education and Multiple Abilities at The University of Alabama is the development, validation, and use of techniques for maximizing students’ (with and without exceptionalities) attainment of their full potential.
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CENTERS, OFFICES, AND SERVICES

Alabama Adapted Athletics
The Alabama Adapted Athletics program was founded in 2003. The purpose of the program is to provide competitive High Performance athletic and non-competitive Sport for All opportunities for students with physical disabilities on campus. Secondary objectives of the program are to facilitate hands-on field experience and internship opportunities for students in the Adapted Sport Kinesiology program, and conducting research and writing grants in the area of adapted sports.

The program areas include wheelchair basketball, wheelchair tennis, adapted rowing, wheelchair track, and adapted golf. Currently we have approximately 25 students with physical disabilities from all around the world participating in the Adapted Athletics program. Additionally we have approximately 60 students per year that complete field experiences and internships within the program.

There are five faculty members and one graduate assistant working in the program. Brent Hardin is the Director and Margaret Stran is the Assistant Director and Coordinator of Sports for All Programs. Elisha Williams is the Women's Wheelchair Basketball Coach, Ford Burtrum is the Men's Wheelchair Basketball Coach, and a Wheelchair Tennis Coach will be hired soon. Recent highlights include four National Championships in Wheelchair Basketball, and one National Championship in Wheelchair Tennis as well as the acquisition of multiple research and service grants, research presentations and publications.

Alabama Positive Behavior Support Office
The Alabama Positive Behavior Support Office is a statewide technical assistance and research agency that focuses on preventing challenging behavior, improving school climate and student outcomes, and supporting students at-risk for and with disabilities. This Office provides technical assistance through (1) initial and booster training in school wide positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), (2) Tier 2 PBIS training, (3) Tier 3 PBIS training, (4) three-tiered coaching and ongoing support, and (5) PBIS, discipline, and school climate data collection and analysis. Additionally, the Office participates in research-based projects and grant writing activities concerning their evidence-based, culturally responsive discipline, PBIS, and school climate practices for K-12 students. The Alabama Positive Behavior Support Office offers technical assistance and participation in research projects to all Alabama public and private K-12 schools, school districts and to the Alabama State Department of Education. The Office is also affiliated with the Alabama Association for Positive Behavior Support Network of teachers, counselors, school psychologists, administrators, family members, and researchers.

Alabama Community College Leadership Academy
Established in 2000, The Alabama Community College Leadership Academy provides a year-long leadership development program for administrators and faculty members desiring to prepare themselves to take advantage of future senior-level management opportunities within the Alabama Community College System. Each year, the Academy activities begin with a four-day summer workshop in residence at The University of Alabama, followed by three two-day seminars at the ACCS offices in Montgomery, the UA Gadsden Center, and host colleges across Alabama throughout the year, and a final two-day seminar back on the UA campus in April. Participants explore solutions to real world problems faced by college administrators. The Academy features a variety of lectures, seminars, and workshops, and centers on six curricular themes: (1) foundations of leadership, (2) policy and governance, (3) administration and finance, (4) teaching and learning, (5) student services and development, and (6) organizational culture, change, and planning.

As part of the seminars, Academy participants learn from nationally-recognized community college educational leaders and scholars, UA faculty and administrators, and Alabama college presidents, as well as content experts from throughout the State of Alabama. The program leads to the award of a CEU-based certificate of completion. Participants who are interested in pursuing graduate college credit can be admitted through the UA Graduate School as non-degree seeking students, and take one or two 3-credit courses in higher education administration in conjunction with The Academy.

The program is presented through a partnership of the UA College of Education and UA College of Continuing Studies in cooperation with the Alabama Community College System, the University of Alabama System, and the Alabama Commission on Higher Education. Participants, generally are sponsored by their employers, although limited enrollment is open to anyone who is interested in learning more about Alabama’s community colleges, leadership, and change. The cohort of participants each year ranges in size from 15 to 25, with between 2 and 5 typically matriculating to the College’s graduate programs in higher education administration after taking part in the Academy.

The College incurs no expense for this program beyond the time of the Academy Director, nor does it receive any of the program revenues, which are kept by the College of Continuing Studies and used, in part, to cover the cost of the program. Members of the College faculty who present in the program typically receive a small honorarium for their time and effort. The College benefits from this program both as a means of marketing its graduate programs and as a means of building teaching, research and service partnerships with the Alabama Community College System.

Alabama Superintendents’ Academy
The purpose of The University of Alabama Superintendents’ Academy (USA), which is conducted in collaboration with the Alabama State Department of Education, is to take the best and brightest educators in school systems throughout the state and bring them together for intensive instruction and skills development utilizing the most recent research and instructional delivery technology. The USA is open to all resident Alabama educators who are eligible to be an elected or appointed superintendent in this state; who have demonstrated their ability to make a meaningful, positive contribution to elementary and secondary public education and who are willing to make a commitment to complete the activities and program requirements of the USA. Participants, through challenging programs and sessions, develop theoretical and pragmatic knowledge and skills essential for today’s administrators. The attributes developed through these interactive programs are easily transferable to real life matters, concerns, and disputes where organizational improvement of K-12 student achievement is the goal.

Belser-Parton Literacy Center
The Belser-Parton Literacy Center is a service and research center established in the memory of Drs. Danylu Belser and Daisy Parton, former College of Education faculty members. The Center is dedicated to the cause of having a direct and visible influence on the course of literacy achievement in Alabama. Toward that end the Center aims to provide leadership in the improvement of literacy education at the local, state, and national levels through research, teacher education, and outreach. The Center supports high quality research that works to identify and solve important problems of practice in all areas of literacy learning and teaching. We seek to support the implementation of innovative teacher preparation programs and field-based teaching through partnerships with local schools and entities, and graduate programs and support for future literacy leaders. The Center also provides programming for the direct support of individual’s reading and writing development through academic year and summertime camps and clinics, often in partnership with preservice and inservice teacher development.

CrossingPoints Transition Program
CrossingPoints (CPP) is a collaborative model transition program between the Special Education and Multiple Abilities Department, the Tuscaloosa City School System, and the Tuscaloosa County School System. CPP provides exemplary transition education to young adults with intellectual disabilities ages 18-21 years. In accord with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, the over arching purpose of CPP is to prepare....
program participants for the achievement of desired postschool/adult outcomes in the areas of (a) employment, (b) community access and participation, (c) independent living and, (d) participation in leisure and recreation within inclusive community sites.

CPP provides state-of-the-art education utilizing innovative, evidence-based instructional approaches such as Covert Audio Coaching and video self-modeling to enhance skills acquisition and promote independence of each individual to the greatest extent possible. To meet individual needs, preferences and interests, program participants rotate through customized employment training sites on campus as well as in community businesses; engage in social, recreational and independent living skills development with same-age peers on and off campus; as well as participate in age-appropriate instruction in sexuality and making positive choices. CPP also serves as a practicum and internship site for preservice teachers in special education and kinesiology, as well as a service-learning site for numerous programs and entities across the entire campus. Currently CPP has approximately 65% employment rate of program graduates, which is way above the current national average of 17.8% reported by the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics in 2012.

Education Policy Center
In support of the mission of The University of Alabama and its College of Education, the Education Policy Center works to improve the quality of life for all Alabamians through expanding access, strengthening equity, and advancing economic and community development. We provide policy-related analyses in support of access, equity, and economic and community development to the benefit of our public secondary schools, community and technical colleges, and four-year colleges and universities.

As a strong proponent that education is critical to economic and community development, the Education Policy Center is concerned with issues of access and funding that can limit educational opportunities. The Center conducts an annual national survey of State Directors of Community Colleges that, due to consistently high response rates over the past several years, helps to provide a wealth of data that has contributed to multiple issue and policy briefs.

The Center has also conducted extensive research into the impact and importance of the federal Pell Grant Voucher Program. The Pell Voucher Program provides billions of dollars to states and continues to serve as the primary vehicle for promoting post-secondary access for many students, particularly those from a rural area. The Center has conducted studies on the importance of Pell to maintaining and improving educational access in Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oregon, Kansas, Iowa, and Maine.

In support of Alabama’s public K-12 education system, the Center also hosts The University of Alabama Superintendents’ Academy, which seeks to develop the leadership, planning, and decision making skills needed by results-oriented school leaders while creating a diverse pool of applicants ready to assume system-wide leadership positions.

Center for the Study of Ethical Development
The Center for the Study of Ethical Development has two primary goals: furthering research in ethical development and supporting psychological measures that have been developed by Center affiliates. To that end, the Center solicits contracts for the use of the measures including scoring and the interpretation of results. In addition, the Center supports research in the field by attracting international scholars, funding small research grants, and providing aid to graduate students who come to Alabama with an expressed interest in ethical development. In addition to these traditional roles, it is our intent to use the Center as a catalyst for research in ethical development on campus. The Center has already committed to a fellows initiative that provides funds for faculty interested in the ethical dimension of their respective fields. Additionally we hope to use these small grants to stimulate external funding. Finally we wish to develop two new initiatives in the areas of neuropsychological correlates of moral reasoning. We fully expect his focus to grow as the departmental focus on educational neuroscience expands.

Regarding citizenship education we note recent theoretical work that highlights the connection between ethical development and citizenship. The Center would like to explore this link more directly using the measurements it currently supports.

The Office of International Programs
The Office of International Programs (OIP) focuses on delivering an overseas elementary and secondary education Master of Arts degree to three South American site partnerships in Colombia, Mexico and Paraguay. The Office has also established new partnerships with two universities in China that includes research collaborative and some Teachings involvements. OIP also manages the College’s visiting scholar program and is generally dedicated to expanding the College’s international exposure in the areas of research and teaching.

Innovative Technology, Teaching, and Learning Lab
The Innovative Technology, Teaching, and Learning Lab is a technology lab that provides faculty, staff, students, and in-service teachers with pedagogy-based tools, resources, and support that promote effective technology integration in PK-12 and higher education settings. The lab is staffed by a doctoral student in Instructional Leadership/Instructional Technology. Services offered in the lab include workshops on a variety of current and relevant topics in instructional technology, weekly open lab hours, personal consultations; and training sessions dedicated to the application of specific tools. The lab has applications that mirror the technologies available in local schools so that preservice teachers can receive congruent training and experiences, as well as application at the vanguard of technology so that preservice teachers can serve as models and leaders in the use of technologies in the classroom.

The Office of Research and Service
The Office of Research and Service provides leadership and services designed to advance the research and service missions of the College which include coordinating research and service operations, building interdisciplinary research teams, and assisting in grant acquisition and completion. Specifically, the ORS:

- Develops and executes strategic plans for increasing COE grant and contract acquisition.
- Promotes and supports research productivity and grant acquisition among faculty, including the identification and implementation of activities to increase scholarly and contract/grant activities, such as:
  - Identifying and disseminating new funding opportunity notifications via weekly email announcements to COE faculty.
  - Assisting faculty and staff with the interpretation of grant proposal guidelines and the preparation of proposals, including the preparation of budgets, for external funding.
  - Identifying, encouraging, establishing and facilitating interdisciplinary research teams to develop and submit grant proposals across COE departments, with other UA Colleges and with other institutions.
  - Conducting targeted searches of governmental and private source databases to identify specific funding opportunities to support specific faculty research goals.
  - Arranging and providing training opportunities related to grant-seeking, grant-writing, grant management, research compliance, and other research-related skills and knowledge building tools.
  - Facilitating the announcement and preparation of white papers for OSP limited submission competitions.
  - Conceptualizing and administering COE research participation incentive programs such as the COE Internal Grants Competition, the Dean’s Grants Incentive Program, time buyout for grant-writing, etc.
  - Working with the University Office for Sponsored Programs to match faculty expertise and funding opportunities.

Provides post-award support and technical assistance for COE Principal Investigators with accounting, human resources/payroll processes, purchasing expenditure tracking, reporting, and close-out.

Manages and ensures proper and timely distribution, utilization, and reporting of College funds generated through the return of indirect cost revenues from grants and contracts.

Provides administrative oversight and coordination of the activities that involve the College of Education Research and Faculty Development Committee, including:

- Reviewing and managing faculty research support provided through the COE Internal Grants Program.
- Reviewing, selecting and announcing the annual COE and Graduate School Dissertation and Thesis...
of the Year nominations.
• Reviewing, selecting and announcing the annual COE and Graduate School Graduate Student Awards nominations.
• Facilitating, as needed, other special purpose funding competitions and opportunities.

Facilitates and provides administrative support for COE participation in the annual UA Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity Conference.

Serves as a College liaison to the UA Office of Sponsored Programs, the Office of Contract & Grant Accounting, the Office of Research Compliance, the Office of Technology Transfer, the Office of Research, and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Provides COE technical support and data analysis services related to the following software and data management systems:
• Faculty Activity Reporting System
• Faculty Credentials Verification System
• Pivot/Community of Science
• Qualtrics On-line Survey System
• Academic Analytics
• GrantsERA
• myBama PI Research Dashboard
• Pivot/Community of Science
• Faculty Credentials Verification System
• myBama PI Research Dashboard
• Pivot/Community of Science

Office of Evaluation
The purpose of the Office of Evaluation is to offer client services in the areas of evaluation and measurement in support of a wide array of initiatives, including potentially school-based inventions, policy pronouncements, grant-sponsored undertakings, and government, as well as private client, projects. The Office is expected to have some profile in conducting grant-based evaluations across the university setting and in pursuing government and private contracts congruent with the mission of the College.

Research Assistance Lab
The Research Assistance Lab in the College of Education is a comprehensive research assistance facility for researchers performing both Quantitative and Qualitative Research. The lab is staffed by a faculty director along with two upper-level graduate students with extensive knowledge about the research process. The staff is available to aid both faculty and students in various steps of their research plan: beginning with research design, survey construction and administration, and IRB, building up to data collection and coding, finishing with analysis and interpretation. The Research Assistance Lab is stocked with lab equipment available on loan that may be necessary for research, including laptops, voicerecorders and digital cameras. The computers located in the lab are complete with the latest statistical analysis software, including SAS, SPSS, and Dragon Naturally Speaking. The lab has helped researchers in multiple disciplines, including Education, Humanities, and Nursing.

Office of Research on Teaching in the Disciplines
The Office of Research on Teaching in the Disciplines (ORTD) focuses on conducting and disseminating research on teaching in the disciplines at the preschool through higher education levels (K-16) for local, state, regional, and national sectors. Included are the sciences, social sciences, mathematics, and the humanities. Corollary disciplines important to, and affecting, students’ successful disciplinary learning are incorporated: English language arts, gifted education, instructional technology, kinesiology, special education, and teacher education. The ORTD fulfills a need for an entity at The University of Alabama focusing on support of interdisciplinary efforts and collaboration to investigate and provide an unique forum for addressing issues in teaching in the disciplines. An ongoing series of research forums and the publication of 24 Research Briefs, 44 Background papers, 8 proceedings, 1 monograph, and 3 Undergraduate Action Research Papers delineates and disseminates major priorities and critical research areas, methodological concerns, and implementation of research needed on teaching in the disciplines. The ORTD sustains ongoing dialog to support a network of school systems and undergraduate programs through annually recognizing excellence in teaching in 9 areas, maintaining a statewide listserve to schools and higher education institutions, and assisting with the formulation of research agendas and related action plans.

Summer Enrichment Workshop
The purpose of the Summer Enrichment Workshop (SEW) is to bring together a diverse group of gifted and talented students who want to engage in a rigorous, enriching educational experience. For over 35 years, SEW has provided a 3-week summer experience for 8th grade gifted and talented students. Sponsored by gifted studies program, SEW delivers an engaging and enriching curriculum to approximately 175 students. Graduate interns, working toward a master’s degree or certification in gifted education, design courses to enhance the cognitive and affective abilities of gifted students. Interns also serve as mentor teachers to undergraduate, preservice teachers pursuing a degree in Multiple Abilities Program (MAP). Together, the interns and preservice teachers transform classrooms into problem-based learning environments. Emphasis is placed on developing students’ critical thinking skills through the Talents Unlimited (TU) model, which has been proven to improve student metacognitive abilities. SEW is recognized across the southeastern US as producing an exciting educational environment that develops students in critical thinking skills.

Technology Support Services
The mission of Technology Support Services is to provide technical support to faculty, staff, and students in the College of Education. This includes support for software and hardware. Faculty, staff, and students can submit a support ticket by calling the TSS Office or online for any type of technical issue that they are having. Recommendations for hardware and software are also provided when requests are made. Specifications for certain hardware and software programs are configured by TSS, as well as vendor recommendations based on University approved vendors.

The computer labs are also operated and supported by TSS. The labs are staffed by students and maintained by an Image Server located in the TSS office. The TSS office schedules events in the labs when faculty need room for a part of their class. The TSS office also trains faculty, staff, and graduate assistants on the use of technology in each classroom.

UA/UWA Inservice Center
The purpose of The University of Alabama/University of West Alabama Regional In-Service Center is to provide professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and impacts student achievement. This is accomplished by creating communities of learners; developing leadership; prioritizing, monitoring and coordinating resources; analyzing data to plan, access, and evaluate professional learning; applying exemplary learning designs; sustaining support for long-term change; aligning outcomes with educator performance and the Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards (ACCRS); and, to create and maintain viable partnerships within and outside of the University environment.

The Center is upholding the strategic goals of The University of Alabama by creating partnerships that position the Center to be actively involved in scholarly research and teaching in order to be of service to the clientele (teachers and administrators) served by the Center in Region 4 of West Alabama. The Center strives to enhance the university learning environment and develop leaders of teachers and administrators who are in the field of service. The Center is an integral part of the College’s mission and key to its public engagement and school outreach. The Center is also one of 11 in a state-wide network of Regional In-Service Centers established in 1984 by state legislation, each one housed in an institution of higher learning.
AIMS, GOALS, & OBJECTIVES OF THE COLLEGE

OVERARCHING AIMS

AIM 1
The provision of a first-rate undergraduate experience, committed but not exclusive to teacher preparation, that enables COE graduates to fulfill their intellectual, social and career objectives, that meets all applicable accreditation standards and that offers the latest and most innovative insights on teaching and learning.

AIM 2
The provision of premier graduate and professional programs in all of the program areas of the College that prepares researchers and educational leaders for work in university settings and in any number of government and precollege school settings.

AIM 3
The advancement of research, scholarly and artistic productivity by faculty, staff, and graduate students.

AIM 4
The development of quality improvements to the workplace and learning environment of the College in ways that support the mission and values of the COE.

AIM 5
The enhanced visibility of public engagement in the work of the College, especially as it relates to bringing improvements to schools, families, and communities.

Aim 1: Undergraduate Education
The provision of a first-rate undergraduate experience, committed but not exclusive to teacher preparation, that enables COE graduates to fulfill their intellectual, social and career objectives, that meets all applicable accreditation standards and that offers the latest and most innovative insights on teaching and learning.

Strategic Goal and Objectives 1.1
Offer undergraduate programs that attract a diverse student population

1.1.1. Increase the percentage of under-represented subgroups in the undergraduate teacher education program and in the allied COE majors
1.1.1c. Increase the overall percentage of first generation students enrolled in the undergraduate teacher education program and in the allied COE majors
1.1.1d. Increase the overall percentage of low income students enrolled in the undergraduate teacher education program and in the allied COE majors
1.1.1e. Increase the overall percentage of Asian and Hispanic students enrolled in the undergraduate teacher education program and in the allied COE majors

Strategic Goal and Objectives 1.2
Offer undergraduate programs that attract and develop highly accomplished academic students

1.2.1. Increase the average GPA and standardized test score measures of undergraduate students admitted into the teacher education program and into the allied COE undergraduate programs
1.2.1.a. Increase the percentage of undergraduate students who pass all of the applicable PRAXIS exams in all of the program areas and increase the average aggregate score on each of the PRAXIS measures

1.2.1.b. Increase the average standardized SAT and ACT score of undergraduate students admitted into the teacher education and into the allied COE majors

1.2.1.c. Increase the cohort GPA, at the point of admission, of the undergraduate students admitted into the teacher education program and into the allied COE majors

1.2.2. Increase the number of Honors College students admitted to the teacher education program and allied COE programs

1.2.3. Increase the retention and completion rates of students admitted into the TEP program

Strategic Goal and Objectives 1.3
Support career placement services and alumni relations with COE graduates

1.3.1. Increase the employment rates of all graduates in all programs

1.3.2. Increase the percentage of graduates employed in high poverty schools

1.3.3. Improve upon the surveyed student satisfaction measures of COE experience

1.3.4. Increase involvement or participation rates with alumni activities

Strategic Goal and Objective 1.4
Ensure financial support for students enrolled in COE undergraduate programs

1.4.1. Increase the number and the overall dollar value of scholarships available to undergraduates in all programs

Strategic Goal and Objectives 1.5
Support academic counseling and advising services

1.5.1. Increase all surveyed satisfaction levels related to COE advising

1.5.2. Increase the number of undergraduates who select UA graduate study options

Aim 2: Graduate Education
The provision of premier graduate and professional programs in all of the program areas of the College that prepare researchers and educational leaders for work in university settings and in a variety of other education-related contexts.

Strategic Goal and Objectives 2.1
Support student selectivity criteria for admission into the College's graduate programs

2.1.1. Increase the average standardized GRE score of graduate students admitted into the COE's graduate degree programs

2.1.2. Increase the cohort GPA average, at the point of admission, of graduate students admitted into the COE's graduate degree programs

2.1.3. Increase the acceptance yield of students admitted into the COE's graduate degree programs

Strategic Goal and Objectives 2.2
Support diversification efforts in the College's graduate enrollment

2.2.1. Increase the percentage of under-represented subgroups in all the graduate degree programs in the College

2.2.1.a. Increase the overall percentage of African American students enrolled in the COE's graduate programs

2.2.1.b. Increase the overall percentage of first generation students enrolled in the COE's graduate programs

2.2.1.c. Increase the overall percentage of low income students enrolled in the COE's graduate programs

2.2.1.d. Increase the overall percentage of Asian and Hispanic students enrolled in the COE's graduate programs

2.2.1.e. Increase the overall percentage of international students enrolled in the COE's graduate programs

Strategic Goal and Objectives 2.3
Support success and retention rates for students enrolled in the COE's graduate degree programs

2.3.1. Improve upon Ph.D and Master's completion rates

2.3.2. Improve upon year-to-completion rates in the College and the departments

2.3.3. Increase placement rates of doctoral students in post-secondary settings and in tenure track positions

2.3.4. Increase the employment rates of Masters and EdS students in positions congruent with their training

2.3.5. Increase the number of Master's and Ed.S. students who elect to pursue doctoral training

2.3.6. Increase number of graduate student published on high ranking journals before graduation

2.3.7. Increase the number of award winning dissertation and other relevant research awards won by graduate students.

Strategic Goal and Objectives 2.4
Support academic advising and course offerings for graduate students

2.4.1. Increase all satisfaction levels reported about COE advising

2.4.2. Increase the availability of courses via distance education and alternative scheduling

2.4.3. Increase number of graduate student published articles and/or books, and course enrollments

2.4.4. Increase graduate student research and creative work

2.4.5. Increase the number of conversations that involve cross-program and cross-departmental audiences.

2.4.6. Increase the number and the dollar value of national and state awards received for faculty research

2.4.7. Increase the number and the dollar value of national and state awards received for graduate student research

2.4.8. Increase the number of national and state awards received for undergraduate student research

Strategic Goal and Objectives 2.5
Ensure Institutional Support for graduate students

2.5.1. Increase the dollar value and number of scholarships available to graduate students in all program areas

2.5.2. Increase the number of graduate assistantships available to all program areas

2.5.3. Increase travel money available to support travel to research conferences

Aim 3: Research and Scholarship
The advancement of research, scholarship, and artistic productivity in the College

3.1.1. Increase the percentage of articles published in the top tier journals of the field by COE faculty, as identified by program coordinators in the College

3.1.2. Increase the number of national awards received by faculty recognizing excellence in research

3.1.3. Increase the number of presentations given by COE faculty and graduate students at AERA and subject-affiliated national and international conferences

3.1.4. Increase compensation and promotion incentives for scholarly work

3.1.5. Increase the number of faculty engaged in collaborations with faculty outside of the College, across departmental affiliations and with students, as measured by faculty dissertation participation rates, collaborative engagements with grant writing, co-produced articles and/or books, and course enrollments of students from disciplines outside of the COE.
Aim 5: The Workplace and Teaching Environment

The development of quality improvements to the workplace and teaching environment of the College in ways that support the mission and values of the COE.

Strategic Goal and Objectives 5.1
Advance the Visibility of and Response to Faculty and Staff Concerns in the COE

5.1.1. Strengthen the role of shared governance decision-making in the COE
5.1.2. Design programs attentive to new faculty and staff needs and interests
5.1.3. Strengthen and support communication systems within the College
5.1.4. Strengthen and support professional development opportunities for faculty and staff

5.2.1. Increase sponsorship of and participation in COE social events for faculty and staff
5.2.2. Encourage faculty and staff involvement in student-sponsored events
5.2.3. Develop an environment that facilitates and nurtures efforts to advance conversation, mutual understanding, awareness of diversity, and collegiality

Strategic Goal and Objectives 5.2
Support a Strong Technological and Physical Infrastructure for Teaching and Learning

5.3.1. Promote vanguard technological applications of promising teaching practices to preservice teachers and college level instructors and other university students
5.3.2. Maintain an optimal rotation of upgrades to the technological needs of faculty.
5.3.3. Maintain first-rate technological resources in the teaching classrooms of the COE
5.3.4. Provide real-time technological support to faculty
5.3.5. Collaborate with the McLure Library on new technologies for teaching and learning

5.4.1. Increase the professional development, resources, and support services in the area of teaching
5.4.2. Reward innovative approaches to teaching in the salary setting process
5.4.3. Demonstrate leadership across the campus in the area of teaching
5.4.4. Develop an effective rubric to identify and reward innovative teaching in the College
5.4.5. Provide onsite demonstration opportunities highlighting good teaching practices
5.4.6. Promote insights from research on teaching to classroom practice
5.4.7. Develop partnership with the McLure Library to improve student research skills

Aim 4: Public Engagement

The enhanced visibility of public engagement in the work of the College, especially as it relates to bringing improvements to schools, families and communities.

Strategic Goal and Objectives 4.1
Promote public engagement and outreach by faculty and staff

4.1.1. Reward and increase public engagement initiatives in the salary setting process
4.1.2. Reward and increase service and teaching grant-sponsored initiatives in the area of public engagement
4.1.3. Increase the public awareness of faculty and staff involvement with schools and other public partners
4.1.4. Increase faculty and staff involvement in a variety of public engagements

4.2.1. Increase established partnerships with schools and community entities.
4.2.2. Increase the number of service projects conducted in schools and the wider community.
4.2.3. Increase non-political involvement with a variety of educational entities
4.2.4. Increase non-political involvement with professional organizations related to the mission of the College
4.2.5. Increase collaborations with other university program areas outside of the College

4.3.1. Increase the number of service projects conducted in schools and the wider community.
4.3.2. Increase the overall dollar value of research grants awarded to COE faculty
4.3.3. Reward grant procurement in the salary setting process
4.3.4. Explore ways to incentivize grant procurement and participation of faculty in grant writing

4.4.1. Increase number of collaborative research efforts and publications between faculty and graduate students
4.4.2. Increase number of graduate students on grant-funded research
4.4.3. Prepare all doctoral students in both quantitative and qualitative traditions of research, requiring an advanced level of understanding and skill in one and an intermediate educated reading level of the other.

4.5.1. Increase the number of faculty elected to professional office
4.5.2. Increase the number of editorships of national journals
4.5.3. Strengthen and support professional service to the Research Community
4.5.4. Strengthen and support communication systems within the College
4.5.5. Strengthen and support professional development opportunities for faculty and staff

Aim 3: The College Environment

5.1.1. Strengthen and support professional service to the Research Community
5.1.2. Increase the number of grants filed and procured in the research centers of the College
5.1.3. Increase the participation rates of faculty in the conduct of the research centers

5.2.1. Increase the number of grants filed and procured in the research centers of the College
5.2.2. Increase the participation rates of faculty in the conduct of the research centers
The provision of a first-rate undergraduate experience, committed but not exclusive to teacher preparation, that enables COE graduates to fulfill their intellectual, social and career objectives, that meets all applicable accreditation standards and that offers the latest and most innovative insights on teaching and learning.

**Strategic Goal 1.1**  
Offer undergraduate programs that attract a diverse student population

**1.1 (1d & 1e) Teacher Education Program majors and Allied COE Majors (Exercise Science)**  
by First Generation College Students (FGCS) and Low Income*  
(Fall 2014 Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>FGCS%</th>
<th>Low Income%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduate Teacher Education Programs and Exercise Science</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Undergraduates are counted by first or second major.  
Low income can only be determined for those students completing the FAFSA form which could result in an understated percentage.  
Low income means an individual whose family’s taxable income did not exceed 150% of the family income level established by the Census Bureau for determining poverty status (Source: US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education)  
Output from N:/SAS/Alicia/Data Requests/Education Baseline Data.sas produced by A. Weaver on 31MAR2015

**Undergraduate Student Education Enrollment by Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Multiracial Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other (includes White non-resident Aliens)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year average</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Undergraduate Education Degrees Conferred by Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Multiracial Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other (includes White non-resident Aliens)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year average</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Praxis Scores, All Program Completers, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Content Knowledge</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Multisubject - Mathematics</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Reading</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Multisubject - Reading Language Arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Multisubject - Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Content Knowledge</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Multisubject - Social Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Content</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Content Knowledge</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language, Literature, and Composition Content</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Learning and Teaching (K-6)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Learning and Teaching (7-12)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Core Knowledge and Applications</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Content Knowledge</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Goal 1.2**  
Academics

**Surveyed Responses of Satisfaction with Characteristics of Fellow Students, Teacher Education Graduates, 2014**

EBI scale uses a 7-point scale: 1) very dissatisfied, 2) moderately dissatisfied, 3) slightly dissatisfied, 4) neutral, 5) slightly satisfied, 6) moderately satisfied, 7) very satisfied

How Satisfied Are You With Peers in Relation to...
Strategic Goal 1.3
Support career placement services and alumni relations with COE graduates

Surveyed Satisfaction Responses of Career Services, Teacher Education Graduates, 2014

EBI scale uses a 7 point scale: 1) very dissatisfied, 2) moderately dissatisfied, 3) slightly dissatisfied, 4) neutral, 5) slightly satisfied, 6) moderately satisfied, 7) very satisfied

How Satisfied Are You With...

Institutional peer group is comprised of the education programs from the following institutions: University of Pittsburgh, University of Arkansas, Kansas State University, Auburn University, Vanderbilt University, and Washington State University.

Strategic Goal 1.4
Ensure financial support for students enrolled in COE undergraduate programs

Annual Money Awarded from Endowed College of Education Scholarships

Strategic Goal 1.5
Support academic counseling and advising services

Employment Satisfaction Ratings on the EBI (2013-2014)

Surveyed Satisfaction Responses of Career Services, Teacher Education Graduates, 2014

EBI scale uses a 7 point scale: 1) not at all; 2, 3, 4 moderately; 5) 6) 7) Excellent

Did Your Coursework Prepare You to...
Surveyed Satisfaction Responses of Career Services, Teacher Education Graduates, 2014

EBI scale uses a 7 point scale: 1) very dissatisfied, 2) moderately dissatisfied, 3) slightly dissatisfied, 4) neutral, 5) slightly satisfied, 6) moderately satisfied, 7) Very satisfied

How Satisfied Are You With...

Graduating Senior Survey Results (OIRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Education Graduates Reporting Very Much or Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4. How would you evaluate advising in your academic advisor?</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>68% (n=107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66% (n=112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Freshman Responding 5, 6, or 7</th>
<th>Percentage of Seniors Responding 5, 6, or 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13a. Indicate the quality of your interactions with academic advisors at your institution</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50% (n=28)</td>
<td>62% (n=688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66% (n=48)</td>
<td>64% (n=745)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIM 2: GRADUATE EDUCATION

The provision of premier graduate and professional programs in all of the program areas of the College that prepare researchers and educational leaders for work in university settings and in a variety of other education-related contexts.

Support student selectivity criteria for admission into the College’s graduate programs

2.1 (1a & 1b) Average GRE Score, MAT Score, and Overall Undergraduate GPA of First-time Entering Graduate Students (Fall 2014 Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Avg GRE (Old)</th>
<th>Avg. GRE (New)</th>
<th>Avg. MAT</th>
<th>Avg. Overall UG GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE Graduate Degree Programs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1052.7</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>412.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Admissions Yield, 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Term</th>
<th>Applications Received</th>
<th>Applications Completed</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>% Accepted of Completers</th>
<th>Enrolled for Entry Term</th>
<th>% Enrolled (of admits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Summer</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>66.82</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Spring</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>63.32</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>74.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Fall</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>69.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Summer</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>76.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Spring</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Total</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>72.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Goal 2.2: Underrepresented Subgroups

**2.2 (1b & 1c) Graduate Degree Programs in the College of Education by First Generation College Students and Low Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>FGCS %</th>
<th>Low Income %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE Graduate Degree Programs</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>23.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Graduate students are counted by first degree program in the College of Education and the following dual degree programs: MSN and EdS in Instructional Leadership and MNS and EDD for Nurse Educators.

Note: Low income can only be determined for those students completing the FAFSA form which could result in an understated percentage. Low income means an individual whose family’s taxable income did not exceed 150% of the family income levels established by the Census Bureau for determining poverty status (Source: US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education).

Note: Output from N:/SAS/Alicia/Data Requests/Education Baseline Data.sas produced by A. Weaver on 31MAR2015

### Graduate and Professional Student Enrollment

#### Master’s and EdS Degrees Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black (includes Hispanic)</th>
<th>Multiracial Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other (includes White non-resident Aliens)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 year average | 170 | 16.2 | 21 | 2.0 | 86 | 8.3 |

#### Doctoral and Professional Degrees Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black (includes Hispanic)</th>
<th>Multiracial Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other (includes White non-resident Aliens)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 year average | 21 | 9.0 | 9 | 3.9 | 14 | 6.1 |

### Strategic Goal 2.3: Support success and retention rates for students enrolled in the COE’s graduate degree programs

#### Median Time to Degree (in Calendar Years) for PhD Degrees in the College of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Years</th>
<th>2010-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5 5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5 5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4 5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A degree year accounts for the spring of the given year and the fall and summer of the previous year. Time to degree is calculated on a calendar year basis as the actual time between entrance (the first time a student is enrolled in a given PhD program) and graduation.

*Includes Educ Admin Elem Middle Sch (ECEC), as it is no longer actively enrolled.

Output from SAS: Alicia:\Requests to PCs\Degree Programs\PhD\College of Education Data produced by T. Nunnally on 6/24/2014
### Median Time to Degree (in Calendar Years) for Ed.D. Degrees in the College of Education, 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department and EDI Program</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education, EDD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education, EDD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medain Time to Degree (in Calendar Years) for Master's Degrees in the College of Education, 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department and EDI Program</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education, M.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education, M.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forthcoming surveyed measures on:
- 2.3.3 the principal employer after graduation of all doctoral graduates;
- 2.3.4 the nature of employment for all Master’s and Ed.S. students after graduation;
- 2.3.5 the number of graduating graduate students returning for doctoral training;
- 2.3.6 the number of graduating graduate students who have published in a high ranking journal and 2.3.7 who won an award for their dissertation study or other research project.

### Number of Presentations at the Conference of the American Educational Research Association Involving UA Faculty and Graduate Students as First Authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Level of Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A degree year accounts for the spring of the given year and the fall and summer of the previous year. Time to degree is calculated for a calendar year basis as the actual time between the first term to a student enrolls in a given Ed.D program and graduation.

*Includes the E D D programs: Counselor Education (CED), Educational Psychology (EDP), and School Psychology (SPP), which are active programs that had no degree recipients in these years.

Data from UA Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) and E D D programs.

Forthcoming measures on: 2.3.3 the principal employer after graduation of all doctoral graduates; 2.3.4 the nature of employment for all Master’s and Ed.S. students after graduation; 2.3.5 the number of graduating graduate students returning for doctoral training; 2.3.6 the number of graduating graduate students who have published in a high ranking journal and 2.3.7 who won an award for their dissertation study or other research project.
Travel Support Dedicated to Graduate Students
2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Grad School and Other</th>
<th>Dean's Office</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp; I</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPTS</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPRMC</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINES</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEMA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,595</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forthcoming measures on 2.5.2 the number of graduate assistantships available to all program areas and 2.5.3 the travel money available to support travel to research conferences.

Strategic Goal 2.4
Support academic advising and course offerings for graduate students

Strategic Goal 2.5
Ensure institutional support for graduate students

Strategic Goal 3.1
Promote the dissemination and production of scholarly and creative work

Research Productivity Measure, Academic Analytics, National Percentile Rankings, reported 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Research Productivity</th>
<th>National Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles Published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles per author</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with a published article</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members with an article</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles published per faculty member</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation per faculty member</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with a citation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total citations</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members with a citation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per publication</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books publications per faculty member</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of books published</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members with a published book</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books published per faculty member</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty member with a grant</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of grants</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members with a grant</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants per faculty member</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant dollars per faculty member</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with an award</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members with an article</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards per faculty member</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Academic Analytics includes 157 Colleges of Education in its database


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer and Administrative Expert Rank</td>
<td>53rd</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resource Rank</td>
<td>90th</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Selectivity Rank</td>
<td>110th</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded Research Rank</td>
<td>95th</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>88th</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. New and World Report ranks 123 Colleges of Education
COE Productivity in Relation to other Broad Fields at the University of Alabama, reported 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Field</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Grant Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,142,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$542,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$711,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$11,932,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Consumer,&amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical &amp; Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>22,935</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$12,041,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,631,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Research Strengths and Weaknesses, Academic Analytics, by Z scores, reported 2015
Research Strengths and Weaknesses, Sorted by National Rank, reported 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Z-Scores</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Authors with a Citation</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per Publication</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Faculty with an Award</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Faculty with a Grant</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants per Faculty Member</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards per Faculty Member</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per Faculty Member</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Dollars per Faculty Member</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>$12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty Members with a Grant</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grants</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty Members with an Award</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Dollars</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>$711,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Faculty with a Citation</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles per Author</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Citations</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Faculty with an Article</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55.70</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles per Faculty Member</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Faculty with a Book Publication</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Articles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Publications per Faculty</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty Members with a Citation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75.10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77.10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty with an Article</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78.60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Books</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty Members who have Published a Book</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars per Grant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$355,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.6 Forthcoming measure on the number of faculty engaged in collaborations with faculty outside of the College, across departmental affiliations and with students, as noted by faculty dissertation participation rates, collaborative engagements with grant writing, co-produced articles and/or books, and course enrollments of students from disciplines outside of the COE.

3.2.1 Forthcoming measures on the number of grants filed and procured in the research centers of the College and the participation rates of faculty in the conduct of the research centers

3.2.2 Grant Submissions and Procurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Office/Center</th>
<th>2015 Submissions</th>
<th>2014 Procurements</th>
<th>2014 Submissions</th>
<th>2015 Procurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>$215,428</td>
<td>$931,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPTS</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPRMC</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$294,969</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Center</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$2,766,665</td>
<td>$2,752,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINES</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEMA</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>$3,288,662</td>
<td>$3,886,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently Approved Course Buy-Out Policy

Course Buys
Faculty members are free to buyout of their teaching obligations in order to pursue grant sponsored projects. Once a faculty member opts for a course buyout, the monies released from the buyout are used to pay for any temporary instructional needs. Once that cost is met, the remaining balance will be redistributed: 1/3 to the Dean’s Office to support college operations; 1/3 to the department to support department level operations; and, 1/3 to the faculty member. The money returned to the faculty member will be kept in a tax-free professional development account with a carry-forward privilege, which allows a faculty member to accumulate monies over time to be used on larger scale initiatives, such as supporting students or going to international conferences. The buyout distribution monies will be made at the end of the applicable semester.

Course Release and Overload
Faculty members who have been granted a course release, including compensation for heavy dissertation duties, grant-related research activities, and service-affiliated responsibilities, should only be permitted to teach overload courses under conditions that speak to a critical College mission or purpose. This could include coursework that assists with on-time graduation rates, coursework that ensures curriculum rotational integrity, coursework that only certain professors are qualified to teach, coursework that lacks an able substitute or some combination of the above.

Course Release, Effort Allocation and Overload
When course releases are given, they must reflect the normed effort allocation of the faculty member in relation to the course release reality. In other words, when faculty members are granted a course release, their effort allocation should indicate less teaching and a commensurate increase in some other function or purpose. This way the performance of the faculty member is held accountable to the in-load effort allocation. If a course overload is granted, the effort allocation does not change, as the work is considered to be off load and not part of the normed effort allocation.

Strategic Goal 3.2
Maintain and support research center involvement

Strategic Goal 3.3
Encourage and reward the pursuit of all external funding sources for research
**AIM 4: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

The enhanced visibility of public engagement in the work of the College, especially as it relates to bringing improvements to schools, families and communities.

Forthcoming measures on the number of service and teaching grant-sponsored initiatives in the area of public engagement; on public awareness of faculty and on staff involvement with schools and other public partners and on faculty and staff involvement in a public engagement.

Forthcoming measures the number of partnerships with schools and community entities, the number of service projects conducted in schools and the wider community and the number of collaborations with other university program areas outside of the College.

**AIM 5: THE WORKPLACE AND TEACHING ENVIRONMENT**

The development of quality improvements to the workplace and teaching environment of the College in ways that support the mission and values of the COE.

**Professional Development Courses Taken by Faculty and Staff**

- **Strategic Goal 5.1**
  Advance the visibility of and response to faculty and staff concerns in the College

  2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  *Courses offered through UA's HR Learning and Development

- **Strategic Goal 5.2**
  Promote healthy social interactions between faculty, staff, and students

  Forthcoming measures on participation rates for faculty and staff, as well as student events.

- **Strategic Goal 5.3**
  Support a strong technological and physical infrastructure for teaching and learning

  Forthcoming measures on material upgrades in technology

- **Strategic Goal 5.4**
  Encourage the development of innovative approaches to teaching and support services
THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The conceptual framework articulates the roles of the College of Education (COE), both current and prospective, in the development of educational professionals engaged in and allied with the vital function of education. As the leading institutional unit for research and for the advancement of educational policies and practices at The University of Alabama, the COE strives to enhance the intellectual and social condition of learners at all levels of teaching and learning. This conceptual framework sets forth the vision and guiding principles that support excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service and provides guidelines for the development of professionals committed to these visions and principles.

The theme of the College of Education is Unite, Act, and Lead (UA Leads). This theme is supported by four pillars of guiding principles: Ideals of Fairness and Equity, Reflective Stance for Professional Practice, Commitment to Diversity, and Culture of Collaboration. These pillars enable individual programs to express their disciplinary uniqueness in developing candidate proficiencies, while maintaining standards of excellence across the COE.

Vision and Mission of the College of Education

Mission

Our mission in the College of Education is to be a leader in Alabama and across the nation in teaching, scholarship, advocacy, and service by developing professionals with pedagogic and disciplinary expertise who advance the intellectual and social conditions of all learners in a globalized society.

Vision

The vision of the College of Education (COE) at The University of Alabama is to develop effective, ethical, and reflective professionals who advance the theme of the COE: Unite, Act, and Lead (UA Leads). This theme undergirds the four ideals of the COE: Ideals of Fairness and Equity, Reflective Stance for Professional Practice, Commitment to Diversity, and Culture of Collaboration. The fulfillment of these ideals calls for a commitment to academic excellence and advocacy through active engagement with shifting social and cultural contexts and advanced technological developments that shape the construction, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge.

The COE will continue to develop professionals who meet the needs of all learners that may arise from differences in race, ethnicity, language, religion, culture, SES, gender identity and expression, sex, sexual identity, disability, ability, age, national origin, geographic location, military status, and political affiliation. By engaging in theoretically informed and intellectually advanced advocacy and effective practice our graduates will

UNITE with the larger community to collaboratively nurture cultural competence, empathy, and a vision of equity and justice for all learners;

ACT to develop the full potential of all learners to be excellent professionals in their fields; and

LEAD through continuous research-based critical inquiry of policy and reflective practice to enable transformative change in our diverse local and global communities.

Through excellence in teaching, scholarship, advocacy, and service, the COE will facilitate visibility and voice of educational leaders beyond the classroom in support of democracy and social justice for all learners in our global society.

Philosophy, Purposes and Institutional Standards

Philosophy

This Conceptual Framework is based on the COE’s theme, UNITE, ACT, and LEAD (UA Leads), by offering a progressive conception of human nature that is related to principles of democratic practice and social justice. We support future educational professionals in all areas to develop an informed understanding of the nature and purposes of education and to engage in the ongoing processes of reflection and dialogue that are at the heart of professional practice. These competencies, together with a respect for diversity and a commitment to social justice, empower our faculty, staff, and graduates to UNITE, ACT, and LEAD in the community in pursuit of educational excellence for all students across our state and beyond.

This philosophical approach enables educational professionals to facilitate students’ physical, emotional, and intellectual development that is responsive to their specific social, cultural, and political contexts. Where appropriate and possible, our educational professionals will foster students’ self-empowerment and agency, giving them the capacity to critically evaluate and take action to enhance their own lives. Educational professionals are aware of the aims of education, including the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for productive educational careers and democratic citizenship. Educational professionals are also responsible for the development, mastery, and appropriate use of instructional practices, methods of assessment, and technological tools to effectively help students realize these ends. Our philosophy is committed to the following precepts of education: student-centered research-based practice (NRC, 2005), “wide-awakeness” (Greene, 1978), democracy in a diverse society (Dewey, 1932, West, 1993), an ethic of care and service to the community (Noddings, 1984), and social transformation (Freire, 1972). This philosophy encompasses our diverse programs and departments.

Purposes

This Conceptual Framework is a model that incorporates an integrated approach to providing programs, endorsements, courses and experiences that are consistent with state, national, and professional standards.

The goals set forth by the College of Education represent what we want our students to be able to do as they become professionals within their respective fields. Concurrently, these goals represent what we want to model and embody for our students as captured in the COE’s theme: UNITE, ACT, and LEAD (UA Leads); and the four supporting pillars of Ideals of Fairness and Equity, Reflective Stance for Professional Practice, Commitment to Diversity, and Culture of Collaboration provide the framework for the specific goals set by our college.

These goals include the following:

1. Collaborate with colleagues, families, schools and communities;
2. Meet educational needs through innovative curriculum and technology, to support all learners inclusive of race, ethnicity, language, religion, culture, SES, gender identity and expression, sex, sexual identity, disability, ability, age, national origin, geographic location, military status, and political affiliation;
3. Embed our work in principles of social justice for a democratic society;
4. Act with professionalism and sound pedagogy grounded in ethical principles; and
5. Reflect continuously on practice for innovation using disciplinary understanding, practical experience, research, and interdisciplinary dialogue with other professionals.

The updated goals complement and extend the goals from the 2007 COE conceptual framework. Table 2 illustrates how current goals align with the goals of the previous conceptual framework.

Table 1. The Alignment of College of Education’s Goals and Supporting Pillars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 COE Goals</th>
<th>COE Goals</th>
<th>COE Supporting Pillars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 COE Goals</td>
<td>Development of students’ physical, social, and intellectual abilities</td>
<td>Life-long learning informed by dialogue, practical experience, disciplinary expertise, and educational research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. COE Conceptual Framework Comparison of Goals between 2007 and 2014

Standards and Expectations

The theme of the COE, Unite, Act, and Lead (UA Leads), undergirds the four supporting ideals, which we refer to as pillars: Ideals of Fairness and Equity, Reflective Stance for Professional Practice, Commitment to Diversity, and Culture of Collaboration. The fulfillment of these ideals calls for a commitment to serve in an increasingly diverse, knowledge-based society, which is mediated by sociocultural change and technology. Thus, a commitment to diversity and the ethical and innovative use of technology constitute the two core conceptual elements of all the programs that prepare educational professionals within the COE.

Diversity

“The College of Education values the diverse social, cultural, and political forces that shape educators’
identities, as well as the identities of the students they serve. With the knowledge that diversity leads to a more dynamic and inclusive learning community, the College of Education seeks to recognize, cultivate, and respect diversity among its administration, faculty, and students. We are committed to developing professionals whose skills and technical proficiency are undergirded by an ethical foundation that supports sound professional judgment rooted in a commitment to equity and social justice. The COE’s commitment is aligned with the University’s vision statement from the Strategic Diversity Plan in that we are engaging communities through research, teaching, and service.

Diversity Expectations for Candidates
Candidates are encouraged to investigate and gain a current and deeper perspective of diversity issues (race, ethnicity, language, religion, culture, SES, gender identity and expression, sex, sexual identity, disability, ability, age, national origin, geographic location, military status, political affiliation, etc.) related to their chosen fields. Candidates have the opportunity to examine critically how diversity issues apply to and affect philosophical positions, sociological issues, and current events in a variety of areas. Candidates examine their belief systems and are encouraged to reexamine and develop more grounded beliefs and practices regarding diversity. Candidates also are provided with ample opportunities to critically engage and reflect on their teaching practices as they encounter diversity in the various work settings and to reflect on educational practices with a commitment to equity, democracy, and social justice.

Technology
The College of Education at The University of Alabama recognizes that technology plays a significant role in teaching, research, and service activities of developing professionals in this digital age. We acknowledge that technology, even the most advanced and sophisticated, is a tool or conduit for implementation of broader educational objectives. Our goal is to use sound professional judgment to engage with the best technological tools and practices in the COE advocate for appropriate and ethical use of technology to promote student success and faculty excellence.

Technology Expectations for Candidates
Candidates use technology effectively in a variety of ways to communicate and collaborate with their peers and instructors and create products as a means of expression of knowledge (iste nets.s, 2012). Candidates are exposed to a variety of digital tools that can be used in the creation, evaluation, and use of information. Finally, candidates in the COE advocate for appropriate and ethical use of technology. Through their multiple experiences with a variety of technology, students will develop a positive disposition towards technology that they carry with them into their professional careers.

This commitment to technology aligns with The University of Alabama’s Office of Technology (OIT) goals 3 and 4:

• OIT Goal 3. Enrich educational experiences through technology to promote student success and faculty excellence.

• OIT Goal 4. Engage the community beyond The University of Alabama campus and build global initiatives.

Knowledge Bases
The Knowledge Base for the College of Education’s Conceptual Framework encompasses the diverse work of the variety of programs, departments, and services provided by the college. We believe that our students should have strong content knowledge within their chosen disciplines. Thus programs assure that essential disciplinary knowledge is covered within their respective courses. The College of Education’s Conceptual Framework knowledge base allowed us to formulate our philosophy, mission, and vision. The following precepts of education: student-centered research-based practice (NRC, 2005), “wide-awakeness” (Greene, 1978), democracy in a diverse society (Dewey, 1932; West, 1993), an ethic of care and service to the community (Noddings, 1984), and social transformation (Freire, 1972) are situated within the context of the four supporting pillars of the Conceptual Framework of the College of Education.

The four pillars complement and extend the five themes and three dispositions from the 2007 COE Conceptual Framework. Table 3 illustrates how current supporting pillars align with the themes and dispositions of the previous Conceptual Framework.

2014 COE CF | 2007 COE CF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillars</th>
<th>Candidate and Community</th>
<th>Disciplinary and Pedagogic Expertise</th>
<th>Technology and Assessment</th>
<th>Collaboration and Life-long Learning</th>
<th>Democracy and Diversity</th>
<th>Student and the Context of Education</th>
<th>The Process of Instruction</th>
<th>The Goals of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pillar One: Ideals of Fairness and Equity
Education in a democratic society should encompass respect for and support of a diverse and inclusive citizenry while providing equal opportunity for individual development and self-actualization. Educational professionals committed to democratic practice should develop and engage in active leadership to advance social justice through the promotion of fairness and equity in decision-making and practice.

We are committed to the development of reflective educational professionals (Schon, 1987) who model critical thinking proficiencies that enable students to evaluate circumstances, policies, and practices. We are committed to the ideal of “prophetic hope” that includes the willingness “to engage in the audacious attempt to galvanize and energize to inspire and invigorate” (West, 1993, p. 5) professionals to work towards transforming systems of power that promote equality of opportunity (Freire, 1972).

Operationalizing Pillar One for Program Development and Candidate Evaluation
To ensure that candidates practice behaviors that are consistent with the ideals of fairness and equity stakeholders involved in the development of the Conceptual Framework developed a standard set of expectations for all professional education candidates:

• Adopt strategies that use all students’ unique prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests to construct educational practices that advance ideals of equity;

• Use pedagogical and evaluation methods that demonstrate that all students can learn; and

• Create environments that are safe spaces for productive discussions about fairness, for equitable learning opportunities, motivation, and appropriate behavior management strategies centered in physical, social, and emotional well-being of students.
Pillar Two: Reflective Stance for Professional Practice
Development of reflective practitioners (Schon, 1987) encompasses enhancement of capabilities to read and critically interpret the context of action, to formulate strategies responsive to such contexts, to evaluate the consequences and implications of these strategies, and to adapt these strategies for greater effectiveness and promotion of goals embedded in these pillars.

We envision the educational professionals coming out of our programs to view education as critical action embedded in research-based practices. As such, candidates understand that professional practice is based upon instructional principles that enable educators to design effective, research-based learning environments. Candidates in our programs understand that school curricula are embedded in different types of content that call for different types of teaching (Shulman, 1987) and diverse learners demand a mixture of instructional methods and learning activities (Brophy, 2001). Through classroom instruction and field experiences, we prepare educational professionals to enable students to transform their prior understandings into well-organized and conceptually grounded knowledge (Chi, Glaser, & Farr, 1988). We also teach educational professionals how to foster students’ control over their own learning through goal setting and self-monitoring (Ames, 1992; Bandura, 1997). These practices are developed within a framework that is learner-centered (instruction begins with what students think and know), knowledge-centered (instruction focuses on what is taught, why it is taught, and what mastery entails), assessment-centered (instruction is informed by students’ work and thought); and community-centered (instruction is embedded in a culture of questioning, respect, and risk taking) (National Research Council, 2000, 2005). Within our programs, educational professionals understand that effective instruction is principled and content-based, aligning the learning environment, management system, curriculum, instructional materials, assessment, and technology (Brophy, 2001).

Additionally, we want graduates of our programs to be educational professionals who understand that education is relational (DeLpitt, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978), where the measure of success or effectiveness must ultimately rely on the ability of educators to nurture and mediate the intellectual and personal growth of students they serve to experience an education wide-awake – the capacity to learn to love the questions and to be able to see “what was ordinarily observed by the family, so much of the accustomed and everyday that it escaped notice entirely” (p. 153).

Operationalizing Pillar Two for Program Development and Candidate Evaluation
To ensure that candidates exhibit a reflective stance for professional practice, stakeholders involved in the development of the Conceptual Framework developed a standard set of expectations for all professional education candidates that

- Exhibit a commitment to planning, reflecting;
- Practice standards of professional and ethical behavior or decision-making;
- Adopt a wide array of resources to promote critical reflection; and
- Seek avenues for lifelong learning, evidenced by engagement in professional learning communities.

Pillar Three: Commitment to Diversity
Diversity is extant in a multicultural society, and our policies and programs must work to meet the learning needs of all learners. Our goal is to develop educational professionals who see themselves as members of a diverse community and who recognize, respect, and engage the centrality of diversity in a growing and evolving society. Within this pillar, our responsibility is to prepare educational professionals who view education as student centered. We are committed to developing educational professionals who embrace a student-centered educational practice that is critically responsive to the (i) physical, intellectual, and emotional developmental of each student; (ii) diverse social, cultural, and political forces that shape each student’s identity and influence his/her opportunities in life; and (iii) interests of concerned constituencies, such as parents, school boards, and broader communities (COE Conceptual Framework, 2007). As such, we encourage our candidates to commit to developing a conceptually informed knowledge of teaching and learning. To that end, the COE seeks to promote a culture of collaboration which yields deeper and richer knowledge construction and greater appreciation for the relevance and implications of learning. In addition, the COE promotes collaboration that fosters understanding, respect, and care for diverse people with diverse perspectives and diverse ways of being.

We are committed to developing educational professionals who see education as an ethic of care and service to the community (Noddings, 1984, 2002, 2012) and who understand that every child deserves the opportunity, the resources, and the guidance to reach their life potential (Delpitt, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1994). We want candidates in our programs to learn that the ethic of care focuses on our relatedness to and with another and so education as a caring activity involves receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness to each other. We want our educational professionals to understand that since education is an endeavor that is both relational and collective in the common goal of empowerment for all people in our state, in our nation, and in our world, our ethic of care should also be our commitment to the motto, “lifting as we climb” (Davis, 1988, p. 349). Thus, we are committed to developing educational professionals who understand that collaborative advancement in education is advancement for the entire community.

To this end, the COE engages in several different collaborations with diverse stakeholders. For instance, COE faculty provide leadership, lend their expertise, and serve at state and regional organizations in the production and dissemination of knowledge within their respective fields. At the same time faculty provide mentorship to students to not only be consumers but producers of knowledge at the regional, state, and local levels. Our faculty also collaborates with the Graduate School, Honors College, International Programs, and a number of other programs across the University.

Additionally, the COE models and advances collaborative practices by having a strong collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences. Our strong partnership is evidenced in faculty holding joint appointments in both COE and A&S, service in committee work, dissertation committees, and grants and research projects. Indeed, the COE and A&S have established formal joint programs in the STEM disciplines. Furthermore, the elementary and secondary education programs and certifications depend on teacher candidates successfully completing their content courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. Thus, the COE and the College of Arts and Sciences unite, create, and recruit students to address teacher shortages, especially in STEM related fields. With higher expectations on certification assessments, this collaboration and responsibility to
content knowledge will grow and expand to benefit the needs of the students.

Operationalizing Pillar Four for Program Development and Candidate Evaluation
To ensure that candidates foster a culture of collaboration, stakeholders involved in the development of the Conceptual Framework developed a standard set of expectations for all professional education candidates to:

- Demonstrate collaborative practices with students, schools, families, colleagues, or communities;
- Recognize the importance of local, regional, and global partnerships; and
- Incorporate a wide variety of resources in the school, family, or community to facilitate student learning.

Operationalizing Pillar Four for Program Development and Candidate Evaluation

To ensure that candidates foster a culture of collaboration, stakeholders involved in the development of the Conceptual Framework developed a standard set of expectations for all professional education candidates to:

- Demonstrate collaborative practices with students, schools, families, colleagues, or communities;
- Recognize the importance of local, regional, and global partnerships; and
- Incorporate a wide variety of resources in the school, family, or community to facilitate student learning.

The COE received State Department of Education approval of its programs in 2008 and was accredited by NCATE in 2008. The COE’s professional education programs are based on professional standards that reflect exemplary practice across all professional education programs. The overriding goal of the unit is to consistently and relentlessly achieve the primary purpose of preparing reflective professionals for success in diverse communities.

Alabama State Department of Education
All state initial and advanced teacher certification programs are modeled after the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) as reflected in the professional studies section of the Alabama Code. The state technology standards are aligned with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards. The professional education unit rigorously adheres to the Alabama State Department of Education standards for initial and advanced teacher education, educational administration, and school counseling programs. Programming for teacher preparation and master’s programs are designed to meet the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS). These standards include (1) content knowledge; (2) teaching and learning; (3) literacy; (4) diversity; and (5) professionalism. These standards are expected to be met and scored within courses.

CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES ALIGNED WITH EXPECTATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL, STATE, AND INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS

The University of Alabama’s College of Education is committed to accreditation and the alignment of programs to national standards. UA has been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools since 1897, the most recent reaffirmation of accreditation was 2005, and the next review will be 2015. Table 4 provides the relevant discipline-based accreditations within the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Course Area</th>
<th>University of Alabama</th>
<th>State Department of Education</th>
<th>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)</th>
<th>Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Pre-K to 6th Grade</td>
<td>Pre-K to 6th Grade</td>
<td>Pre-K to 6th Grade</td>
<td>Pre-K to 6th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Education</td>
<td>7th to 9th Grade</td>
<td>7th to 9th Grade</td>
<td>7th to 9th Grade</td>
<td>7th to 9th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Education</td>
<td>10th to 12th Grade</td>
<td>10th to 12th Grade</td>
<td>10th to 12th Grade</td>
<td>10th to 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATE Alabama
EDUCATE Alabama (EA) is Alabama’s online formative assessment process to evaluate teachers in their first three years. This assessment is aligned with the AQTS and include (1) content knowledge; (2) teaching and learning; (3) literacy; (4) diversity; and (5) professionalism. This assessment provides information about the educator’s current level of practice through reflection, self-assessment, and goal setting. Throughout the teacher preparation programs reflection, self-assessment, and goal setting are embedded to ensure that our students are able to succeed in their beginning years as teachers.

Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders
Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders provide the expectation for high quality school leadership for principals and administrators. The standards are (1) planning for continuous improvement; (2) teaching and learning; (3) human resources development; (4) diversity; (5) community and stakeholder relationships; (6) technology; (7) management of the learning organization; and (8) ethics.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)
In addition to meeting state standards, the unit has mapped its teacher preparation programs directly to the InTASC standards. These standards serve as the basis for the unit’s desired outcomes of its teacher candidates which include (1) knowledge of subject matter; (2) knowledge...
of development and learning; (3) diversity; (4) multiple instructional strategies; (5) learning environment; (6) communication; (7) instructional planning skills including technology; (8) assessment; (9) professional commitment/responsibility/reflection; and (10) collaboration/professionalism.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)
The unit has aligned the educational administration program with the six ISLLC standards. The standards serving as the basis of the program include (1) vision of learning; (2) school culture; (3) learning environment; (4) community involvement; (5) ethics and integrity; and (6) political, social, economics, legal and cultural context.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
For candidates seeking certification in school counseling, the unit has aligned the program with the CACREP standards. The standards serving as the basis of the program are (1) professional identity; (2) social and cultural foundations; (3) human growth and development; (4) career development; (5) helping relationships; (6) group work; (7) assessment; (8) research and evaluation; (8) technology; (9) school counseling program; (10) collaboration; (11) school climate; (12) advocacy; and (13) reflective practice.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards (NCATE)
The professional education unit is equally committed to meeting the six revised 2002 NCATE standards in its initial and advanced certification programs. These include (1) candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; (2) assessment system and unit evaluations; (3) field experiences and clinical practice; (4) diversity; (5) faculty qualifications, performance, and development; and (6) unit governance and resources.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
For candidates seeking advanced degrees in teacher education, the unit continues to refine its programs to align more closely with NBPTS standards. The five core propositions serve as the basis for the refinement of these programs. They are (1) teachers are committed to students and their learning; (2) teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students; (3) teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning; (4) teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and (5) teachers are members of learning communities.

College of Education Candidate Proficiencies
The theme of the College of Education is Unite, Act, and Lead (UA Leads). This theme is supported by the four pillars of guiding principles: Ideals of Fairness and Equity, Reflective Stance for Professional Practice, Commitment to Diversity, and Culture of Collaboration. The candidate proficiencies/competencies align with the theme of the COE as Unite, Act, and Lead (UA Leads) and with the COE Goals, InTASC, and Educate Alabama standards. The COE Assessment Committee along with the Conceptual Framework Committee solicited input through a faculty survey to develop the College's candidate proficiencies.

Competent Candidates

**UNITE** by…
• Modeling life-long learning by analytically and systematically reflecting upon one's own and others’ practices, and in continuous collaboration with professional learning communities.
• Demonstrating an ability to collaborate with colleagues, schools, families, and communities in order to serve all students.

**ACT** by…
• Serving with the decorum expected of a contributing member in the educational profession and demonstrating professionalism grounded in ethical principles.
• Developing positive and safe learning environments which allow students to have a democratic voice and reach high levels of learning,
• Appropriately integrating and adapting meaningful technology into professional practice to support the success of all students.
• Utilizing proven skills and methods to reach all learners and effectively teach and assess the content.

**LEAD** by…
• Displaying a depth of knowledge in the content field which is supported by a broad educational foundation.
• Exhibiting the pedagogical expertise to build on the individual and cultural strengths of all students.
• Engaging in authentic and reflective assessment practices for assessing the learning, academic development, and growth of all students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Educate Alabama</th>
<th>InTASC</th>
<th>COE Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Long Learning</td>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>Standard 9</td>
<td>Goal 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collaborate</td>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>Standard 10</td>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve with decorum</td>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>Standard 9</td>
<td>Goal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe learning environment</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful technology skills and methods</td>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Standard 8</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in content</td>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Goal 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical expertise</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective assessment</td>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Goal 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College of Education Candidate Competencies Alignment Chart
The Unit has developed a continuous improvement plan supported by a strategic examination of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations through the UA-S. The UA-S is a two-pronged system: (a) Candidate Performance and Program Quality are overseen by the Assessment Committee; and (b) Unit Operations are evaluated by the Dean and the Unit’s Leadership Council (LC). This system has enabled the Unit to systematically track its progress and develop continuous improvement plans.

Candidate Performance/Program Quality
Overseight of candidate performance and program quality are conducted by the Assessment Committee (AC), which is chaired by the Senior Associate Dean. The AC provides input and feedback about the unit wide assessment system and related processes. The AC consists of representatives from each department in the College of Education (COE), faculty members from Arts and Sciences (A&S) and School Library Science and Information Studies (SLIS), and Unit Assessment Committee members represent their Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Assessment Committee discussions and report meeting business to their respective faculties. The AC meets monthly to discuss assessment issues which include implementation of continuous improvement activities; candidate and program assessments; and possible revisions to the UA-S.

The Unit’s Assessment Staff and Assessment Committee are responsible for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data collected. The Assessment Staff (Senior Associate Dean, Associate Dean for Student Services and Certification, Coordinator of Accreditation, Assessment, and Reporting Support, and Clinical Instructor for Technology Applications and Assessment) compile reports, which include candidate performance data, stakeholder feedback (graduate, alumni and employer surveys). Data are provided to each EPP at the Unit departmental retreats held in August and January, regularly scheduled EPP faculty meetings, and collegewide faculty/staff meetings (see Attachment UA-S Data Sources).

The work of the AC is supported by the work of other Unit committees and entities. For example, the Clinical Experiences Advisory Committee (CEAC) comprised of classroom teachers, school district personnel, and university faculty/staff discuss issues related to field experiences/Practical Experience and assessments, which provide recommendations and feedback to Unit Leadership.

The CEAC chair, the Director of Clinical Experiences, submits committee recommendations to the Unit’s leadership. The University Council on Teacher Education includes school district personnel, Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) personnel, College of Education representation, and College of Arts and Sciences representatives as an important component of the unit wide assessment process by providing feedback and support (e.g., Praxis test analysis and course alignment) to the Unit. AC recommendations and proposal approvals are sent to the Leadership Council for review. The LC, which is led by the Dean, is comprised of the Administrative Council (Dean, Associate Dean for Student Services, Associate Dean for Research and Service, and Director of Financial Affairs, and six Department Heads).

Candidate Performance
All candidates are assessed at three transition points (checkpoints): Program Entry, Program Progression, and Program Completion. A minimum of five key assessments are employed and evaluated to ensure expectations are met.

Initial Educator Preparation
Bachelor’s Degree/Alabama Class “B” Certification
Alternative Master’s Degree/Alabama Class “A” Certification
Key assessments, across three transition points, are used to assess initial certification candidates in undergraduate and alternative master’s educator preparation programs. Undergraduates and alternative master’s candidates seeking initial certification must meet admission requirements for The University of Alabama and the Teacher Education Program. TEP applications are reviewed by program faculty to ensure that candidates meet program and state requirements (e.g., GPA, Basic Skills test, writing sample/ interview) for program entry. Professional dispositions, GPA, and Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTSs) are also assessed by program faculty at ALSDE requirements, each of the 150 AQTS indicators were aligned to specific courses in each of the initial EPPs to allow for assessment and the assurance by the Associate Dean for Student Services and Certification, that each initial candidate had met each AQTS indicator, as designated on a 4-point scale (Advanced-4, Target-3, Developing-2, Unacceptable-1). All indicators must be assessed at a 2 or above in order to complete course requirements. Starting in spring 2015, the E-Portfolio is assessed for the first of three times at Program Entry.

A review of all initial certification candidates is conducted prior to Clinical Practice. Before candidates can enter Clinical Practice (Candidates and Progression), they must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 150 hours (with 90 hours in three hour increments) in the P – 12 schools, pass Praxis test(s) required by the candidate’s program, and meet all Unit and EPP GPA requirements. At the end of the Clinical Practice (Program Completion), candidates complete their TEP portfolios and must satisfactorily meet all academic, clinical, and pedagogical requirements by program areas; all alternative master’s candidates must satisfactorily complete a Comprehensive Assessment designed by their EPP to assess content and pedagogical knowledge. Since implementation for initial certification candidates, only one candidate has not completed the portfolio requirements, and in turn, was not recommended for certification until completed.

Traditional Master’s Degree/Alabama Class “A” Certification
Educational Specialist Degree/ Alabama Class “AA” Certification

All Advanced Teacher Candidates or Other School Professionals pursuing certification at the traditional master’s and educational specialist/AA levels are assessed at three transition points with five key assessments.

Candidates at both levels must meet all university and state admission requirements at Program Entry; key assessments at Program Entry include GPAs and MAT/GRE Scores. Recognizing the need to employ technologies to support candidate reflection and data collection through an E-portfolio process, beginning in January 2014, all incoming Advanced candidates were required to utilize LiveText as a tool, which allowed the Unit to engage in systematic digitized assessments that reflected the new Dispositions, Conceptual Framework, Unit Competencies, Clinical Assignment, and E-portfolio assessment which include candidate reflection. For instance, upon admission, a Graduate Orientation Module is completed by each new Educator Preparation Candidate, which includes uploading artifacts into an electronic portfolio that reflect the Unit’s candidates’ prior professional or academic work that relate to the College’s four professional dispositions. Program faculty assess the artifacts and other components which provide a benchmark on which the candidates can reflect and grow throughout the program; any assessment deemed “Unacceptable” 1 on the 4-point scale at any checkpoint requires remediation by the candidate’s EPP faculty. Clinical experiences embedded into specific program courses are assessed by program faculty at transition points; a key assessment developed for the clinical component is completed in each candidate’s E-portfolio.

During program completion, candidates must meet Praxis I, II, and III scores (if required) and GPA requirements (3.0 for MA required and 3.25 for Educational Specialist required). As part of the comprehensive assessment, program faculty evaluate a third dispositions assessment as part of the E-portfolio, which is submitted and assessed by the candidate’s EPP faculty with the Advanced Portfolio Rubric. Candidates must complete a program specific comprehensive examination at the end of their comprehensive assessment, which may be an exam and/or thesis (Ed.D. program) to meet program completion requirements.

Ed.D. Educator Preparation Programs
Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, and Special Education

Doctorate of Education candidates who enroll in degree programs that are preparing graduates for K-12 educational settings are assessed at three transition points with five key assessments. At Program Entry all students must meet University graduate school admission requirements including GRE/MAT scores, GPA, transcripts, statement of purpose and letters of recommendations. GRE/MAT scores and prior GPA serve as key assessments for the first transition point. Professional dispositions are reviewed at all three transition points and serve as a benchmark for candidates and faculty. During Program Progression, the comprehensive examination serves as a key assessment along with the Professional Dispositions. During the Program Completion phase, Ed.D. candidates participate in a Clinical Experience, are evaluated on their Professional Dispositions, and must complete the dissertation.

Candidate performance data are collected at three checkpoints (transition points) from entry to the program through program completion. Data are reported, shared, and analyzed throughout the academic year with faculty and stakeholders. Data are collected and archived through a variety of processes and technology tools. Admissions data (i.e., GRE/MAT scores, GPA data are collected from the University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment [OIRA]). The Office of Student Services, led by the Associate Dean for Student Services and Certification maintains a database that tracks candidate data, such as Praxis scores, TEP admission dates. This office is also responsible for completing the Title II annual report, ALSDE admission reports and maintaining Praxis II data from Educational Testing Services (ETS). The CAEP Annual Report and the PEDS Report are completed by the Assessment Staff, led by the Senior Associate Dean, with the assistance of the Leadership Council and the Assessment Committee. The
Senior Associate Dean represents the College of Education on the University Assessment Council. Information related to SACS COC, annual university assessment reports, and institutional effectiveness are discussed by the University Assessment Council. Data related to candidate, employer, and alumni perceptions collected from the Educational Benchmark Inc. and internal entities are sent to the Coordinator of Accreditation, Assessment, and Reporting Support to be compiled and shared with stakeholders.

The Unit has developed partnerships with other university entities to assist with this process. Disposition, AGTS, and selected Clinical Experience data are housed and archived in LiveText. Faculty complete Professional Dispositions and AGTS assessments each semester on candidates, providing a score of 1 – 4 for each component. Inter-rater reliability is used to ensure the assessment data are reliable.

The Clinical Instructor who coordinates the technology applications and assessment systems provides program and departmental reports to Department Heads. Additional data from mentoring teachers and university supervisors are stored in the Office of Clinical Experiences.

Unit Operations

The focus of Unit Operations is to ensure and support the development of “professionals with pedagogical and disciplinary expertise who advance the intellectual and social conditions of all learners in a globalized society” (Conceptual Framework, 2014, p. 4). The ongoing operations of the Unit are indicative of a shared governance model that invites and recognizes voices of its participants in the decision-making process. The leadership team of the Unit includes multiple entities: Administrative Council, Leadership Council, Staff Council, and numerous committees, including the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) and Faculty Issues Committee (FIC). These groups serve to support, review, and recommend policies and procedures for the Unit. The AIC, reviews and makes recommendations to the Dean that related to curricular or academic concerns. The FIC addresses policies (e.g., annual review) or issues of faculty concern.

These groups serve to support, review, and recommend policies and procedures for the Unit. The AIC, reviews and makes recommendations to the Dean that relate to curricular or academic concerns. The FIC addresses policies (e.g., annual review) or issues of faculty concern.

Data are collected and reviewed with the appropriate entity. Research productivity is reviewed to evaluate faculty scholarship, research funding, research impact. Stakeholder data collected examines candidate preparation, advising/mentoring, technology, and facilities. Financial data includes research/advancement, grant funding, and budget/planning. Data are collected and reviewed with the appropriate entity. The Coordinator of Accreditation, Assessment, and Reporting Support collaborates with members of the Administrative Council to collect and provide data to the EPPs and Unit leadership, which are used to inform decision-making.

Technology Tools

As previously mentioned, the Unit employs multiple technologies for its UA-S. At the time of the last visit, the Unit relied on the Teacher Education Assessment System (TEAS), a database for all certification levels and LiveText for initial candidates to organize the UA-S. Initially, TEAS allowed for reporting of performance data (e.g., faculty publications, examination pass scores). Over time, the utility of TEAS was deemed insufficient to meet the growing needs of the UA-S, which led to its discontinuance. At present, the Unit employs several technologies to support the UA-S.

Since 2007, evaluations of the 150 Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AGTS) indicators have been ongoing. Although no indicator is assessed more than once, candidates and faculty can review candidate progress by examining candidate growth as it relates to one of the five AGTS (Content Knowledge, Teaching and Learning, Literacy, Diversity, Professionalism). The Clinical Instructor for Technology Applications and Assessment runs AGTS reports and provides them to the departments as well as the Associate Dean for Student Services and Certification to verify that standards are met for state certification.

The LiveText system also allows for reports to be run for the EPPs, E-Portfolios, and EPPs Internet reporting multiple course sections. Reports on Dispositions, Graduate Orientation Module, Advanced Clinical Experiences, E-Portfolios are provided to EPPs and the Senior Associate Dean. In 2015, staff from UA Central Administration met with Unit staff to explore ways to interface Banner with the expanded LiveText version. LiveText Analytics, that provides a deeper data analysis, especially as related to individual and longitudinal candidate data.

Another important technology used to support candidate data is an ACCESS database, which operates from the Office of Student Services and Certification. Candidate entry points, completion information, and certification requirements are tracked in the database. The Unit’s Registrar utilizes reports from ACCESS and LiveText to ensure that program completion requirements have been met.

As previously mentioned, WEAVEonline is utilized campus wide for submission and sharing of the Institution’s annual reports and goals. The Faculty Activity Report system (FAR) is employed by administrators to assess the productivity of the faculty and assists with the Annual Faculty Review; the Associate Dean for Research and Service serves as the head administrator of the annual FARs, which is utilized by the Dean and Department Heads as part of the Annual Faculty Review.

With the implementation of the Unit’s Strategic Plan, and expansions in our UA-S, the Unit’s leadership, led by the Dean will explore new technologies that will meet the expanding needs of the Unit to collect, analyze, and disseminate candidate, program, and unit data.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Implementation

Data are collected and archived through a variety of processes and technology tools. Admissions data (i.e., GRE/MAT scores, GPA data) are collected from the University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). The Office of Student Services maintains a database that tracks a candidate’s progress relative to Praxis scores, TEP admission dates from admission through recommendation for certification. This office is also responsible for completing the Title II annual report, State admission reports and maintaining Praxis II data from Educational Testing Services (ETS). The NCATE Annual Report and the PEDS Report are completed by the Senior Associate Dean with the assistance of the College of Education Leadership Council and College of Education Assessment Committee. The Senior Associate Dean represents the College of Education on the University Assessment Council. Information related to SACS COC, annual university assessment reports, and alignments to the University’s strategic plan are discussed by the University Assessment Council. All the tasks and information are essential components of the College of Education’s Assessment System.

Data related to candidate, employer, and alumni perceptions collected from the Educational Benchmark Inc. and internal entities are sent to the Coordinator of Accreditation, Assessment, and Reporting Support, to be compiled and shared with stakeholders. The College of Education has developed partnerships with other university entities to assist with this process. Disposition, AGTS, and selected Clinical Experience data are housed and archived in LiveText. Faculty complete Professional Dispositions and AGTS assessments each semester on candidates, providing a score of 1 – 4 for each component. Inter-rater reliability is used to ensure the assessment data are reliable.

The Clinical Instructor who coordinates the technology applications and assessment systems provides program and departmental reports to Department Heads. Additional data from mentoring teachers and university supervisors are stored in the Office of Clinical Experiences.

Data are reported, shared, and analyzed throughout the academic year with faculty and stakeholders. The College of Education Assessment Committee provides input and feedback about the unit wide assessment system and related processes. Committee members represent their respective programs in Assessment Committee discussions and report meeting business to their respective faculties. Other administrators, including the Dean and Department Heads, Advisory Committee comprised of classroom teachers, school district personnel, and university faculty discuss issues, which emerge about Clinical Experiences and provide feedback to the College. The University Council on Teacher Education includes school district personnel, Alabama State Department of Education personnel, College of Education representation, and College of Arts and Sciences representatives and constitutes an important component of the College of Education’s unit wide assessment process.

The current Conceptual Framework evolved from previous efforts to unify the missions and outcomes of the CCE’s multiple academic programs and reflect the growth and progress of the college. The previous work on the Conceptual Framework was completed in 2007 and used by the current committee to expand, clarify, and unite the philosophies and work from all departments. The connection to and revision of the 2007 Conceptual Framework is demonstrated throughout the document. For example, Table 2 demonstrates the overlap between the goals of the 2007 Conceptual Framework and the 2014 Conceptual Framework. Table 3 demonstrates the overlap between the themes and dispositions of the 2007 Conceptual Framework and the 2014 Conceptual Framework. Language used in the 2007 Conceptual Framework is integrated into the description of the four pillars in the Knowledge Bases section.

The current Conceptual Framework also evolved from other college-wide efforts to develop a unified set of dispositions to be used as an analytic, design, and assessment framework across the college. In Spring 2013, a college-wide assessment committee consisting of representatives
from all departments across the college developed four dispositions (see Appendix A) that were made available for college-wide feedback, then revised, voted on, and adopted in Summer 2013.

In Fall 2013 the Conceptual Framework Committee was formed to evaluate and revise the 2007 Conceptual Framework. This committee represents all departments within the college and includes faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students. This committee met weekly from Fall 2013 through Spring 2014 developing the Conceptual Framework.

Before crafting the current Conceptual Framework, the committee developed a list of stakeholders including College of Education faculty, students, and staff, affiliated faculty and administrators across the university, K-12 educational leaders across the state, principals from across the state, and local K-12 administrators and educators who represent key community partnerships with the College of Education. At the beginning of October 2013, these stakeholders were solicited via email to take an open ended on-line survey for their feedback about the vision, mission, and general direction of the college. The survey was developed from the NCATE Conceptual Framework requirements and consisted of seven open-ended questions. They included the following:

1. What is the purpose/mission of education?
2. What core attributes does the college want to develop in professionals in education?
3. What goals and outcomes should the college have for the different professionals in education?
4. In what ways can the Conceptual Framework address relevant local, state, and national educational policies and standards?
5. What are the expected proficiencies among professionals in education?
6. How should the goals, outcomes, and proficiencies of professionals in education be assessed and evaluated; and
7. Describe any additional thoughts and ideas about the mission of the College of Education.

The feedback received from the stakeholders was compiled and organized into themes and ideas. During this process, the committee recognized that the feedback from the stakeholders was consistent with the four dispositions developed by the Assessment Committee. Therefore, the committee decided to use the dispositions developed by the Assessment Committee and adopted by the COE as the foundation for the mission and vision statements. These dispositions became the four pillars described throughout the current Conceptual Framework.

Using the feedback from the stakeholders and the dispositions developed by the Assessment Committee, the Conceptual Framework Committee crafted the vision and mission statements. The vision and mission were sent to COE faculty and stakeholders for comment and discussion at departmental meetings with representatives from the community, the mission and vision was openly discussed as an agenda item during the December 2013 COE faculty meeting. Based on the feedback received during these meetings, the Conceptual Framework Committee made minor revisions to the vision and mission of the COE. Since the revisions were minor, the vision and mission of the COE was sent to COE faculty for vote and was approved in January 2014.

Using the vision and mission as its foundation, the Conceptual Framework Committee developed the full Conceptual Framework during Spring 2014. At the beginning of April 2014, the Conceptual Framework was sent to COE faculty and stakeholders for review. The Conceptual Framework was also openly discussed as an agenda item during the April 2014 COE faculty meeting. COE faculty and stakeholders had three weeks to offer comment. Based on the feedback from these meetings, the Conceptual Framework Committee revised the final document. During the Summer and Fall 2014, the COE Assessment Committee sought input from faculty to complete the College's proficiencies and description of the Unit Wide Assessment System. A final review by the entire COE faculty meeting. Based on the feedback received during these meetings, the Conceptual Framework Committee made minor revisions to the vision and mission of the COE. Since the revisions were minor, the vision and mission of the COE was sent to COE faculty for vote and was approved in January 2014.
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