



# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Patricia I. Wright, Ed.D.  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
P.O. BOX 2120  
Richmond, Virginia 23218-2120

Office: (804) 225-2023  
Fax: (804) 371-2099

January 3, 2012

Dr. Matthew D. Shank  
President  
Marymount University  
2807 N. Glebe Road  
Arlington, Virginia 22207

Dear President Shank:

I am pleased to inform you that on November 17, 2011, the Virginia Board of Education approved the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's (ABTEL) recommendation to grant education programs at Marymount University the "Approved" status. The list of approved education programs by endorsement areas is enclosed.

*The Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* (8VAC20-542-10 et seq.), effective September 21, 2007, and amended January 19, 2011, require colleges and universities that offer programs for the preparation of professional school personnel to obtain education program (endorsement area) approval from the Board of Education. The approval of education programs includes the review of biennial reporting of the seven accountability measures and program alignment with endorsement area competencies as outlined in "8VAC20-542-50 and 70" of the regulations. Based on the report of the biennial accountability measures for September 1, 2009, to August 31, 2011, each program endorsement area must receive one of the following three ratings by the Board of Education: *Approved*, *Approved with Stipulations*, or *Approval Denied*. Marymount University met all criteria for education programs.

Please convey our congratulations to the faculty, staff, and students in the Education Department for their achievement. If you have questions regarding the Board's decision, please contact Mrs. Patty S. Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, at (804) 371-2522 or e-mail: [Patty.Pitts@doe.virginia.gov](mailto:Patty.Pitts@doe.virginia.gov).

Sincerely,

Patricia I. Wright

PIW/jyc  
Enclosure

c: ✓ Dr. Wayne A. Lesko  
Mrs. Patty S. Pitts  
Dr. JoAnne Y. Carver

# MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

Elementary Education PreK-6

School Counselor PreK-12

Visual Arts PreK-12

English as a Second Language PreK-12

Computer Science

English

History and Social Sciences

Mathematics

Science - Biology

Science - Chemistry

Science - Earth Science

Science - Physics

Special Education - General Curriculum K-12

Administration and Supervision PreK-12

Administration and Supervision PreK-12 (central office only)



# BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

## Summary for Professional Education Unit

### Institution Name:

Marymount University

### Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 4: Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

### Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

## I. Introduction

### I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

Marymount University (MU) in Arlington, Virginia, was originally founded in 1950 by the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary as a women's college, known as Marymount College of Virginia. In 1960, the institution was incorporated as Marymount College of Virginia, an independent college governed by an autonomous board of directors, and in 1972, the institution's first male students were admitted into the nursing program. In 1973, Marymount became a senior college offering a bachelor's degree in more than 20 fields, and in 1979, graduate programs leading to a master's degree were added. The institution became coeducational at all levels in 1986, and its name was changed to Marymount University. The professional education unit resides in the School of Education and Human Services (SEHS). The core mission of SEHS is to enable students to serve as agents of positive change in the local and global communities. SEHS offers baccalaureate degree programs in four major disciplines: criminal justice,

criminal justice/forensic science, psychology, and sociology.

**I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?**

The Commonwealth of Virginia has developed a partnership with NCATE and the protocol developed through that partnership was followed. Being a joint visit, state and NCATE team members shared writing assignments, interview responsibilities, and decision making during the visit.

**I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).**

Marymount University offers programs through two off-campus sites, the Ballston Campus and the Reston Center. Both sites were visited during the visit and candidates and faculty from both sites were included in interviews.

**I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.**

No unusual circumstances affected the visit.

## II. Conceptual Framework

*The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.*

**II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.**

The unit's mission statement and the three basic tenets of its conceptual framework are clearly tied to the university's mission, strategic plan, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The stated goal of all Marymount University education programs is to prepare students for a variety of educational positions in P-12 school settings. The Education Department strives to graduate educators who embody the characteristics of "critical thinkers," "effective practitioners," and "caring professionals". These include solid academic knowledge, up-to-date teaching skills, ethical behavior, professional demeanor, and appropriate personal characteristics.

The conceptual framework tenets are further delineated and measured by the learning outcomes statements at each program level. The undergraduate teacher candidates are expected to: make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data; use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students; demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy; effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods; and exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting. Graduate candidates are expected to: analyze content, behavior, and data for instructional decision making; use strategic problem solving to support the development of all learners; demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy; reflect on the context of the classroom and the outcomes of they students;

use communication, technology, management, and pedagogical skills to implement instruction and assessment; and exhibit high ethical standards, respectful attitudes, and a dedication to teaching. Administration and Supervision candidates are expected to: demonstrate effective problem solving skills, tools of inquiry, and analytical abilities that generate multiple solutions for practical decision-making that can affect the school, student development, the parish, and the wider community; understand supervision evaluation strategies for faculty/staff growth and development; understand basic legal issues and demonstrate knowledge of resources related to safe and effective management of student, faculty, and school issues; exemplify a love of teaching, appreciation for diversity, respect for the unique gifts and talents of all, and understand the importance of integrating the values of faith; demonstrate high moral, ethical, and legal standards in their relationships with students, faculty, and parents; and exhibit an effective and caring attitude that seeks to develop the whole child intellectually, physically, emotionally, socially, and spiritually.

### III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

#### Standard 1

##### Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

*Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

##### 1.1 Overall Findings

**What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

All evidence from assessments of candidates in the Teacher Education (TE), Professional Studies (PRST), and Administration and Supervision (A&S). programs indicates that nearly all candidates meet or exceed performance expectations. In the letter dated January 3, 2012, from the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), all programs received "Approved" status. The programs, therefore, are meeting content standards. In examining the way in which the programs use the results of the assessments to improve their programs, interviews with program administrators, faculty, and students provide compelling evidence that few major changes based on assessment data were warranted.

The Offsite Report included two areas of concern for Standard 1. The first area of concern was: "Evidence/data/exhibits provided do not support the use of data to make program level (teaching endorsement area) decisions to improve candidate performance." The team removed this area of concern, because the unit provided evidence on the NCATE Blackboard website that there is a university assessment and accountability process to use candidate assessment data to inform decisions about program change. On an annual basis, each program submits the Student Learning Assessment Report that analyzes and summarizes program assessment data, identifies strengths and weaknesses, and makes recommendations for program improvements based upon the analysis. With only a few exceptions, nearly every case this process indicates that no program changes were warranted.

The team also removed the second area of concern: "There is a lack of information, data, and analysis of data for Counselor Education." The team removed this area of concern, because NCATE policy is that for the School Counseling Program, which is approved by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling

and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), the team is required to review the program only for NCATE Standard 6. The letter from CACREP that was added to the unit's NCATE website during the onsite visit stated that the School Counseling Program was approved by CACREP, and this is the only evidence required for Standard 1 to be met.

The offsite report also included nine items related to evidence to validate during the onsite visit. The team's findings for these nine items are the following:

Provide context for assessments and breakdown of candidate data by performance categories. This evidence was provided in the IR Addendum, which provides information about assessments and how means are calculated. Folder 1.5.1 of the IR Addendum (on unit NCATE BlackBoard site) provides graphs for levels of performance for all of the key assessments for all programs. For the teacher education program, the key assessments, including the Professional Portfolio, Self-Assessment form, Teacher Work Sample, Student Teaching Summary Report, and Critical Assignments are aligned with InTASC Standards. Sample portfolios were in the workroom that provided detailed descriptions and examples of critical assignments and rubrics;

How do dispositions measure fairness and understanding that all children can learn?

The IR provides an explanation for how fairness is included in ethics, etc. in some key assessments. The IR Addendum indicates that "understanding that all children can learn" is assessed in Standard 4 of the Portfolio, but the standard does not emphasize this disposition. Standard 4 states: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

How are data presented related to evidence of continuous improvement?

The unit provided a new chart of "Change or Revisions to Program or Unit" in IR exhibit Folder 1.5.3. A primary source of data cited for program improvements was narrative comments in exit surveys of student teaching or in the PRST Goals exit feedback survey. The IR Addendum exhibits provide copies of the annual summary assessment reports and the annual program reports, such as "Student Learning Assessment Plan 2009-2010 Grad TE." These reports include analysis of the annual data for each program and recommendations for changes as needed.

What is the evidence to verify that other programs are accredited? The IR states that all programs are approved by the Virginia Board of Education. A letter dated January 3, 2012, from the Virginia Department of Education is included in the exhibit and states that all programs are approved. The School Counseling Program is accredited by CACREP.

What information is available about the critical assessments and portfolio evidence for Administration and Supervision K-12 (Catholic School Leadership Program)? In the original IR exhibit, document 1.3.c Key Assessments for Administration and Supervision provides the scoring rubrics – one to be used in any course with a critical assessment and one each for the portfolio, onsite evaluation, and evaluation by the University Supervisor. An examination of portfolios in the visit workroom provided good evidence that the critical assignments and feedback from faculty to candidates are designed to assess the standards identified on the scoring rubric. The collection of critical assessments provide for good breadth and depth of coverage of the standards for Administration and Supervision program candidates. The final summary statement in the portfolio provided by the candidate provides an analysis of the manner in which the critical assessments, and other documents provide evidence of their performance.

What are the data and explanations/analysis of data for Administration and Supervision?

Folder 1.5.1 provides means for each assessment for the Administration and Supervision program. Graphs also were provided at the onsite visit which included the breakdown of performance levels for

each of the assessments. Data are aligned with the Virginia Department of Education standards for Administration and Supervision. The unit provided a copy of the state approved matrices for Administration and Supervision that provided evidence of alignment of courses in the program with each Standard (January 2010 letter).

What is the evidence of impact on student learning in Administration and Supervision program? In addition to the scoring rubrics and portfolios, the unit provided data in Folder 1.5.8 about job placements, which evidences the success of their program at placing nearly all of the graduates in school leadership positions.

What do alumni surveys of Administration and Supervision graduates show?

The alumni surveys for the Administration and Supervision program graduates, though few in number, provide data for program review. IR exhibits also included data on employment of Administration and Supervision graduates in IR Addendum Folder 1.5.8. Eighty-eight percent of the graduates of the A&S program are employed within the first three months after graduation, and of those 88% that are employed, 100% are employed in an A&S field.

What are examples of new experiences in technology for Administration and Supervision candidates to learn how to enhance P-12 learning? IR addendum narrative 1.5.9 explains that Blackboard is used extensively for delivery of course information, for course discussion, and to share project work in the online courses. During summer sessions, professors use PowerPoint, Prezi, video clips, and student made video presentations. Candidates are taught during the summer session to use their own computers as library research tools. During the last two years, faculty have encouraged students to develop electronic portfolios rather than portfolio binders, but this currently is not a requirement (because of the diversity of technological expertise of students). The program plans to phase in electronic portfolios as a requirement during the next few years.

The team did not judge that any of the Areas of Concern that remained were at a sufficient level to warrant listing them as an AFI. There was an issue with the lack of data on the A&S program, but that data was provided on-site directly from the program coordinator.

## **1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

**Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.**

### **1.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

**Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.**

Not applicable to this standard.

### **1.2.b Continuous Improvement.**

**What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The unit has a process, which is required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for university accreditation, to develop annual reports of assessment data from program outcomes that are prepared for each program and reviewed by the University Assessment Committee. These reports include an analysis and summary of candidate data, identification of strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for program revision (as needed). Every five years the unit submits a comprehensive program review to the University Assessment Committee, which addresses how well all outcomes have

been achieved by candidates. In addition, each year faculty in each program review program assessment data, and the results are discussed among all faculty in the unit. Program changes have been made based on the results of the analysis of program assessment data, because a majority of the candidates exceed the performance criteria set for all standards for each program.

Since the last NCATE review, multiple changes have been made in courses and programs based on required policy changes. Also, narrative data from candidates' exit surveys have been used by faculty as formative data to make incremental changes to courses and assignments. In two cases, significant changes have been made to the teacher education program. In response to data from student teacher narrative, comments about the lack of opportunity to learn to use technology and from similar comments by principals about the preparation of student teachers to use technology, the unit hired a faculty member with a degree in educational technology. This new faculty member has the responsibility to improve the use of technology by faculty in courses to prepare students to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. In interviews with faculty, students, and principals, the team found that the unit has made significant gains in infusing educational technology into the programs. In a second case, in response to narrative data from student teachers and supervisors of student teaching, the unit has instituted a required course in classroom management to be completed by all teacher education candidates concurrent with student teaching.

**1.2.b.i Strengths.**

**What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

None cited for this standard.

**Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u><b>AND</b></u>	<u><b>OR</b></u>	<u><b>AND</b></u>	<u><b>AND</b></u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.  [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

**1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

### 1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

### 1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

## 1.4 Recommendations

### For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met
<b>Target Level</b>	

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable
<b>Standard 2</b>	

## Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

*The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

### 2.1 Overall Findings

#### What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

As described in the unit's IR as well as moving to target narratives, exhibits, and onsite interviews, the unit assessment system focuses on candidate performance based on learner outcomes. The unit's assessment system has aligned assessments to the InTASC standards, Virginia licensure requirements, and feedback from candidates, faculty, and University stakeholders.

According to exhibit 1.5.3 in the IR Addendum, the unit reviews data on a yearly basis and makes changes based on the data. From interviews with the Assessment Committee and Reston Center education director and staff, there is a process in place for sharing program data with faculty. The data are shared with the education dean, department chairs, and the University Assessment Committee where data are analyzed and recommendations for program changes are made. Minutes for September faculty meetings are provided for 2009-2012 in IR Addendum exhibit 2.5.1, which indicate that data are discussed and general program changes are made as needed. Based on interviews, there is an indication that no major program changes have been made as a result of data review.

From interviews with faculty and the Assessment Committee, it was determined that the unit's assessment system is limited in its capacity to monitor candidate performance in the Administration and

Supervision program. The system for the Administration and Supervision program has not been integrated into the unit's assessment system.

After review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty at the Main Campus and Reston Center and the Department of Education Assessment Committee, it is apparent that there is no formal process for sharing program assessment data with candidates to help candidates reflect on and improve their performance and programs. In addition, there is no formal process for sharing data with candidates to help faculty make program and unit changes. The narrative indicates that advisors meet with candidates to discuss candidate progress; however, no formal process is presented how candidate progress informs program and unit change.

According to information from an interview with the Arts and Sciences dean, a committee consisting of members from the Department of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences, meets twice during an academic year to review and discuss data regarding the performance of undergraduate candidates. The committee also uses a Blackboard site to share information and make admission decisions.

Specialized Professional Association (SPA) reports are optional in Virginia; therefore, the unit has not sought national recognition. The School Counselor Education program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP). Programs in the unit were approved by the Virginia Board of Education in 2012.

The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional practice.

According to Exhibit 1.5.1 in the IR Addendum, the unit has disaggregated data by program and teaching endorsement area for the Main Campus, Reston Campus, and PDS Cohort. Data are available for 2010-2013.

According to the IR Addendum and in interviews with faculty and the education Assessment Committee, the unit's assessment system is a stand alone system that is housed on a shared drive of the School of Education and Human Services network. In addition, assessment data are compiled in an Access database which is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education. There is a mid-term and a final review of candidate clinical experiences that are funneled to the Access database.

A previous Area for Improvement from the last visit indicated that the unit did not have a single system for collecting and analyzing data to inform program changes across all three programs. Because of the information presented in the IR, IR Addendum and onsite interviews with the Assessment Committee and faculty, the team has removed the Area for Improvement from the previous NCATE visit.

Data from student teaching exit surveys and employer surveys also are housed in the shared drive.

Alumni surveys are provided to the unit by the university's Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Interviews with the Department of Education Assessment Committee, Associate Dean of the School of Education and Human Services, and exhibits in the IR and IR addendum validate how the assessment system ensures validity and reliability, especially in candidate professional portfolios and Teacher Work Samples. The unit monitors the assessment system for fairness, consistency, and validity through a triangulation system that includes common evaluation instruments, training, feedback, and inter-rater review of critical assessments. All teacher education candidates in all programs and in all cohort groups are assessed using the same evaluation instruments. Training for the use of the evaluation instruments is ongoing for faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Full time faculty share the responsibility of evaluating professional portfolios and Teacher Work Samples of candidates completing their student teaching experience.

Further, faculty meet before beginning the evaluation cycle to review issues and to clarify criteria statements. Training for the faculty frequently includes group analysis of a portfolio. Prior to each semester, university supervisors meet with the Chair of the Department to review all the evaluation instruments used in student teaching, and each supervisor meets with the cooperating teacher to clarify all criteria statements on their evaluation instrument. New supervisors meet individually with the Chair of the Education Department and are provided with needed interpretations. Each semester, all portfolios are double scored. When any portfolio evaluation results in a discrepancy of greater than one point on a single element, a conference between reviewers is initiated.

The Department Chair reviews those double scorings to determine the need for specific training. The

chair also looks for congruence of evaluations for individual student teachers from cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and monitors individual faculty rating scores to identify any faculty member who may be rating portfolios or Teacher Work Samples with significantly better or worse scores than other faculty.

The unit maintains records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution. Through a password protected Student Complaint Log and Response Action Matrix, the unit has a formal process for addressing student complaints from listing the complaint to responding to and resolving the complaint. In addition, there is a formal process for addressing faculty concerns regarding candidates through a database for Monthly Progress Reports Log and Response Action Matrix.

## **2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

**Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.**

### **2.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

**Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.**

Moving Toward Target:

The technology standard added to the Professional Portfolio, piloted in Spring 2013, and required for the Fall 2013 was validated by Exhibit 2.5.9b in the IR Addendum and through sample portfolios onsite.

The Professional Portfolio was validated through dispositional ratings added to ED 250: Introduction to Teaching and Learning.

Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs. Results of employer surveys were completed in Spring 2013 and validated in Exhibit 2.5.9d in the IR Addendum.

Samples of portfolios from all programs that have been double scored were validated on site and through the Assessment Committee interviews. Examples of changes in the unit's assessment system as to the validity and usefulness of learner outcomes was verified onsite in double scored portfolios and rating sheets as well as department meeting minutes in Exhibit 2.5.9e in the IR Addendum. The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards.

A draft revision of changes to the Professional Studies program was available for review onsite as well as the IR Addendum.

A report for permanent contact information for graduates for 2013 was available onsite for review.

Faculty review data on their performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data. Institutional assessment reports for the last five years is verified in Exhibit 1.5.3 in the IR Addendum.

An area of strength is the system that the Clinical Experiences Coordinator has initiated, in a pilot program for Fall 2013, where assessment data for clinical experiences are compiled into a single Access database. A midterm and a final review of candidate clinical experiences are funneled to the Access database.

### **2.2.b Continuous Improvement.**

**What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

Not applicable to this standard.

### **2.2.b.i Strengths.**

**What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

Not applicable to this standard.
----------------------------------

**Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.  [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

**2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales****2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit has no single system for collecting and analyzing data to inform program changes across all three programs.	Substantial evidence is evident in the narrative and exhibits that the unit employs a single, comprehensive, and integrated assessment system. The narrative indicates that there is a unit database for clinical experiences; a University Office of Institutional Effectiveness which collects, maintains, and shares enrollment data, course evaluations, and alumni survey; Marynet for candidate progress; Starfish for advisors and candidates; and a College-University system for licensure.

**2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?**

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit's assessment system is limited in its capacity to monitor candidate performance in the Administration and Supervision	From interviews with faculty and the Assessment Committee, it was determined that the unit's assessment system is limited in its capacity to monitor candidate performance in the Administration and Supervision program. The system for the Administration and

program.	Supervision program has not been integrated into the unit's assessment system.
There is no formal process for sharing program assessment data with candidates.	There is no formal process for sharing data with candidates to help faculty make program and unit changes. The narrative indicates that advisors meet with candidates to discuss candidate progress; however, no formal process is presented to show how candidate progress informs program and unit change.

## 2.4 Recommendations For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

### Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Advanced Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)

## Standard 3

### Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

*The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.*

### 3.1 Overall Findings

#### What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence presented in the unit's Institutional Report, IR Addendum, and interviews conducted during the onsite visit confirm the unit engages in collaboration, communication, and program evaluation with school partners to provide candidates the opportunity to develop the requisite knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to work effectively in public and private schools. The unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placement of student teacher candidates, in both initial and advanced programs, to provide appropriate learning experiences, and share expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice.

Interviews with P-12 administrators and cooperating teachers confirmed that candidates in both initial and advanced programs have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to be effective teachers. When asked to compare the preparation of Marymount candidates to preparation of candidates from other institutions, all interviewees stated that Marymount candidates are more well prepared. One principal indicated that he had hired seven Marymount candidates after they completed student teaching in his building. He also indicated that he lobbied to receive Marymount candidates over candidates from other institutions.

Candidates are regularly exposed to and utilize a variety of technology throughout their coursework, field experiences, observations, and clinical experiences. All teacher education candidates utilize Blackboard in their coursework, field experiences, and clinical experiences. The use of Blackboard

allows clear and concise communication between candidates and unit faculty. Other technologies include, but are not limited to, Internet research, PowerPoint presentations, a wide range of hardware in several platforms, educational software, iPads/tablets, use of SMART Boards where available, and use of document cameras. Candidates are regularly evaluated on their utilization of various technologies.

Documentation and interviews confirm candidates are placed with caring and qualified school faculty in field experiences and clinical practice in both initial and advanced placements, where they are given regular and continuing support and feedback.

Candidates continuously reflect on their lesson delivery throughout field experiences and clinical practice. Assessments, including pre-tests and post-tests, along with anecdotal and formal observations, examine candidate effect on student learning.

Information provided in the IR Addendum and interviews during the onsite visit clarified procedures regarding placement procedures for both initial and advanced candidates in clinical practices and student teaching.

### **3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

**Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.**

#### **3.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

**Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.**

Not applicable to this standard.

#### **3.2.b Continuous Improvement.**

**What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The unit is developing and utilizing improved record keeping of field experiences and internships, ensuring diverse and multiple settings for candidates in both initial and advanced programs. Additionally, the unit is improving electronic feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers.

The unit continues to expand its partnerships with local, regional, national, and international schools and districts to further enhance diversity and provide more opportunities for candidates to increase their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

#### **3.2.b.i Strengths.**

**What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

None cited for this standard.

#### **Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence

not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u><b>AND</b></u>	<u><b>OR</b></u>	<u><b>AND</b></u>	<u><b>AND</b></u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.  [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

**3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**3.4 Recommendations  
For Standard 3**

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met
<b>Target Level</b>	

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable
<b>Standard 4</b>	

**Standard 4: Diversity**

*The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.*

#### **4.1 Overall Findings**

##### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The unit provides opportunities for candidates to understand diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process. Coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice are designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education and acquire the ability to develop meaningful learning experiences for all students.

Field experiences and clinical practice support the development of educators who can apply their knowledge of diversity, including exceptionalities, to work in schools with all students. They provide opportunities for candidates to reflect on their observations and practices in schools and communities with students and families from diverse ethnic/racial, language, gender, and socioeconomic groups.

Course syllabi and candidate interviews confirm candidates learn about exceptionalities and inclusion, English language learners, ethnic/racial cultural differences, gender differences, and the impact of these factors on learning. Proficiencies, including those related to professional dispositions and diversity, are drawn from the standards of the profession, state, unit, and institution. Proficiencies related to diversity are identified in the unit's conceptual framework.

While the institution and unit hire faculty from diverse populations, interviews with the president, provost, Human Resource Executive Director, and Vice President of Finance confirm there is neither an institutional nor a unit plan in place demonstrating a good faith effort to recruit and maintain diverse faculty.

The range of international cultural backgrounds and experiences among faculty inside the unit and the institution as a whole enhances the candidates' understanding of diversity.

Documentation, observations, and interviews confirm candidates in both initial and advanced programs have multiple opportunities to interact with diverse candidates throughout their entire university experience through coursework and extracurricular activities. Candidates are given multiple opportunities and are encouraged to share their experiences, beliefs, traditions, and culture among themselves and in school and community settings.

Throughout field experiences and clinical practices, candidates in both initial and advanced programs consistently work with diverse students. The director of field placement ensures all candidates are placed in a variety of diverse settings. The local partner schools and districts/divisions are all racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse. Candidates in advanced programs, where there is limited diversity, are given opportunities to interact with diverse students. Documentation, observations, and onsite interviews confirm these findings.

#### **4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

**Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.**

##### **4.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

**Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.**

Not applicable to this standard.

**4.2.b Continuous Improvement.**

**What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The unit continues to emphasize diversity in a variety of aspects throughout the educational experience. Candidates have opportunities to work and interact with diverse faculty, other candidates, and P-12 students through coursework, observations, and activities, including studying abroad. The unit continues to expand its partnerships with local, regional, national, and international schools and districts/divisions to enhance experience in diversity.

**4.2.b.i Strengths.**

**What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

None cited for this standard.

**Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.  [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

**4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale
	Through information in the IR Addendum and interviews with faculty,

Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	administration, and P-12 school personnel, the unit has demonstrated opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.
---	--

#### 4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

#### 4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit has not demonstrated a good-faith effort to recruit and maintain a diverse faculty.	Interviews with the president, provost, Human Resource Executive Director, and Vice President of Finance confirm there is neither an institutional nor a unit plan demonstrating a good faith effort to recruit and maintain a diverse faculty.

### 4.4 Recommendations For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met
<b>Target Level</b>	

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable
<b>Standard 5</b>	

### Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

*Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.*

#### 5.1 Overall Findings

##### What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Based on a review of the IR, the IR addendum, the exhibits from all phases of review, and interviews of stakeholders, faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching.

All full-time professional education faculty in the unit have earned doctorates. Clinical faculty have degrees in the areas that they supervise and all are licensed for the areas that they supervise, or they possess exceptional expertise. Faculty have contemporary professional experience in the programs where they teach. University supervisors and cooperating teachers have credentials for the areas that they teach. Intern supervisors in the Catholic School Leadership Program are chosen by the candidates and are alumni from the program.

Professional education faculty possess content knowledge for the areas that they teach. Faculty model the conceptual framework of Preparing Educational Leaders for Diverse Learning Communities. Faculty show that they foster candidates who are critical thinkers, effective practitioners, and caring professionals. Faculty incorporate professional, state, unit, and institutional standards in their syllabi. Syllabi show that a variety of strategies support the development of an appreciation for different learning styles. While the syllabi show implementation of technology in some courses, the student teaching narrative survey summary for the period 2010-2013 includes several references to the need for more experience with technology, specifically SMARTBoards. However, interviews and the conversations at the poster session event shows that the candidates are thoroughly prepared with technological applications and often serve as tutors to veteran teachers in clinical placements. Faculty regularly self-assess their performance with candidates through review of their teaching evaluations and syllabi. This occurs in the annual reviews and through the course manager approach to mentoring adjunct faculty. These procedures are described in the IR and the exhibits and were discussed in onsite interviews. Exhibits for professional development participation for the faculty were provided.

Review of faculty vitae show that all faculty are involved in scholarly work in their fields. Besides participation in professional associations, presentations at conferences and scholarly writing, faculty successfully obtain grants to support research and service to schools.

All faculty are involved in service to the university, the P-12 schools and many are involved in professional associations, as shown in the vitae. At the poster session event and in interviews, the service to P-12 schools both locally and internationally was demonstrated. Candidates and school partners described the ready availability of faculty for mentoring and problem-solving of professional problems. In addition, faculty actively promote candidate membership in professional organizations, as shown at the poster session and discussed with candidates.

The unit has a comprehensive system of faculty evaluation that relies on self-evaluation and evaluation by peers and administrators. These procedures are described in the IR and handbooks. Onsite interviews substantiate that the procedures are followed and contribute to syllabus revision, as well as improvement in teaching, service, and scholarship.

The unit supports faculty development as shown in the exhibits and discussed in onsite interviews. In the last three years, the unit has directed attention to the upgrading of knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the use of technology in instruction for candidates and P-12 populations. Interviews and syllabi show that this professional development impacts the delivery of instruction and the modeling of best practice.

The Offsite Report requested several pieces of information which were provided by the unit. First, a chart to display the credentials, licenses, degrees, and experiences of the P-12 school faculty was requested. The unit provided a list of school faculty with this information. Interviews and field visits were also used to verify that the school faculty met the unit's requirements for appropriate supervision of candidates in their programs. The report also requested information about faculty teaching overloads. The three years of course loading data provided demonstrate that faculty are in compliance with the unit's policies regarding course overloads. Finally, more details on which of the unit faculty were participating in professional development activities was requested. The charts provided showed that faculty are participating regularly in the unit's supported professional development activities.

## **5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

**Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.**

### **5.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

**Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.**

Not applicable to this standard.

### 5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

**What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

Throughout the onsite visit interviews, faculty discussed ways that they have used self-reflection, analysis of their student evaluations to improve their teaching, revised their syllabi, and ultimately modified curricula. Specifically, faculty have been responsive to issues around candidate preparation for classroom management in the pre-service program, which led to course revision and scheduling variation.

Faculty have systematized mentoring of adjunct faculty with annual meetings and the provision of packets for teaching.

The largest investment of time and resources has occurred around the infusion of technology into courses. The unit hired a faculty member who is knowledgeable in technology. She has provided one-to-one mentoring of colleagues, as well as, encouraged syllabus revision. The unit successfully applied for a Verizon grant to implement iPads into the programs. The university increased budget allocations for technology.

### 5.2.b.i Strengths.

**What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

Professional education faculty at the institution have earned doctorates or exceptional expertise, have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship.

Professional education faculty value candidates' learning and adjust instruction appropriately to enhance candidate learning.

The unit's systematic and comprehensive evaluation system includes reviews of the professional education faculty's teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession.

The unit has policies and practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners.

### Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects

described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	of the target level rubric for this standard.	of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	of the target level rubric for this standard.
<b><u>AND</u></b>	<b><u>OR</u></b>	<b><u>AND</u></b>	<b><u>AND</u></b>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.  [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

**5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

**5.4 Recommendations For Standard 5**

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met
<b>Target Level</b>	

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable
<b>Standard 6</b>	

**Standard 6: Unit Governance And Resources**

*The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and*

*institutional standards.*

## 6.1 Overall Findings

### What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Based on a review of the IR, the IR Addendum, the exhibits from all phases of review, and interviews of stakeholders, the unit has the necessary leadership and resources to prepare candidates.

The dean has full authority to manage the unit and its five departments, reporting directly to the provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who then reports to the president. The associate dean performs duties assigned by the dean and acts in the dean's absence. The dean, associate dean, and chairs of the five departments meet regularly. The Department of Education chair is responsible for undergraduate and graduate teacher education, chairs the Undergraduate Teacher Licensure Board, and serves on the Graduate Teacher Education Committee. The Reston Center has a director who supervises the graduate education programs, which are offered at that location. The Professional Development Schools Director is a school based professional (employed by Marymount); classes for the M.E.D. in Elementary and Secondary Education programs are offered at the Reston Center. There is a clinical experience coordinator for field experiences and student teaching, and a Counseling Placement Coordinator. At the time of the visit, the Counseling Placement Coordinator was on leave. Full-time faculty serve as course managers for their areas of expertise, mentor adjunct faculty, and review their syllabi. Policies and job descriptions are found in 6.3.a Exhibit (Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit ).

Policies for students, faculty, and staff are written and regularly reviewed. Admissions policies are described clearly. The process for admission of candidates to the undergraduate program is handled by the Undergraduate Licensure Committee, which meets once each semester and online to admit students. A shared Blackboard site facilitates communication for this committee. Graduate admissions are processed by the respective programs. Regular communication with Arts and Sciences faculty is facilitated for undergraduates through the Undergraduate Licensure Committee. Graduate students enter with content background and generally secure any necessary general education deficiencies at community colleges. Communication and consultation with P-12 faculty occurs regularly through informal dialog, scheduled meetings, and focus groups that emerge through the analysis of data. Examples shared onsite were the Fairfax County focus group on arts education, which led to the redesign of the arts major, the addition of a ceramics curriculum, and the building of a kiln. The university is recruiting a ceramist, as well. Another example of informal program communication is the redesign of the classroom management curriculum and the sequence of the courses in the program.

The university website provides the academic calendar, catalogs, grading policies, and services to students; these are current and accurate on the website.

The unit budget is comparable to other units on campus as shown in the IR and Exhibits 6.3.f and 6.3.g. The comparisons are drawn from other units with clinical programs, notably business administration and health professions. The budgeting process is program driven with a priority given to support of university students. Faculty justify requests for new programs and increased financial support through an annual committee process that flows from the unit to the provost to a university committee led by the Vice President of Financial Affairs. The process works to support the unit, according to interviews and review of exhibits. The university is rolling out a zero-based budget plan in the coming year.

Polices and procedures for full-time faculty, clinical faculty, and adjuncts are fully described in the handbook exhibits 6.3.f and 6.3.h. Faculty loads are nine credits per semester. Clinical supervision of candidates is limited to 12 candidates per semester. There is one graduate assistant for the Education

Department and one for the Counseling Department. Other support personnel include Administrative Assistant to the Dean, front desk administrative assistant, and an Administration and Supervision Administrative Assistant. The unit has an Assessment Coordinator who reports to the Department of Education Chair, according to the organization chart (Exhibit 6.3.b) and in the updated chart shown onsite.

The Education Department is housed in a recently renovated building on the main campus. The counseling program is located on the Ballston campus, which is due to be razed. The current facilities are well equipped, and a two-year interim location for counseling and other programs served by this campus will meet the space needs for the programs. Regular meetings with the Education Department create opportunities for dialog with the school counseling program. The professional studies program, the graduate education program, and the PDS program are located at the Main Campus and Reston Center. The Ballston Campus and Reston Center are well equipped, served by the library, and full-time faculty teach courses there regularly.

Faculty have access to professional development in various ways, through participation in professional education conferences, competitive institutional grants, and opportunities for taking courses at tuition partner institutions.

It is clear that technology resources are supported across the university and within the unit, according to the IR and substantiated in many interviews of all stakeholders. The university replaces student-used hardware every three years and faculty computers every four years, according to interviews. Systematic budget increases have been implemented for technology as described in the IR. Over 1.3 million dollars was spent to upgrade technology and these upgrades continue to feature in the strategic plan adopted for the next five years. For example, a new fiber optic cable linking the main campus to the Ballston Campus was added this year.

Library and instructional materials support the unit. The university participates in consortia with nine other libraries in the immediate area. A librarian is designated to serve the counseling program and the education programs. The librarians meet with faculty regularly, suggest materials for courses, and receive requests from faculty for courses. Librarians teach in the programs and offer professional development to faculty and candidates. When new courses or programs are developed, these undergo a library review to ensure that onsite or consortia resources are available to support the new curriculum.

For the online portions of programs the delivery system is reliable, confidential, and supported by the IT structure of the university.

The Offsite Report sought greater clarity on the role of the Director of the Reston Campus and the relationship of this individual to the main campus. Interviews and unit documents showed that the Director is a half-time appointment and a member of the Education Department. Thus, regular communication is assured between the Reston Campus and the main campus. As well, all members of the education department teach at the Reston Campus and on the main campus. The Offsite Report also requested greater clarity on the role of the student workers as support personnel to the unit. Usually, there is one student worker assigned to the unit to support administrative tasks. During the preparation for accreditation, a second student was employed for this past year.

The Offsite Report requested more information about the investment in technology for the unit. Exhibits and interviews substantiate substantial investment in infrastructure, hardware, software, and technical support for the unit and the university. The Offsite Report requested newsletters that delineated unit accomplishments. Copies of these documents were provided for review.

## **6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

### 6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

### 6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit is engaged in continuous improvement through the investment in both physical resources and human resources. Examples of these investments include the unit designating a director of the Reston Campus, recruiting a new faculty member with technological expertise, investing in technology infrastructure, hardware, software, and personnel, and the renovating the unit's facilities.

#### 6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating all programs at the institution designed to prepare education professionals to work in P-12 schools.

The unit's recruiting and admissions practices are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs.

The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling.

### Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	
--	--

### 6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

#### 6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

#### 6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

#### 6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

### 6.4 Recommendations For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met
<b>Target Level</b>	

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable
<b>IV. Sources of Evidence</b>	

#### Documents Reviewed

#### Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Interview List

Exhibits

See **Attachment** panel below.

### V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).





**Marymount University  
Arlington, Virginia**

**May 2014**

**ACCREDITATION DECISION**

Accreditation is continued at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. The next onsite visit will take place in Fall 2020.

*Please refer to the Board of Examiners report for strengths of the unit and for additional information on findings and areas for improvement.*

**STANDARDS SUMMARY**

Standards	Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP)	Advanced Preparation (ADV)
★ 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Met	Met
★ 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	Met
★ 3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	Met
★ 4 Diversity	Met	Met
★ 5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	Met
★ 6 Unit Governance and Resources	Met	Met

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The following areas for improvement (AFIs) should be addressed before the unit's next onsite visit. Progress made toward eliminating them should be reported in the annual report. The Board of Examiners (BOE) team will indicate in its report at the next visit whether the institution has adequately addressed each of the AFIs.

STANDARD 2 - Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

1	The unit's assessment system is limited in its capacity to monitor candidate performance in the Administration and Supervision program.	<input type="checkbox"/> ITP <input type="checkbox"/> ADV
2	There is no formal process for sharing program assessment data with candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/> ITP <input type="checkbox"/> ADV

#### STANDARD 4 - Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

1	The unit has not demonstrated a good-faith effort to recruit and maintain a diverse faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/> ITP <input type="checkbox"/> ADV
---	--	--

***NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, team members, nor other agents of CAEP are empowered to make or modify Commission decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Commission itself. This Accreditation Action Report is available to members of the public upon receipt of a request in writing.***