

Lewis University College of Education Conceptual Framework

History of the Development of the Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework was in place for the first NCATE/ISBE on-site accreditation visit in 1999. The unit further developed its conceptual framework during the 2000-2001 academic year by revisiting the theoretical and philosophical portions and adding curricular changes and development of new programs. The revision included alignment of programs with Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTTS) and national specialty professional associations; enhanced implementation of campus and school mission and new faculty who brought new perspectives which contributed to significant changes. NCATE 2000 also provided further guidance as we re-examined, expanded and changed the conceptual framework.

Prior to its establishment as a College of Education (COE), our unit was a School of Education housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. We became a College of Education in 2003 midway between our initial and subsequent NCATE accreditation visit. This change in administrative structure, which provided more autonomy and the ability to take greater control of our destiny, also impacted the content of the conceptual framework. Development continued with improved discussion of the candidates, faculty, staff, the school communities served and the Lewis University community.

Drafts were sent to the Education Advisory Board, select College of Arts and Science faculty and the University administration for more discussion and feedback. A final draft was approved at the May 2004 planning meeting. During summer and early fall 2005, the document was widely distributed and discussion continued regarding key theorists, in part to introduce new faculty members to this aspect of the conceptual framework.

Following the NCATE visit in October 2006, a team of 11 faculty members, as a whole and in sub-committees, met regularly during spring and summer 2007 reexamining the unit standards in light of the changes needed for the assessment plan. During that time revised unit standards were determined. The faculty as a whole met for three full planning days during that time frame and the revised unit standards were presented, reviewed, analyzed and made operational for the fall 2007 semester. During fall 2007, proficiencies aligned with the unit standards, university and college missions and NCATE standards were determined and also made operational. Revisions to the mission and vision were approved by the full faculty in fall 2007 as well.

The conceptual framework remained constant for the next four years with most revision and attention given to the unit and program assessment systems. The unit continued to focus on the three established unit standards being ever mindful of the University mission and strategic plans intended to grow the University and the College of Education.

In fall 2011, a new NCATE Standards Team was established in preparation for the upcoming accreditation visit. A review of the conceptual framework was the first order of business. The NCATE team reviewed each section of the conceptual framework with a critical eye for changes

and challenges in the field, state regulatory requirements and an essentially negative national conversation about the preparation and contribution of the education field. The NCATE team has updated the history with new information and initiatives as well as an intensive unit wide review of the knowledge bases in order to include current theory and research as the field of education has evolved and we have grown in our understanding of societal influences on student learning.

Drafts of the revised conceptual framework were shared with the Leadership Team and the COE faculty in fall 2012. Time was spent at COE planning days to review the document and provide all faculty an opportunity to check for accuracy and provide revisions.

The conceptual framework was revisited in fall 2013 as we wrote our institutional report for our upcoming accreditation visit. It was reviewed by our P-12 partners as part of our fall Education Advisory Board meeting and again by our faculty at our November 1 planning day.

The conceptual framework contains the five structural elements (NCATE 2008, p. 14): (1) vision and mission of the institution and unit; (2) philosophy, purposes and goals/institutional standards of the unit; (3) knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice and education policies that drive the work of the unit; (4) candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state and institutional standards and (5) a summarized description of the unit's assessment system.

The COE conceptual framework continues to evolve in keeping with the NCATE belief that a conceptual framework is a living document, constantly being updated and refined.

Key components of the document have been incorporated into COE handbooks and COE policy manuals and have also been shared with candidates, mentor teachers, advisory board members and prospective students and parents.

Structural Element #1: Vision and Mission of the Institution and Unit

Vision of the University

Lewis University will be recognized as an outstanding, innovative, mid-sized Catholic university, offering programs of academic distinction to a diverse population.

In the Lasallian tradition, Lewis will prepare graduates who are intellectually engaged, ethically grounded, socially responsible and globally connected.

Mission and Core Values of the University

Faithful to the Lasallian Heritage in Catholic Higher Education

Lewis University, guided by its Catholic and Lasallian heritage, provides to a diverse student population programs for a liberal and professional education grounded in the interaction of knowledge and fidelity in the search for truth.

Lewis promotes the development of the complete person through the pursuit of wisdom and justice. Fundamental to its mission is a spirit of association which fosters community in all teaching, learning and service.

These distinctive values guide the University in fulfilling its Mission:

- **Knowledge.** The result of a lifelong pursuit of learning fostered through creative and critical interaction in a community of learners.
- **Fidelity.** The spirit which recognizes God as ultimate reality, unifying the diverse forms of knowledge in the pursuit of fullness of truth, while recognizing the diversity of human experience.
- **Wisdom.** The result of the integration of reflection and action developed through higher learning throughout all of life.
- **Justice.** The affirmation of the equal dignity of every person and the promotion of personal and social responsibility.
- **Association.** The process of forming a community of mutual respect, collegiality, collaboration and service.

Vision of the College of Education

The vision of the Lewis University College of Education is to be regionally recognized as a midwest leader in providing value-oriented, collaborative and research-based preparation programs for educators. Lewis University's College of Education is imbued with a Lasallian moral and ethical legacy. This heritage compels it to consider the central role education can and should take in the creation of a more equal and just society. Therefore, the COE views its work as making a salient contribution to the amelioration of injustice and inequality through the preparation of educators who believe all can learn, challenge marginalizing discourses, and honor diversity. The COE also aligns itself with John Dewey's notion that the school is the primary vehicle of social progress. As such, it envisions the school as an important location for challenging and transforming social ills and seeks to prepare educators who are deeply discerning, knowledgeable and critical lifelong learners. These are characteristics that are indispensable for a truly transformative educator.

Mission of the College of Education

In keeping with the University Mission, the College of Education is committed to enacting the values of knowledge, justice, association, wisdom and fidelity through the teaching and scholarship of the faculty, design of academic programs, content of the curriculum, focus of school partnerships and service to the larger community. A culture of critique, possibility and inquiry is fostered where students and faculty recognize the political, social, moral and economic dimensions of education, submit their own beliefs and understandings to scrutiny, challenge dominant discourses and understand their responsibility as social justice advocates for all students, especially the marginalized. This mission requires students and faculty to engage in ongoing reflection and dialogue while maintaining a willingness to wrestle with this difficult and complex work.

In order to develop learning communities, students, faculty and local school personnel should value diverse perspectives, collaborative decision-making and interactive learning experiences. The College of Education through the pre service, advanced and professional education programs, encourages the development and practice of these integrated components.

Structural Element #2: Philosophy, Purposes and Goals/Institutional Standards of the Unit

COE Philosophy

Community

Just as association is fundamental to the mission of the University, the unifying thematic principle serving as the foundation of the College of Education's mission is also one of association, expressed in an ethic of community, with a specific focus on *Developing Learning Communities*.

This unifying principle reflects the Lewis University Lasallian heritage and the work of Saint John Baptist de La Salle (1651-1719), the Patron Saint of Education. De La Salle regarded school as a community of believers working cooperatively to achieve a shared vision. He was an innovator in the development of teacher training programs and in curricular and pedagogical practices. Although De La Salle's schools were primarily for the poor, they attracted children from families of differing economic backgrounds. However, he did not tolerate social segregation which was the practice of the day. He prescribed uniform management procedures for the classroom instruction of students from different social and academic levels.

The Lasallian pedagogy has continued for more than three centuries. Centering on Catholic values, personal relationships and creativity, Lasallian Education emphasizes academic excellence, faith formation, inclusion, respect for the individual, service and social justice. The Lasallian Education story is about transformative experiences that enrich each student's cultural, intellectual, physical, social and spiritual development.

Community is the foundation for the College of Education because we believe the only way to achieve our vision of schooling is to commit to work together on important problems, even with those who are different from us; to commit to communicate and engage in dialogue; to commit to share our stories and respect the views and values of others; in other words, to commit to the processes associated with democratic community in schools (Furman & Starratt, 2002).

Critical Pedagogy

Perhaps the most important aspect of community is concern for others in the educational environment. Critical pedagogy espouses the idea that teaching reaches beyond the surface and asks students to question and challenge dominant beliefs, attitudes and histories. The belief system of the College of Education challenges candidates and faculty alike to view practices in schools with a critical lens, act on professional convictions to improve educational equity for marginalized populations and advocate for change. Candidates learn that all P-12 students are their responsibility regardless of race, class, ethnicity, ability, gender or sexual orientation and approach the futures of their students with a concern for equity and social justice. Candidates understand the current reality of schools in which they will work as well as the future they want to create for all students and families. Faculty and candidates learn and experience the value of diverse perspectives, ongoing reflection, inquiry and critique. They continue to challenge their own thinking, as well as the thinking and practice of their colleagues.

Commitment to Diversity

The College of Education's commitment to diversity is central to the work of the College and the experiences fostered with our candidates, colleagues, the University community and the local schools we serve. As a central focus, diversity is reflected in the mission statement of the College which is strategically aligned with the University's mission, the Unit Standards and accompanying candidate proficiencies.

The unit's commitment to diversity is integrated throughout program curriculum, assignments and field-based experiences. Candidate proficiencies with diversity are assessed through unit and program key assessments.

The COE emphasis on diversity encourages opportunities for faculty and candidates to have multiple diversity experiences; recruitment of more diverse candidates, faculty and staff; and professional development opportunities with a diversity emphasis for faculty. To achieve these aims, the COE instituted a Diversity Committee which organizes film events, guest speakers, symposia, reading groups and local trips that sensitize undergraduate and graduate candidates as well as College of Education faculty to what forces cause institutional inequities in schools and in society, the diverse values and ideas embraced by various social groups across the globe, and cultural work generated by communities to bring about change. The College continues to initiate service learning activities with local school communities for the purpose of exposing undergraduate and graduate candidates to diverse individuals, of guiding candidates to recognize policies and programs that cause unjust conditions in schools and communities and expecting candidates to reflect upon how they can assist community members to improve their social contexts. The College revamped its field based experiences for undergraduate and graduate

candidates to make sure candidates work in diverse communities, examine political and social factors impacting teaching and learning and learn to challenge dominant discourses.

Commitment to Educational Technology to Help All Students Learn

The College of Education is committed to the use of educational technology to help all candidates and students in the P-12 setting succeed in the 21st century classroom. Candidates must demonstrate proficiency in using technology in key assessments and course projects, such as lesson planning, data collection and analysis, presentations and instruction during field-based experiences. Initial licensure candidates record themselves teaching lessons and use this recording to reflect on their teaching.

The institution and unit commitment to technology is also demonstrated through the technology resources available to candidates and faculty. The College of Education has a dedicated computer lab. There are also additional computer labs across campus that can be used by candidates and faculty.

Technology support services are also available. The COE has a full time graduate assistant for technology to assist faculty and students. The University IMPACT Lab (Innovative Multimedia Projects, Assessment and Coaching with Technology) offers workshops for candidates on new technology such as digital cameras, iPods and laptops which are available for candidate checkout along with lab space for candidate projects. The LARC Center (Leckrone Academic Resource Center) provides subscriptions for close captioned media and Bookshare digital books for professors of and candidates with specific documented learning disabilities or other disabilities. Support staff members are available to assist as needed via phone, online and in person.

Technology hardware includes such items as interactive white boards, overhead projection unit, iPads, camcorders, Elmos and digital audio and video recorders. The Special Education Department also owns many pieces of assistive technology such as adapted keyboards and other specialized hardware, software and communication devices which are used both within the courses and also loaned to P-12 school districts as needed for student assistive technology evaluations.

In all initial and advanced certification programs, LiveText is the web-based program adopted by the College of Education to collect data for the required key assessments in each program. Many faculty members also use Blackboard and LiveText course shells that hold course syllabi, assignments, documents and other necessary course material.

COE Purpose and Unit Standards

The purpose of the College of Education is to prepare candidates to be educators who possess the knowledge and skills of their profession and the values to use that knowledge in a way that will positively impact schools and the larger community. Faculty in the College of Education are guided in this purpose by the mission and core values of Lewis University and the College of Education, the general education requirements of the University and the content, teaching,

administrative and counseling standards of the State of Illinois and the national professional organizations.

At the completion of education programs in the COE, candidates need to have demonstrated evidence of meeting the three unit standards of the Lewis University College of Education, which stem directly from the Lewis University mission values and work of Saint John Baptist de La Salle. The three unit standards are:

1. Candidates and Faculty are Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators
2. Candidates and Faculty are Multicultural Educators
3. Candidates and Faculty are Social Justice Advocates

Dispositions Expected of All COE Candidates

The COE dispositions are fundamental to achieving the unit standards. Educators’ dispositions impact student learning, motivation and development in addition to having an impact on one’s own professional growth. In addition to disposition-related standards already assessed via programmatic key assessments aligned with state and Specialty Professional Associations, the unit has agreed upon the following professional dispositions that all candidates in the College of Education are expected to demonstrate:

- ❖ Disposition to reflect on professional experiences
- ❖ Disposition to act on professional convictions
- ❖ Disposition to challenge dominant discourses
- ❖ Disposition to be fair and believe all students can learn

Unit Standards and Proficiencies for Initial and Advanced Candidates.

The following chart displays the proficiencies expected of candidates in initial and advanced programs for each of the unit standards. These proficiencies include the COE dispositions, which are marked with an asterisk*.

Standard 1: Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators

Candidate Proficiencies for Initial Programs	Candidate Proficiencies for Advanced Programs
a. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	aa. Demonstrates in depth knowledge of subject matter
b. Demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	bb. Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills
c. Demonstrates knowledge of critical pedagogical content	cc. Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content
d. Integrates technology in teaching	dd. Integrates technology in practices
e. Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	ee. Creates positive environments for student learning
f. Reflects on professional experiences*	ff. Reflects on professional experiences*
g. Acts on professional convictions*	gg. Acts on professional convictions*

Standard 2: Multicultural Educators

Candidate Proficiencies for Initial Programs	Candidate Proficiencies for Advanced Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Demonstrates knowledge of personal prejudices and biases b. Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space c. Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures d. Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning e. Demonstrates ability to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> aa. Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning bb. Demonstrates knowledge of schools and classrooms as non neutral cultural space and the implications for teaching and learning cc. Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures dd. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning ee. Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities

Standard 3: Social Justice Advocates

Candidate Proficiencies for Initial Programs	Candidate Proficiencies for Advanced Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Demonstrates knowledge of institutional inequities b. Demonstrates knowledge of relevant communities to bring about change c. Challenges dominant discourses* d. Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> aa. Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning bb. Engages relevant communities to bring about change cc. Challenges dominant discourses* dd. Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*

*College of Education dispositions

Structural Element #3: Knowledge Bases

In addition to working with colleagues within the unit, across the campus and in the P-12 community in order to remain actively linked with the ever changing knowledge base of practice, the knowledge base of the COE is supported by the work of several scholars. Saint John Baptist de La Salle is central to the work of unit faculty and candidates. Our knowledge base is also supported by the work of multiple scholars and educators-Deborah Ball, James A. Banks, Charlotte Danielson, Linda Darling-Hammond, Lisa Delpit, John Dewey, Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Maxine Greene, Jonathan Kozol, Peter McLaren, Sonia Nieto, Nel Noddings and Lev Vygotsky-who affirm our unit philosophy and standards at the initial and advanced programmatic levels.

Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educator

Critical pedagogy encourages faculty and candidates to challenge dominant discourses that promote inequality by understanding the relationship among teaching, production of knowledge and institutional structures, in the wider community, state, country and world. Paulo Freire states there is no such thing as a neutral educational process and believes the first step for attaining change is to raise the level of consciousness of the people. Freire believes the inequalities in society are possible to overcome once the people who are oppressed become aware of the hegemony- -the blindness to the true situation--which keeps them in their current situation. Freire suggests change requires both critical reflection and action for true social activism to occur. Freire's work has been extended by critical scholars such as Henry Giroux (2011), bell hooks (2010) and Peter McLaren (2006) in the current U.S. context of schooling. Critical scholars encourage educators to translate theory in democratic practice, to teach in a manner that transforms themselves and their students, "to honor education as the practice of freedom because we understand that democracy thrives in an environment where learning is valued where the ability to think is the mark of responsible citizenship, where free speech and the will to dissent is accepted and encouraged" (hooks, 2010, p. 17).

John Dewey (1938) was concerned with how schools create and recreate the existing culture, beliefs and practices. He was aware of how the structures, subject matter and organization of schools perpetuate the status quo. Dewey clearly supported the need for educators to understand the social forces at work, the role of the schools and why they are doing what they are doing with a critical and transformative focus.

Lev Vygotsky (1978) believed learning depends on socio-cultural interactions that support a learner's development and can only take place in a student's zone of proximal development. Vygotsky emphasized the importance of learning the knowledge, skills and processes that would transmit and transform culture.

This critical and transformative stance clearly requires candidates to understand content and subject matter in ways that makes it accessible and relevant for all students. Educators should provide instruction that includes an academic language focus. They have to be able to use subject matter knowledge flexibly to address ideas as they come up in the course of learning (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Educators need to know about curricular resources beyond textbooks in order to facilitate authentic student learning and be able to connect their students with sources of information and knowledge that relates to their daily lives. Educators must provide their students with process skills that enable them to think critically and strategically to solve problems that are relevant and meaningful to their current and future lives (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001). Ball (2011) promotes a set of "high-leverage" skills and knowledge for teachers in order to assure student achievement.

The University and the College are aware of the significance of technology in pedagogical practices and unit operations/administrative functions. The COE Technology Plan linked to the University Strategic Plan and COE Vision, reflects the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards. The technology plan promotes technology integration as necessary

to be knowledgeable critical transformative educators. Candidates are expected to design, develop and model technology-enriched learning experiences to address the diverse needs of all learners by using learner-centered strategies (ISTE.NETS-T, 2008). According to Prensky (2010), teachers in the 21st century should provide students with context, quality assurance and individualized help with new technology tools.

Being a knowledgeable educator also includes an awareness and response to regulatory changes at the state and national level. Our unit is making sure that candidates are familiar with our state's requirements for professional evaluation. The Illinois State Board of Education has implemented a teacher evaluation system that is built on the Framework of Charlotte Danielson (2013) and measures teacher competencies across the domains of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction and professional responsibilities. The discrete knowledge and skills that are required to demonstrate competence are well aligned to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards (InTASC) the NCATE standards and the soon to be required Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) that will be needed for licensure by the Illinois State Board of Education in 2015. The unit is implementing the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) tasks and the elements of the Danielson Framework into the curriculum for all initial licensure programs across the unit. In the Educational Leadership principal preparation and teacher leader programs, the Danielson framework is a required component in mastering necessary knowledge and skills for the clinical supervision and coaching of educators in the classroom. Leadership candidates will be required to participate in mandated training from the state in order to obtain licensure as teacher leaders and principals capable of supervision, evaluation, coaching and mentoring of proficient educators in their schools.

The COE is embedding knowledge of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) into candidate curriculum to make sure that our candidates are familiar with expectations for the P-12 students that they will teach. The Common Core State Standards (CCSSO, 2010) provide a clear, consistent understanding of what students are to learn, so that educators will be better equipped to help students achieve.

Multicultural Educator

In developing candidates who understand the value of multiculturalism and their responsibility to a diverse student population, the College of Education draws on the work of a number of theorists, perhaps most notably James A. Banks. Banks's scholarship on multicultural education spans the variety of components of education including teaching (2012), curriculum (2007) and research (2003). His work also crosses over into the other College of Education standards that emphasize transformation and social justice advocacy (2006). The College of Education embraces the same assumption as Banks, that schools are not culturally neutral spaces. They tend to operate from the dominant cultural perspective and too often school administrators and educators are unaware of this state of affairs. Banks's scholarship encourages the College of Education to provide a multicultural education that avoids divisiveness and recognizes the importance of ethnic and racial identities as well as identities rooted in religion, social class, gender and sexual orientation (2006). The work of James Banks has been continued and built

upon by scholars such as Lisa Delpit (2006), Gloria Ladson-Billings (2009) and Sonia Nieto (2010) who among others make the case that white educators (and educators of color) can and must become culturally responsive educators who are not afraid to acknowledge and teach about race and racism.

Social Justice Advocate

The social justice commitment of our candidates, their students and the families with whom they work is a legacy of Lasallian universities. This commitment is grounded in the work and beliefs of Saint John Baptist de La Salle who dedicated his life to the establishment and management of schools for children of the poor (Salm, 1996). This heritage compels us to consider the central role education can, and should, take in the creation of a more equal and just society. Therefore, the College of Education views its work as making a meaningful contribution to the elimination of injustice and inequality through the preparation of educators who challenge marginalizing discourses and honor diversity. The College of Education also aligns itself with Dewey's notion that the school is the primary vehicle of social progress (1938). It envisions the school as an important agent for challenging and transforming social ills and seeking to prepare educators who are deeply discerning, knowledgeable and critical. We believe that many of the same ideas in the work of De La Salle can be found in the writings of Nel Noddings (1992; 2013) and Maxine Greene (2000; 2007). In both Noddings' notion of caring and Greene's emphasis on aesthetics in education, teaching and learning is a joint and imaginative endeavor. Students and educators come together to create a more just social order.

Contemplating our students in all their variety, we cannot but realize that they are more than merely responding creatures, more than static 'mind.' With cognitive, physical, emotional and imaginative potentials, with consciousnesses thrusting into the world, they are continually involved in transactions with other persons and with their environment (Greene, 2007, p. 2).

There is clear alignment between the Lewis University values and mission, College of Education vision and mission, unit standards, proficiencies, dispositions and assessments. This alignment facilitates the enactment of policies and procedures that are supportive of the overarching work of the university and College of Education. This is evidenced in the teaching and scholarship of the faculty, design of academic programs, design of the unit assessment system, content of the curriculum, focus of school partnerships and service to the larger community. A culture of inquiry, critique and possibility is fostered where candidates and faculty recognize the political, social, moral and economic dimensions of education, submit their own beliefs and understandings to scrutiny, challenge dominant discourses and understand their responsibility as a social advocate for all students, especially the marginalized.

Structural Element #4: Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional, State and Institutional Standards

Alignment of Institutional/Unit Standards and State/Professional Standards with the Conceptual Framework

Lewis University is fully accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of College and Schools. In addition, the College of Education has been accredited by NCATE since 2000. The Illinois State Board of Education requires the unit to submit annual reports about its licensure programs in order to receive recognition for entitlement of candidates. Full recognition has been ongoing since the process began.

The College of Education is aligned to the NCATE unit standards and programs with a Specialty Professional Association are aligned to their association's program standards.

All licensure programs are aligned to standards of the Illinois State Board of Education. There is a set of Illinois Professional Teaching Standards to which initial programs must align. Advanced programs have a set of professional teaching standards that are particular to their professional content area to which they must align. The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards for initial programs are listed below.

Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (Initial Only)

Adopted 6/24/2010

1. Teaching Diverse Learners-The competent teacher understands the diverse characteristics and abilities of each student and how individuals develop and learn within the context of their social, emotional, cultural, linguistic and academic experiences. This teacher uses that information to create instructional opportunities and maximize student learning.
2. Content Area and Pedagogical Knowledge-The competent teacher has in depth understanding of content area knowledge, which includes central concepts, methods of inquiry, structures of the discipline(s) and content area literacy. This teacher creates meaningful learning experiences for each student based upon interactions among content area, pedagogical knowledge and evidence-based practice.
3. Planning for Differentiated Instruction-The competent teacher plans and designs instruction based on content area knowledge, diverse student characteristics, student performance data, curriculum goals and community context. This teacher plans for ongoing student growth and achievement.
4. Learning Environment -The competent teacher structures a safe and healthy learning environment that facilitates cultural and linguistic responsiveness, emotional well-being, self-efficacy, positive social interaction, mutual respect, active engagement, academic risk taking, self-motivation and personal goal setting.

5. **Instructional Delivery**-The competent teacher differentiates instruction by using a variety of strategies that support critical and creative thinking, problem solving, continuous growth and learning. This teacher understands that the classroom is a dynamic environment requiring ongoing modification of instruction to enhance learning for each student.
6. **Reading, Writing and Oral Communication**-The competent teacher has foundational knowledge of reading, writing and oral communication within the content area and recognizes and addresses student reading, writing and oral communication needs to facilitate the acquisition of content knowledge.
7. **Assessment**-The competent teacher understands and uses appropriate formative and summative assessments for determining student needs, monitoring student progress, measuring student growth and evaluating student outcomes. This teacher makes data-driven decisions about curricular and instructional effectiveness and adjusts practice to meet the needs of each student.
8. **Collaborative Relationships**-The competent teacher builds and maintains collaborative relationships to foster cognitive, linguistic, physical and social/emotional development. This teacher works as a team member with professional colleagues, students, parents/guardians and community members.
9. **Professionalism, Leadership and Advocacy**-The competent teacher is an ethical and reflective practitioner who exhibits professionalism, provides leadership in the learning community and advocates for students, parents/guardians and the profession.

Lewis University has developed Baccalaureate Student Outcomes for all undergraduate programs in the institution and Graduate Student Learning Outcomes for all graduate programs. College of Education programs have aligned their curriculum to these standards. The Baccalaureate Student Outcomes and Graduate Student Learning Outcomes are listed below.

Lewis University Baccalaureate Student Outcomes

1. Read, write, speak, calculate and use technology at a demonstrated level of proficiency.
2. Understand the major approaches to knowledge.
3. Understand the place of faith, religion and spirituality in the search for truth and meaning.
4. Understand and prepare for moral and ethical decision-making.
5. Become an informed, involved and responsible citizen of a diverse yet interconnected national and global community through a grounding in economic, political, social and historical influences that are inherent in shaping, developing and advancing nations and the world.
6. Think critically and creatively.
7. Possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enter or advance a career, or to begin graduate study.

Lewis University Graduate Student Learning Outcomes

1. Synthesize theoretical and research concepts from multiple perspectives to inform inquiry and practice.
2. Formulate creative responses to complex issues through critical analysis.
3. Model ethical and professional behaviors to guide inquiry and practice in a global and diverse society.

See Appendix for Competency Alignment Charts for programs.

Structural Element #5: Summarized Description of the Unit's Assessment System

Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The Lewis University College of Education has developed and maintained an articulated assessment system designed to measure competencies of candidates as they develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enter the teaching field or to advance into post baccalaureate programs. It includes key assessments required to measure candidate competencies in NCATE unit standards, specialty professional association standards, Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and College of Education unit standards. The assessments are listed below:

Key assessments for initial and advanced programs follow:

1. State licensure examinations of content knowledge
2. Additional assessment of content knowledge
3. Ability to plan instruction, or (for non-teaching fields) to fulfill identified professional responsibilities
4. Clinical practice evaluation
5. Impact on student learning or (for non-teaching fields) the ability to create supportive learning environments
6. Final reflective essay
7. Oral response to service learning
8. Dispositions evaluation

Additional key assessments for initial programs include:

9. Field experiences evaluation
10. Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) State Certification Test

Unit assessments 1 to 5 align with Specialty Professional Associations for each program. The professional education unit created a common unit evaluation rubric for unit standards assessments #6 through #8.

Other common assessments for all education programs are the following:

- Program Completer Survey (completed before leaving Lewis University)
- Graduate Survey (completed in September, one year after graduation)
- Employer Survey (completed in September, one year after graduation)

College of Education Assessment Procedures

The College of Education assessment system is overseen by the associate dean. A data manager is responsible for assisting faculty in the collection and organization data. Analysis and interpretation is the work of program faculty.

Assessment data is collected as follows:

Key Assessments	
1. State licensure examinations	ISBE reports to the unit
2. Additional assessment of content knowledge	Varies by program e.g. comprehensive exams, grades, etc.
3. Ability to plan instruction, or (for non-teaching fields) to fulfill identified professional responsibilities	Submission via College LiveText Assessed with a rubric
4. Clinical practice evaluation	Evaluation form via College LiveText
5. Impact on student learning or (for non-teaching fields) the ability to create supportive learning environments	Submission via College LiveText Assessed with a rubric
6. Final reflective essay	Submission via College LiveText Assessed with a rubric
7. Oral response to service learning	Assessed with a rubric Rubric data entered into College LiveText
8. Dispositions evaluation	Evaluation form via College LiveText for Initial program Rubric evaluation via College LiveText
9. Field experiences evaluation (initial programs only)	Evaluation form via College LiveText
10. Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) State Certification Test	ISBE reports to the unit
Program Completer Survey	Submission via College LiveText form
Graduate Survey	Submission via College LiveText form
Employer Survey	Submission via College LiveText form

Each semester new College LiveText links are disseminated from the COE data manager to program faculty to insure a clean set of data containing the correct candidates for each program. The data manager uses the aggregate data in order to create program data reports for the

assessments and disseminates these to department chairs and program directors for analysis and interpretation.

Department and program faculty meet and review the data by checking for accuracy and comparing results to previous years and semesters and noting any changes in faculty assignments and noting any changes in data trends. At the end of the academic year (September 1 to August 31) the department creates a written report that is used for Specialty Professional Association review as well as the Illinois State Board of Education annual program report that is required for continuing recognition. Reports are submitted to the unit administration electronically and are generally due on October 15 for the previous academic year.

At the conclusion of each assessment cycle, the unit administration reviews aggregate unit data compiles a report for review by the Leadership Team, the Assessment Committee, the faculty and stakeholders. Assessment data is presented at the Education Advisory Board and the Town Hall meeting for candidates. The College of Education website also includes a page with assessment data on the performance of the education candidates in initial and advanced programs (<http://www2.lewisu.edu/ncate/index.htm>). The College of Education is committed to the use of unit and program assessment data for transparency with the education and university community as well as the general public.

Individual candidate information is contained in paper form in a file as well as within the student data management system utilized by the University. A program assessment page was created for each program and department leadership and faculty use the information entered here to monitor progress through the transition points. Department secretaries are charged to keep student information up to date and to monitor that paper evidence of completion of transition points are entered and maintained in the filing system.

Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency and Avoidance of Bias

The unit uses the following strategies to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and eliminations of bias throughout its assessment system:

Fairness: Assessments are fair when they assess what has been taught. Candidates should be exposed to the knowledge, skills and dispositions which are measured in the assessments. Without this type of exposure, it is not fair to expect candidates to have mastered the material. One strategy used in all Lewis University programs is the identification of where in the curriculum candidates have had the opportunity to learn and practice the material being assessed. In addition, fairness also means that candidates understand what is expected of them on the assessments. To this end, key assessments are discussed with candidates upon entry into the program. Additionally, candidates receive notification and descriptions of the assessments in the course syllabi for the courses in which the assessments occur. Candidates are also given information on how the assessments are scored and how they count toward completion of the programs. This is done by course instructors.

Accuracy: Assessments are accurate when they measure what they purport to measure. To this end, the assessments in all Lewis University programs are aligned with the standards and

learning proficiencies that they are designed to measure. The assessments are aligned with the knowledge, skills and dispositions being assessed. Accuracy is emphasized at faculty meetings and program meetings where faculty examines the assessments to insure alignment and appropriateness. Accuracy is also approached by having faculty review and document the relationship between the assessment results and candidate performance on related assessments, grades and programs completion. This is done at department and program meetings at least once each semester.

Consistency: Assessments are consistent when they produce dependable results or results that would remain constant on repeated trials. This is achieved in the College by providing training for faculty to promote similar scoring patterns and understandings regarding the meaning of the data. This is done at the department and program level.

Avoidance of Bias: It is important to remove any contextual distractions and/or problems with the assessment instruments that introduce sources of bias and thus adversely influence candidate performance. When administering assessments, faculty members are aware of contextual distractions as well as clarity of directions and expectations. Lewis University faculty members are cognizant of poorly conceived language and task situations and other forms of cultural insensitivity that might interfere with candidate performance and unintentionally favor some candidates over others. Further, faculty check each other in ensuring there is no discrimination against groups of candidates. This is done at department meetings.

Unit Policies When Candidates are Not Meeting Expectations

In light of the COE's commitment to Lasallian Education, once admitted into a program, every effort is made to help a candidate address any deficiencies that they may demonstrate. Examples include review sessions for state or comprehensive exams, working one to one with a faculty member for course assignments or assessments and extended field-based experiences. Candidates who fail to remediate these deficiencies must be reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee which scrutinizes the adequacy of the support provided before deciding to dismiss the student from a program.

Assessing Unit Operations

The unit seeks feedback on its operations from the Education Advisory Board (EAB), Candidate Advisory Board (CAB) and program advisory boards. The EAB reviews data from key assessments and provides feedback on policies and procedures that relate to clinical practice and program improvement. The CAB provides feedback on the utility of the assignments that are assessed in programs. Program advisory boards review program data and provide specific feedback on the relevance and validity of those assessments. The unit also maintains records of candidate complaints and their resolution; minor complaints at the program level are maintained by department chairs and records of more serious complaints are maintained at the unit level by the dean's office.

Unit governance committees review policies and operations related to budget, faculty and staff review, enrollment and curriculum. The Academic Affairs Committee approves new programs and reviews significant program changes. It also reviews admissions criteria and approves candidates for admission to graduate programs. The Budget Review Committee reviews the unit's use of resources and recommends policy for such activities as copier use, honorarium money for speakers and suggested budget changes. The Faculty Affairs and Professional Status Committees review policies related to faculty life, faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure. Faculty involvement in the analysis of assessment system data and report preparation is recognized in the evaluation and promotion and tenure review process.

Feedback from program advisory boards and completer surveys provide additional means of determining that the changes enacted in programs have positive and strengthening effects without adverse consequences. Advisory boards and the unit EAB assure us that the changes made to increase candidate experiences with diversity, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), content knowledge, classroom management and research are strengthening programs to better prepare candidates to respond to the P-12 environment. Program advisory board minutes and EAB minutes reflect these discussions.

Examples of tools used to assess unit operations include:

- 1) Program Completer Survey
- 2) Graduate Survey
- 3) Employer Survey
- 4) School Personnel Evaluations of Field and Clinical Placements
- 5) Course Evaluations
- 6) Faculty Classroom Observations
- 7) First and Third Year Faculty Evaluations
- 8) Faculty Review for Promotion and Tenure
- 9) Administrator Evaluations
- 10) Department Chair Evaluations
- 11) Staff Reviews

In conclusion, the COE is working with systems to aggregate and analyze program-specific and unit-wide data that permit assessment of candidates in multiple ways and evaluate existing programs. The overriding mission of *developing learning communities* inspires members of the COE to continually fine-tune programs and develop new programs designed to meet the needs of contemporary educators. In day-to-day tasks or long-range plans, the COE strives to enact the shared mission of *developing learning communities* that promote the principles of knowledge, association, fidelity, justice and wisdom.

References

- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2011, Summer). Building a common core for learning to teach and connecting professional learning to practice. *American Teacher*, 35(2), 17-21, 38-39.
- Ball, D. L., Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511.
- Banks, J. A. (2012). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2003). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Banks, J.A. (2006). *Race, culture and education: The selected works of James A. Banks*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J.A. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Educators College Press.
- Carr, J., & Harris, D. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) & National Governors Association (NGA) (2010). *Common core states*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement: A framework for school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000a). Greater expectations for student learning: The missing connections. *Liberal Education*, 86, 6-14.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 166-173.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing educators for a changing world: What educators should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- De La Salle (1720), published in English (1996). *The conduct of the christian schools*. Landover, MD: Lasallian Publications.
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Delpit, L. (2012). "*Multiplication is for white people*": *Raising expectations for other people's children*. New York: New Press.
- Dewey, J. (1909). *Moral principles in education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: MacMillan.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Foster, W. (2004). The decline of the local: A challenge to educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 176-191.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Furman, G. (2004). The ethic of community. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 215-235.
- Furman, G., & Starratt, R.J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.). *The Educational Leadership Challenge: Redefining Leadership for the 21st Century* (pp.105-133). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Giroux, H.A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York/London: Continuum.
- Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts and social change*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Greene, M. (2007). *The search for pedagogy*. Retrieved from <http://maxinegreene.org/articles.php>.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2012). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- ISTE.NETS-T. (2008). *National Education Standards for Teachers*. International Society for Technology in Education. Retrieved from <http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/nets-t-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Random House.
- Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation*. New York: Random House.
- Kozol, J. (2009). *On being a teacher*. New York: Oneworld Publications.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- McLaren, P. (2006). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education, (5th Ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nieto, S. (2009). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities: 20th anniversary edition*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspective (2nd Ed.)*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York, NY: Educators College Press.
- Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Prensky, M. (2010). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning (1st Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Salm, FSC, L. (1996). *The work is yours: The life of Saint John Baptist de La Salle*. Washington, DC: Christian Brothers Publications.
- Schön, D. (1996). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Starratt, R. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. London: Falmer.
- Starratt, R. (1996). *Transforming educational administration: Meaning, community, and excellence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stiggins, R. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Vygotsky, L. (1934 original work/1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, CA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.A. (most recent publication, 1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, E. Souberman, Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Educative assessment: Designing assessment to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix

APPENDIX

Initial Licensure Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION SPA: NAEYC; CEC

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	IPTS	Spa Standard	Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1a	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	1, 2	2KB, 2KH, 2PA, 2PD, 3KA, 6KA, 6KB, 6KD, 6KF, 6KG, 6KH, 6PA, 6PB, 6PC, 6PD, 6PE, 6PF, 6PH, 9KA	NAEYC 5a, 5b CEC-ECSE 1k, 3k, 5k, 6k	BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1b	Demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10	2KB, 2KC, 2KF, 2KF, 2KG, 2, PE, 2PG, 3KB, 3KG, 3PB, 3PE, 3PH, 4KA, 4KD, 4KG, 4PA, 4PB, 4PC, 4PE, 4PF, 4PG, 5KA, 5KB, 5KD, 5PA, 5PB, 5PC, 5PI, 5PJ, 6KC, 6KE, 6KI, 6PI, 7KA, 7KB, 7KC, 7KD, 7KE, 7KF, 7KG, 7KH, 7KI, 7PA, 7PB, 7PC, 7PD, 7PE, 7PF, 7PG, 7PH, 9KC, 9A, 9PB, 9PE, 9PI	NAEYC 1a, 1b, 1c, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 5c, 6b, 6d CEC-ECSE 1k, 1s, 2k, 2s, 3k, 3s, 5k, 5s, 6k, 6s	BLO1 BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1c	Integrates technology in teaching	1, 5	2KD, 2PB, 2PC, 2PF, 3PD, 5PD	NAEYC 4b, 4c, 5b, 5c CEC-ECSE 1s, 2s, 5s	BLO2 BLO4	GSLO 2
1d	Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	4, 9	1KG, 2PD, 2PG, 3KE, 3PG, 5PF, 5PG, 9KG, 9PK, 9PL	NAEYC 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d CEC-ECSE 4k, 4s	BLO1	GLO1, GLO3
1e	Reflects on professional experiences*	3, 4, 8, 9		NAEYC 4d, 6d CEC-ECSE 6s		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
1f	Acts on professional convictions*	6, 7	9PC, 9KE	NAEYC 6a, 6b, 6d, 6e CEC ECSE 6s, 7s	BLO3	GLO2, GLO3
2a	Demonstrates knowledge of personal prejudices and	4, 9	9KD, 9PG	NAEYC 4d, 6b, 6d CEC ECSE 6s	BLO4 BLO5	GSLO 3

APPENDIX

	biases					
2b	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space	6, 7, 8	1KF	NAEYC 2a CEC ECSE 6k, 6s, 7k, 7s	BL05	GSLO1
2c	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	4, 6, 7, 8	1KA, 1KC, IKE, IPD, 3KC, 4KB, 4KC, 3PD, 8KA	NAEYC 2b, 2c CEC ECSE 1k, 1s, 4s, 5k, 5s, 6k, 6s, 7k, 7s	BL05	GSLO3
2d	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	3, 4, 7, 8, 9	1PE, 3KF, 3PI, 8KB, 8KC, 8KD, 8KE, 8KF, 8KG, 8KH, 8KI, 8PA, 8PB, 8PC, 8PD, 8PF, IPG, 8PH, 8PI, 8PK, 9PD, 9PF	NAEYC 3b, 3c CEC ECSE 4k, 4s	BL05	GSLO2
2e	Demonstrates ability to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities	3, 4, 5	7PU	NAEYC 1a, 1b, 1c, 5c CEC ECSE 1s, 2s, 4s, 5s,	BL06	
3a	Demonstrates knowledge of institutional inequities	3 4, 5, 8, 9, 10	IKG, IPA, 1PC, 1PD, 2PH, 2PI, 3KA, 3KC, 3KD, 3PC, 4KE, 4KH, 4PI, 5KG, 5PH, 7PI, 8PF	NAEYC 6b, 6d CEC ECSE 1k, 4k, 6k, 6s,7k, 7s		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3b	Demonstrates knowledge of relevant communities to bring about change	6, 7		NAEYC 2a, 2c CEC ECSE 1k, 2k, 6k, 6s	BLO4	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3c	Challenges dominant discourses*	7		NAEYC 2a, 2b, 2c, 6b, 6d, 6e CEC ECSE 6k, 6s	BLO5	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3d	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	6	9KF, 9PH	NAEYC 1a, 1b, 4c, 5c, 6e CEC ECSE 1s, 2s, 4s, 5s,6s, 7s	BL06	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3

APPENDIX

Advanced Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

SPA: ELCC

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	Spa Standard ELCC	State Standard ISLLC	Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome Not Applicable	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1aa	Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of subject matter	#1 and #2				GSLO1
1bb	Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills	#1 and #2				
1cc	Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content		2.1	2.B and 2.F		
1dd	Integrates technology in practices		2.4 and 3.2	2.H and 3.B		
1ee	Creates positive environments for student learning	#3	2.1 and 4.1	2.A, 2.C		
1ff	Reflects on professional experiences*	#8	5.2	5.B		
1gg	Acts on professional convictions*	#8	5.1	5.B		GSLO3
2aa	Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning	#8	5.1	5.B		
2bb	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space	#4 and #2	2.1 and 5.5	4.B and 5.E		
2cc	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	#7	5.2	4.B and 4.D		
2dd	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	#4 and #2	4.2 and 4.4	2.E and 5.A		
2ee	Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities		2.1	2.A and 3.C		
3aa	Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning	#4 and #2	6.1	6.B		
3bb	Engages relevant communities to bring about change	#7	1.1 and 4.3	4.B		GSLO2
3cc	Challenges dominant discourses*	#4	5.5, 6.1 and 6.2	5.C and 5.E		
3dd	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	#8	5.1 and 5.3	2.B ,2.E , 3.E, and 5.E		GSLO3

APPENDIX

Initial Licensure Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

SPA: ACEI Association of Childhood Education International

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	IPTS	Spa Standard – ACEI	Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1a	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	1, 2	2KB, 2KH, 2PA, 2PD, 3KA, 6KA, 6KB, 6KD, 6KF, 6KG, 6KH, 6PA, 6PB, 6PC, 6PD, 6PE, 6PF, 6PH, 9KA	2.1–2.7	BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1b	Demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10	2KB, 2KC, 2KF, 2KF, 2KG, 2PE, 2PG, 3KB, 3KG, 3PB, 3PE, 3PH, 4KA, 4KD, 4KG, 4PA, 4PB, 4PC, 4PE, 4PF, 4PG, 5KA, 5KB, 5KD, 5PA, 5PB, 5PC, 5PI, 5PJ, 6KC, 6KE, 6KI, 6PI, 7KA, 7KB, 7KC, 7KD, 7KE, 7KF, 7KG, 7KH, 7KI, 7PA, 7PB, 7PC, 7PD, 7PE, 7PF, 7PG, 7PH, 9KC, 9A, 9PB, 9PE, 9PI	3.1-3.5	BLO1 BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1c	Integrates technology in teaching	1, 5	2KD, 2PB, 2PC, 2PF, 3PD, 5PD	3.1, 3.4, 3.5	BLO2 BLO4	GSLO 2
1d	Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	4, 9	1KG, 2PD, 2PG, 3KE, 3PG, 5PF, 5PG, 9KG, 9PK, 9PL	4.0	BLO1	GLO1, GLO3
1e	Reflects on professional experiences*	3, 4, 8, 9		5.1		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
1f	Acts on professional convictions*	6, 7	9PC, 9KE	5.1	BLO3	GLO2, GLO3

APPENDIX

2a	Demonstrates knowledge of personal prejudices and biases	4, 9	9KD, 9PG	1	BLO4 BLO5	GSLO3
2b	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non neutral cultural space	6, 7, 8	1KF		BL05	GSLO1
2c	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	4, 6, 7, 8	1KA, 1KC, IKE, IPD, 3KC, 4KB, 4KC, 3PD, 8KA		BL05	GSLO3
2d	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	3, 4, 7, 8, 9	1PE, 3KF, 3PI, 8KB, 8KC, 8KD, 8KE, 8KF, 8KG, 8KH, 8KI, 8PA, 8PB, 8PC, 8PD, 8PF, IPG, 8PH, 8PI, 8PK, 9PD, 9PF	4.0, 5.2	BL05	GSLO2
2e	Demonstrates ability to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities	3, 4, 5	7PU	1, 3.1.3.,2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5	BL06	
3a	Demonstrates knowledge of institutional inequities	3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10	IKG, IPA, 1PC, 1PD, 2PH, 2PI, 3KA, 3KC, 3KD, 3PC, 4KE, 4KH, 4PI, 5KG, 5PH, 7PI, 8PF	5.1, 5.2		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3b	Demonstrates knowledge of relevant communities to bring about change	6, 7		5.2	BLO4	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3c	Challenges dominant discourses*	7		5.1, 5.2	BLO5	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3d	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	6	9KF, 9PH	1.5, 5.2	BL06	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3

APPENDIX

Advanced Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SPA: TESOL

<i>Unit Standard</i>	<i>Competency</i>	<i>NCATE Key Assessment</i>	<i>Spa Standard</i>	<i>State Standard (if applicable)</i>	<i>Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome</i> <i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Lewis University Graduate Outcome</i>
1aa	Demonstrates in depth knowledge of subject matter	1	1a			1
1bb	Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills	1 & 2	1b			1
1cc	Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content					
1dd	Integrates technology in practices		3c			2
1ee	Creates positive environments for student learning		5a			
1ff	Reflects on professional experiences*	6				
1gg	Acts on professional convictions*		5b			3
2aa	Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning	7				
2bb	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space	1	2			
2cc	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	3	2d			
2dd	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	5	4a, c			
2ee	Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities	6	2e, f, g; 3 a, c			2
3aa	Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning	6				2
3bb	Engages relevant communities to bring about change	7	5b			
3cc	Challenges dominant discourses*					
3dd	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*					3

APPENDIX

Advanced Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY M.ED. PROGRAM SPA: ISTE-TL (Technology Leadership) Standards

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	SPA Standard ISTE-TL	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1aa	Demonstrates in depth knowledge of subject matter	1, 2	IA	GLO1, GLO2
1bb	Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	IB, IIB	GLO1, GLO2
1cc	Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content	1, 5		GSLO 2
1dd	Integrates technology in practices	3, 4, 5	IIA, VA-D	GLO1, GLO3
1ee	Creates positive environments for student learning	3, 4, 5, 8	IID, IIIA	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
1ff	Reflects on professional experiences*	4, 6, 7		GLO2, GLO3
1gg	Acts on professional convictions*	4, 9		GSLO3
2aa	Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning	6, 7, 8	IIIB	GSLO1
2bb	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non neutral cultural space	3, 6, 7, 8	VIB, VIC	GSLO3
2cc	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	6, 7, 8	VIB	GSLO2
2dd	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	3, 4, 5	VIC	
2ee	Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities	3, 4, 5, 8	VIE	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3aa	Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning	6, 7	VIE	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3bb	Engages relevant communities to bring about change	7		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3cc	Challenges dominant discourses*	6		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3dd	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	VIE	

APPENDIX

Advanced Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: READING & LITERACY

SPA: International Reading Association

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	Spa Standard International Reading Association 2010	State Standard (if applicable) ISBE 27.120	Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1aa	Demonstrates in depth knowledge of subject matter	1, 2, 3, 6	1	1	NA	1, 3
1bb	Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3	1, 2, 3	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	NA	1, 3
1cc	Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content	2, 3, 5, 6, 7	4, 5, 6	3, 4, 6	NA	2, 3
1dd	Integrates technology in practices	2, 3	2, 5	1, 2, 7	NA	2
1ee	Creates positive environments for student learning	2, 3	5	1, 4, 7	NA	2, 3
1ff	Reflects on professional experiences*	2, 3, 4, 6, 7	6	8	NA	1, 2, 3
1gg	Acts on professional convictions*	2, 4, 6, 7	6	8	NA	1, 3
2aa	Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning	2, 6, 7, 8	4, 6	8	NA	3
2bb	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non neutral cultural space	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	4, 5	NA	NA	1, 3
2cc	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	2, 3, 4, 6	4	1	NA	2, 3
2dd	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	2, 3, 5, 6, 8	3, 4	2	NA	1, 3
2ee	Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities	2, 3, 4, 6, 8	4, 5	1, 4, 5, 7	NA	1, 3
3aa	Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning	2, 6, 7	4, 5, 6	5, 6, 8	NA	2
3bb	Engages relevant communities to bring about change	2, 6	4, 6	5, 6, 8	NA	2, 3
3cc	Challenges dominant discourses*	2, 6, 7	4, 6	5, 6, 8	NA	2, 3
3dd	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	4, 5	8	NA	3

APPENDIX

Advanced Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: SCHOOL COUNSELING

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	Spa Standard	State Standard	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1aa	Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of subject matter			1	GSL0 1
1bb	Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills			4	GSL0 3
1cc	Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content			1,8	GSL0 1
1dd	Integrates technology in practices			13	GSL0 2
1ee	Creates positive environments for student learning			3	GSL0 3
1ff	Reflects on professional experiences*			18	GSL0 1
1gg	Acts on professional convictions*			21	GSL0 3
2aa	Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning			18	GSL0 3
2bb	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space			4	GSL0 2
2cc	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures			19	GSL0 3
2dd	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning			13	GSL0 1
2ee	Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities			3	GSL0 3
3aa	Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning			18	GSL0 3
3bb	Engages relevant communities to bring about change			10	GSL0 2
3cc	Challenges dominant discourses*			18	GSL0 2
3dd	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*			1	GSL0 3

APPENDIX

Initial Licensure Program Alignment Chart

Program: SECONDARY EDUCATION

SPA: NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, NSTA

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	IPTs	Spa Standard				Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
				NCTE	NCTM	NCSS	NSTA (2012)		
1a	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	1, 2	2KB, 2KH, 2PA, 2PD, 3KA, 6KA, 6KB, 6KD, 6KF, 6KG, 6KH, 6PA, 6PB, 6PC, 6PD, 6PE, 6PF, 6PH, 9KA	1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9,10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15		1a,1b, 1c	BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1b	Demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10	2KB, 2KC, 2KF, 2KF, 2KG, 2, PE, 2PG, 3KB, 3KG, 3PB, 3PE, 3PH, 4KA, 4KD, 4KG, 4PA, 4PB, 4PC, 4PE, 4PF, 4PG, 5KA, 5KB, 5KD, 5PA, 5PB, 5PC, 5PI, 5PJ, 6KC, 6KE, 6KI, 6PI, 7KA, 7KB, 7KC, 7KD, 7KE, 7KF, 7KG, 7KH, 7KI, 7PA, 7PB, 7PC, 7PD, 7PE, 7PF, 7PG, 7PH, 9KC, 9A, 9PB, 9PE, 9PI	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15		2a, 2b, 2c	BLO1 BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1c	Integrates technology in teaching	1, 5	2KD, 2PB, 2PC, 2PF, 3PD, 5PD	7, 8, 12	6		2b, 3a, 3b	BLO2 BLO4	GSLO2
1d	Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	4, 9	1KG, 2PD, 2PG, 3KE, 3PG, 5PF, 5PG, 9KG, 9PK, 9PL		7		2c, 3c	BLO1	GLO1, GLO3
1e	Reflects on professional experiences*	3, 4, 8, 9			7				GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
1f	Acts on professional convictions*	6, 7	9PC, 9KE		7			BLO3	GLO2, GLO3

APPENDIX

2a	Demonstrates knowledge of personal prejudices and biases	4, 9	9KD, 9PG		7	IV		BLO4 BLO5	GSLO3
2b	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non neutral cultural space	6, 7, 8	1KF	1, 2, 4, 9, 10	7	I		BL05	GSLO1
2c	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	4, 6, 7, 8	1KA, 1KC, IKE, IPD, 3KC, 4KB, 4KC, 3PD, 8KA	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10	7	I		BL05	GSLO3
2d	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	3, 4, 7, 8, 9	1PE, 3KF, 3PI, 8KB, 8KC, 8KD, 8KE, 8KF, 8KG, 8KH, 8KI, 8PA, 8PB, 8PC, 8PD, 8PF, IPG, 8PH, 8PI, 8PK, 9PD, 9PF	10	7	I		BL05	GSLO2
2e	Demonstrates ability to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities	3, 4, 5	7PU	10	16.1, 16.2		3a, 4b	BL06	
3a	Demonstrates knowledge of institutional inequities	3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10	IKG, IPA, 1PC, 1PD, 2PH, 2PI, 3KA, 3KC, 3KD, 3PC, 4KE, 4KH, 4PI, 5KG, 5PH, 7PI, 8PF		7	V	6		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3b	Demonstrates knowledge of relevant communities to bring about change	6, 7		1	7	I, II, V		BLO4	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3c	Challenges dominant discourses*	7			7	V		BLO5	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3d	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	6	9KF, 9PH	10	7		2, 3, 6	BL06	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3

APPENDIX

Initial Licensure Program Alignment Chart

PROGRAM: SPECIAL EDUCATION

SPA: Council for Exceptional Children

Unit Standard	Competency	NCATE Key Assessment	IPTS	Spa Standard	Lewis University Undergraduate Outcome	Lewis University Graduate Outcome
1a.	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	1, 2	2KB, 2KH, 2PA, 2PD, 3KA, 6KA, 6KB, 6KD, 6KF, 6KG, 6KH, 6PA, 6PB, 6PC, 6PD, 6PE, 6PF, 6PH, 9KA	CEC 1 ,3	BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1b	Demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10	2KB, 2KC, 2KF, 2KF, 2KG, 2PE, 2PG, 3KB, 3KG, 3PB, 3PE, 3PH, 4KA, 4KD, 4KG, 4PA, 4PB, 4PC, 4PE, 4PF, 4PG, 5KA, 5KB, 5KD, 5PA, 5PB, 5PC, 5PI, 5PJ, 6KC, 6KE, 6KI, 6PI, 7KA, 7KB, 7KC, 7KD, 7KE, 7KF, 7KG, 7KH, 7KI, 7PA, 7PB, 7PC, 7PD, 7PE, 7PF, 7PG, 7PH, 9KC, 9A, 9PB, 9PE, 9PI	CEC1, 3	BLO1 BLO2 BLO6 BLO7	GLO1, GLO2
1c	Integrates technology in teaching	1, 5	2KD, 2PB, 2PC, 2PF, 3PD, 5PD	CEC 5	BLO2 BLO4	GSLO2
1d	Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	4, 9	1KG, 2PD, 2PG, 3KE, 3PG,5PF, 5PG, 9KG, 9PK, 9PL	CEC 4	BLO1	GLO1, GLO3
1e	Reflects on professional experiences*	3, 4, 8, 9		CEC 6		GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
1f	Acts on professional convictions*	6, 7	9PC, 9KE	CEC 6, 7	BLO3	GLO2, GLO3
2a	Demonstrates knowledge of personal prejudices and biases	4, 9	9KD, 9PG		BLO4 BLO5	GSLO3
2b	Demonstrates knowledge of the cultural aspects of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space	6, 7, 8	1KF	CEC 1	BL05	GSLO1

APPENDIX

2c	Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures	4, 6, 7, 8	1KA, 1KC, IKE, IPD, 3KC, 4KB, 4KC, 3PD, 8KA	CEC 2 ,5, 7	BL05	GSLO3
2d	Demonstrates knowledge of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessing student learning	3, 4, 7, 8, 9	1PE, 3KF, 3PI, 8KB, 8KC, 8KD, 8KE, 8KF, 8KG, 8KH, 8KI, 8PA, 8PB, 8PC, 8PD, 8PF, IPG, 8PH, 8PI, 8PK, 9PD, 9PF	CEC 4	BL05	GSLO2
2e	Demonstrates ability to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities	3, 4, 5	7PU	CEC 3,5	BL06	
3a	Demonstrates knowledge of institutional inequities	3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10	IKG, IPA, 1PC, 1PD, 2PH, 2PI, 3KA, 3KC, 3KD, 3PC, 4KE, 4KH, 4PI, 5KG, 5PH, 7PI, 8PF			GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3b	Demonstrates knowledge of relevant communities to bring about change	6, 7		CEC 6, 7	BLO4	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3c	Challenges dominant discourses*	7		CEC 6, 7	BLO5	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3
3d	Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn*	6	9KF, 9PH	CEC 2, 5	BL06	GLO1, GLO2, GLO3