EVERGREEN
THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

Master in Teaching

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Accreditation and Program Approval

Submitted September 21, 2007

by

Dr. Sherry Walton, Director
The Master in Teaching Program

Master in Teaching Program
Evergreen State College
Olympia, WA 98505
http://www.evergreen.edu/mit

Acknowledgements

The MIT Program is indebted to the following people for their generous and thoughtful attention to the development of this report!

Eric Hargrave – Webmaster Extraordinaire

Maggie Foran, Sonja Wiedenhaupt, Anita Lenges, Scott Coleman and PEAB members – Reviewers, Editors, Consultants

Glossary of Terms

The following is a list of terms used in the *Institutional Report* that may be unfamiliar to the reader. The majority of these terms were retrieved on September 19, 2007 from http://www.evergreen.edu/institutionalresearch/glossary.htm. The terms in brackets were added.

[Cohort
In the MIT program, 45 to 50 candidates enter the full-time two-year program each fall. The candidates and their faculty constitute a cohort of learners who usually remain together for the full two years of the program.]

Collaborative Learning
A variety of educational approaches involving joint intellectual effort by students or students and teachers together; usually in groups of two or more students mutually search for understanding, meaning, solutions, or in the creation of a product.

DTF (Disappearing Task Force)
A collaborative work group created to study various topics and make recommendations to the campus community. The group disbands when the group's work is done. Several DTFs are active each academic year, and students are encouraged to participate.

Evergreen Social Contract
Written by founding faculty members, the Social Contract contains guidelines for social ethics and working together that help Evergreen function as a community.

[Faculty Team
In the MIT program, three faculty members in Year 1 of the program, and four in Year 2 of the program, work together as a team to plan, deliver, and assess the curriculum and to advise candidates, support their learning, and assess their work.]

FTE(Full-Time Equivalency)
Refers to either faculty or student load, and is used to calculate enrollment and budget figures. One FTE represents a full-time unit load. Per State of Washington standards, one undergraduate FTE = 15 credits per quarter; one graduate FTE = 10 credits per quarter.

[Governance
All faculty are expected to contribute to the development and management of the college through participating in governance activities. This includes participation in DTF's, Planning Unit Meetings, and faculty meetings.]

Learning Community
A purposeful structuring of curriculum to link together coursework so that students find greater coherence in what they are learning and greater interaction with faculty and peers.

Narrative Evaluation
Evergreen's grading system consists of a narrative evaluation of a student's academic work at the end of each quarter. Faculty members write evaluations of each student's work and progress, and each student writes a self-evaluation. These become official documents, making up the permanent transcript. Students also write evaluations of faculty members, which become part of the faculty member's official portfolio.

Planning Unit
Divisions for the purposes of curricular planning. Planning units include: First-Year Programs; Culture, Text and Language; Environmental Studies; Expressive Arts; Native American and World Indigenous Peoples; Scientific Inquiry; and Society, Politics, Behavior and Change.

Seminars
A central experience of an Evergreen education. In a seminar, a faculty member and up to 25 students meet to discuss and analyze assigned readings and other program work.

Student Self-Evaluation
Students' evaluations of their academic work as measured against their objectives for the quarter and the requirements of their program, course, contract, or internship. Self-evaluations are part of students' formal academic records.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Page

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASTER IN TEACHING PROGRAM

The faculty and staff of the Master in Teaching (MIT) program at The Evergreen State College welcome you! We appreciate your dedication to ensuring the health, effectiveness, and well being of teacher preparation in the State of Washington and your efforts to support quality education for P-12 students. Based on the standards and criteria specified in WAC 181-78A-220(1), 255, 261, 264, and 270, we have reviewed and evaluated the program's processes, structure, content, and assessment information in preparation for your visit. Extensive links to program documents and data, organized under each of the program re-approval standards, are available on the accreditation website (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Teacher_Accreditation). In addition, a thorough analysis and discussion of the program is provided in this report.

In 2003, the Master in Teaching program at Evergreen received the Richard Wisniewski Award from the *Society of Professors of Education* in recognition of outstanding contributions to the field of teacher education. We are proud of this recognition of the quality of the program, of our faculty, and of our candidates. MIT faculty members are committed to enacting the vision of Evergreen's first president, Charles McCann, by creating bridges between theory and practice for meaningful, lifelong learning both for our candidates and for their future students. Our candidates become teachers who understand teaching and learning as developmental processes situated in a wide range of cultural and personal contexts. They seek, with the support of their peers and faculty, to understand their own cultural encapsulation so that they might become leaders in multicultural, anti-bias, democratic education. They investigate a range of pedagogical, research-based practices in preparation for reaching, and positively impacting, all students in their classrooms. They develop the skills that allow them to be critical, intelligent consumers of educational research.

Many of our alumni, or their students, have received special recognition for their work. For example:

- Audrey Sharp received the Outstanding Young Art Educator Teacher of the Year award in 2006 from the Washington Art Education Association
- Bruno Bowles was awarded the Environmental Educator of the Year award in 2003-04 by the Environmental Association of Washington
- Darice Johnson was awarded the Golden Apple Award in 2003 for excellence in education
- Ervanna Little Eagle was recognized by the Marysville School District for her work in revising the social studies curriculum to include the histories of local tribes
- Wayne Au was made a member of the editorial Board for *Rethinking Schools*
- Gordon Quinlan was recognized by the Sunnyside Grange for changing the quality of support for students with disabilities in his high school
- Deidre Pleasant's students were highlighted in their local newspaper for their multi-media presentation about child labor
- After a year of working with Laura Handy, 76% of a group of students who had not met the WASL reading standard were successful in meeting standard
- Cecily Schmidt was featured in a 2006 ABC news broadcast about approaches that reduce high school drop out rates
- The *Olympian* published a story about Mark Bowden's middle school students' AIDS education project

These are just a very few of the ways that our alumni have contributed to the education of children and youth. We believe that every one of our candidates is well prepared to positively affect the students who enter their classrooms. Our high placement rate, first or second in the state for the last five years (Table 1) suggests that principals and hiring committees agree! The University of Washington's retention and mobility study, which indicated that nearly 80% of alumni who graduated in 2001 are still teaching, reflects MIT's data which suggests that the great majority of our graduates tend to remain in teaching.

TABLE I

MIT PLACEMENT STATISTICS

	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Employed in-state public	**28**	**28**	**21**	**29**	**21**	**18**
Employed in-state private	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**0**
Employed out-of-state public	**1**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**2**
Employed out-of-state private	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**2**
Percentage of MIT grads employed as teachers	**86%**	**84%**	**76%**	**86%**	**83%**	**67%**
State mean	**Not yet available from state**		**53%**	**52%**	**52%**	**58%**
Substitute, seeking full-time position	**2**	**2**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**
Substitute, not seeking full-time position	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**
Percentage employed as substitutes	**8%**	**5%**	**18%**	**14%**	**14%**	**14%**
TOTAL PERCENTAGE IN TEACHING	**94%**	**89%**	**94%**	**100%**	**97%**	**81%**

Our candidates and graduates are supported by faculty who are skilled and dedicated educators. MIT faculty members create significant learning opportunities for our candidates that incorporate emerging local, state, and national initiatives and they also make time for scholarly work and service to Evergreen and to the larger community. For example, in two of our recent cohorts, faculty skillfully responded to HB 1495 by including studies of tribal histories through reservation-based work and through curriculum development projects that may be included in the Chehalis culturally appropriate social studies curriculum. The two most recent cohorts have benefited from statewide math research in which one of our math faculty has participated. Two recent cohorts experimented successfully with

innovative ways of incorporating arts across the curriculum. In all cohorts, candidates review and critique educational research that can help them become more effective teachers.

Members of our MIT faculty are regularly invited to submit writings or interviews for publication, to make guest presentations in undergraduate programs and at regional and national conferences, to provide workshops or mentorship for public school teachers, to collaborate with P-12 teachers in a variety of ways, and to serve in significant leadership roles in the college. The MIT faculty and staff actively attempt to enact the mission of The Evergreen State College and the Conceptual Framework of the program in order to contribute to a more just and excellent system of education for all children and youth.

The kaleidoscope of images on the first page of the accreditation website represents, in a rather profound way, the vision of the program and the experience of the candidates who come together to create our program learning communities. This particular design was on the cover of the Master's Project Presentation guidebook of candidates who graduated in June 2007. Thirty-six kaleidoscopes, designed by 36 individuals, are creatively integrated into a whole. These kaleidoscopes represent the 36 graduates who helped make this cohort unique. They came to the program as individuals but worked together to build a cohesive learning community that supported their development as teachers and learners. As with previous cohort members, many will continue to participate in a network (another type of learning community) that will support their work in a wide range of public schools. This idea of a dedicated community of learners is central to the vision and enactment of our Master in Teaching program.

The kaleidoscope, and the experiences of the 2007 graduates, is representative of the MIT Program in general. As you will see in this report, and on the accreditation website, a variety of individual components contribute to the wholeness of the program, including the commitments embedded in Evergreen's vision of education and in the MIT Conceptual Framework; the unique experiences and talents represented by the faculty and candidates in each cohort; research about learning and effective teaching practices; on-going program and individual assessment; and attention to the State of Washington's Learning Goals and Essential Academic Learning Requirements. The creative integration of these components is what makes Evergreen's MIT program unique, responsive to individual and cultural diversity, and able to support the development of skilled and compassionate teachers who care to create just and educative learning experiences for their students.

We invite you to explore our program and we look forward to your feedback!

MISSION AND VALUES OF THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

Education Reform and The Evergreen State College

In 1993, through HB 1209, the State of Washington Legislature established a set of four student-learning goals intended to enhance the educational learning opportunities of all P-12 students. These goals, as well as the initiatives in the *Washington Learns Report,* emphasize the importance of key competencies in communication and a range of content area disciplines, as well as the ability to think analytically, creatively, and logically and to apply what has been learned to a range of life contexts. All of these goals are embedded in the mission and values of The Evergreen State College and nourished through its innovative approaches to supporting learners.

In fact, The Evergreen State College and the MIT program are in a unique position to support the work described in *Washington Learns.* As Evergreen State College President, Thomas L. Purce, explained in his introduction to Evergreen's 2007 update to its strategic plan:

> . . . the Governor's *Washington Learns* initiative challenges public education to move away from a one-size-fits-all approach, promote creativity and imagination, encourage lifelong learning, build rigor, relevance and relationships into our curricula, and focus on results for our students and our state. Not surprisingly, Evergreen is already well along on this path.
>
> Since 1971, Evergreen has led the charge to personalize higher education; empower students to design their own paths to lifelong learning; broaden the educational frame of reference through interdisciplinary teaching; bridge the gap between academic theory and real-world problems and solutions; inspire creativity, innovation and critical thinking; and demand substantive results. Evergreen can serve as a model for the type of "bold reforms" called for in *Washington Learns*. It was our charge in the beginning and remains so today. In fact, the opportunity for leadership has never been better (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/president/docs/strategicplanup07.pdf on 8/20/07).

The Mission of The Evergreen State College

When the college was chartered in 1967, Governor Dan Evans "declared the need for a flexible and sophisticated educational instrument." Senator Gordon Sandison stated, "It was not the intent of the Legislature that this would be just another four year college; . . . (the college would be) a unique opportunity to meet the needs of the students today and the future because the planning would not be bound by any rigid structure of tradition as are the existing colleges nor by an overall central authority as is the case in many states" (Archives, The Evergreen State College).

Evergreen's first president, Charles McCann, stated, "We hoped to outline an environment which stimulates the learning process, encourages the student to come to grips with his mind and ideas at the beginning of his undergraduate years, expects him to know not only the facts but how they are found, how to deal with them and how to articulate them . . . We assumed that the most valuable service a college can offer a student is to initiate a process of continuing learning: by preparing him with the methods of learning and experimentation, by encouraging independence in pursuing inquiries that interest and motivate him, by providing him with resources to test his knowledge and ability" (Archives, The Evergreen State College).

To meet those expectations, and to those ends, Evergreen enacted a higher education learning environment that prioritized learning opportunities which drew on faculty and students' interests and that prepared its graduates to engage in life-long learning and to live and act effectively in the world. From its inception, Evergreen's primary focus has been on nurturing learners who, through the

philosophy embedded in the *Five Foci of Teaching and Learning at Evergreen,* develop important knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflected in the *Six Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate* which were articulated in 2001.

The Five Foci of Teaching and Learning

- Interdisciplinary Learning
- Learning Across Significant Differences
- Personal Engagement with Learning
- Linking Theory and Practice
- Collaborative Learning

The Six Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate

- Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work
- Participate collaboratively and responsibly in our diverse society
- Communicate creatively and effectively
- Demonstrate integrative, independent and critical thinking
- Apply qualitative, quantitative and creative modes of inquiry appropriately to practical and theoretical problems across disciplines
- As a culmination of your education, demonstrate depth, breadth and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning.

On January 10, 2007, The Evergreen State College Board of Trustees adopted the following as its mission statement: "As the nation's leading public interdisciplinary liberal arts college, Evergreen's mission is to sustain a vibrant academic community and to offer students an education that will help them excel in their intellectual, creative, professional and community service goals (Board of Trustees Handbook, retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/board1.htm on 8/13/07). This statement rendered more succinctly the college's mission statement originally adopted on March 16, 1989 and revised on September 25, 1991; April 4, 1997; and January 12, 2000. The 2000 statement affirmed:

> The Evergreen State College is a public, liberal arts college serving Washington State. Its mission is to help students realize their potential through innovative, interdisciplinary educational programs in the arts, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences. In addition to preparing students within their academic fields, Evergreen provides graduates with the fundamental skills to communicate, to solve problems, and to work collaboratively and independently in addressing real issues and problems. This mission is based on a set of principles, listed below, that guide the development of all college programs and services.
>
> - Teaching is the central work of the faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
> - Supporting student learning engages everyone at Evergreen-faculty and staff.
> - Academic program offerings are interdisciplinary and collaborative, a structure that accurately reflects how people learn and work in their occupations and personal lives.
> - Students are taught to be aware of what they know, how they learn, and how to apply what they know; this allows them to be responsible for their own education, both at college and throughout their lives.
> - College offerings involve active participation in learning, rather than passive reception of information, and integrate theory with practical applications.
> - Evergreen supports community-based learning, with research and applications focused on issues and problems found within students' communities. This principle, as well as the desire to serve diverse place-bound populations, guides Evergreen's community-based programs in Tacoma and on Tribal Reservations.
> - Because learning is enhanced when topics are examined from the perspectives of diverse

groups and because such differences reflect the world around us, the college strives to create a rich mix in the composition of its student body, staff, and faculty, and to give serious consideration to issues of social class, age, race, ethnicity, (dis)ability, gender, religious preference, and sexual orientation.

- Faculty and staff continually review, assess and modify programs and services to fit changing needs of students and society.
- The college serves the needs of a diverse range of students including recently graduated high school students, transfer students, working adults, and students from groups that historically have not attended college.
- As evidenced by these principles, an important part of Evergreen's educational mission is engagement with the community, the state, and the nation. One focus of this engagement is through the work of public service centers that both disseminate the best work of the college and bring back to the college the best ideas of the wider community (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/about/mission.htm on 8/13/07).

Not only does Evergreen state a clear and consistent set of values and principles, the college has also been nationally recognized for its approach to education and educational outcomes for students in the book, *Creating Conditions That Matter,* based on data from the *National Survey of Student Engagement* and in Pope's book, *Colleges That Change Lives.* According to Don Bantz, Evergreen's Provost:

> . . . In the recently published book*, Student Success: Creating Conditions That Matter,* a team of educational researchers from Indiana highlight twenty institutions that share "an unshakeable focus on student learning and who create environments designed to promote student success." Evergreen is one of those twenty institutions. The researchers cited Evergreen for what they termed "positive restlessness" i.e., we evaluate *everything* we do in the classroom and constantly focus on how to improve our teaching. Their research was [informed by a concept of] *student engagement* of which there are two elements: 1) the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities and 2) how an institution allocates its resources and organizes the curriculum and other learning opportunities and support services to encourage students to participate in activities that lead to student success (learning, persistence, satisfaction, graduation). They employed five benchmarks of effective educational practice: 1) academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student-faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment.
>
> They were effusive in their praise for Evergreen in all five areas, "Evergreen has created a structure for putting higher order mental skills into practice….the operating philosophy: innovation leavened with autonomy, personal responsibility, and egalitarianism." (Retrieved 9/2/07 from http://64.233.167.104/custom?q=cache:IAIYcrLZVVUJ:www2.evergreen.edu/strategicplan/files/Draft%2520of%2520March%252014.doc+Positive+restlessness&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us&client=google-coop-np)

The NSSE survey results placed Evergreen in the top 10% of schools surveyed for the level of academic challenge as well as the level of active and collaborative learning.

Implications of the Mission and Guiding Principles for Planning, Assessment, Professional Development, and Governance

The Evergreen State College is unusual. Prospective students are urged to participate actively and collaboratively in the design and enactment of their education. Faculty come to Evergreen knowing that their central work is teaching. Creativity, critical thinking, and innovation are valued and actively encouraged among faculty and students.

This focus plays out in the ways that faculty plan the curriculum and assess student learning, and the ways in which they negotiate professional development and governance (service). As stated in the Faculty Handbook:

> The art of teaching at Evergreen should be the art of arranging the conditions and moments when the student encounters problems and ideas so that important learning takes place; lives are touched, shaped and changed so that they become responsible, critical and creative life-long learners. The art of administration at Evergreen should be, must be, the art of protecting, stimulating, supporting, and rewarding good teaching.
>
> Because the art of really effective teaching is something we all learn together, and because the art of developing and teaching interdisciplinary programs is something that we will work at for years to come, the more experimental, creative, critical and self-corrective we are, the more successful we will all be.
>
> To ensure this, the faculty has been organized into many temporary, small, autonomous teams and each given a great deal of freedom and a great deal of responsibility, power and authority . . . The academic structure of Evergreen enables faculty members to know and feel their stake in the success of their program--and their stake in the success of the Evergreen idea. When the structure did not support our goals, it was changed, and it will be changed again as need arises (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/f-2100.htm on 8/13/07).

Through a series of formal and informal meetings, faculty develop the college's curriculum. Out of these conversations, programs are envisioned, proposed, and accepted or modified by a faculty group and a curriculum dean. Faculty rarely teach alone, instead working in teams of two to four colleagues from multiple academic disciplines to plan, organize, and implement programs around themes and compelling questions. However, the faculty teams don't create learning experiences in isolation from students. Again, as stated on Evergreen's website, "Learning at Evergreen is a creative, interactive pursuit where students and faculty develop the skills and knowledge to tackle complex real-world issues (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/academics.htm on 8/13/07). Faculty help students learn, students help each other and faculty learn, and faculty help each other.

After each quarter of rigorous investigations, everyone enters into the critical process of self-assessment and assessment of others. Faculty write narrative evaluations for each of their students in place of grades. They also write narrative evaluations for their colleagues and for themselves. Students write narrative evaluations of their own progress in learning and write evaluations of their faculty. The assessment process culminates in evaluation conferences during which faculty and students share their evaluations and advice.

Every five years, faculty compile extensive portfolios which are read by a dean and all of the colleagues with whom they have taught. They then meet with those colleagues for two to four hours to discuss what they've learned and to seek advice about meeting their self-selected goals. Faculty evaluation, then, is informed by feedback from students and colleagues but it is the faculty member herself who makes sense of the feedback and makes plans for professional development.

Important venues for professional development include faculty rotation into the deans' positions, academic advising, and the library. Faculty in the three graduate programs rotate regularly into

undergraduate teaching teams and liberal arts faculty are encouraged to teach in the graduate programs. In addition, all faculty are expected to participate in weekly text seminars and are encouraged to participate in summer institutes. Faculty may also apply for faculty development funds to attend and present at international, national, and state conferences.

All Evergreen faculty are expected to participate in governance, or service to the college. Each year faculty are asked to identify areas in which they will contribute time and thought to support the functioning of the college and its development. For example, faculty may serve on hiring committees, DTF's (similar to study or action committees at other institutions), the Agenda Committee, or as Planning Unit Coordinators.

Teacher Preparation in the Context of Evergreen's Mission and Values

When the Teacher Education Program (TEP) was added at Evergreen in 1986, a faculty team crafted the program to embody the same values and visions as those that permeated the undergraduate curriculum. At the heart of the teacher preparation program were the Five Foci. At the center was the belief in learning and the power of the learner working in collaboration with other learners. Evergreen's approach to teacher preparation emphasized building a community of learners, developing a strong theoretical foundation, and learning to apply theory through extensive opportunities for practice in public school classrooms. The inaugural 1986 cycle was also informed and inspired by the idea of "development in education", and in particular by the question "what does it mean to take development as the aim of education?" Faculty worked in teams to create inter-disciplinary, collaborative learning experiences that invited candidates to explore essential questions about the nature of teaching, learning, community, and society as they prepared to work with children and youth. Students and faculty read primary documents, critically examined a range of texts in seminars and through writing, attended and participated in workshops that explored the place of development in teaching and learning from multiple perspectives, and applied theory to practice through participation in extensive field and student teaching placements.

The Master in Teaching Program replaced the Teacher Education Program in 1992. Planning for the Master in Teaching program began in the mid-1980s in response to state and national calls for reform in teacher preparation. Evergreen's innovative program was a direct result of a 1987 law passed by the Washington State Legislature. Today, Evergreen's Master in Teaching program mirrors the original alternative nature of the college with its cross-curricular, interdisciplinary programs, guiding questions or themes around which to structure learning opportunities, the absence of separate academic departments, and an emphasis on primary as well as secondary source learning materials, interactive student-teacher dialogue, graduate-level writing skills and narrative evaluations in place of letter grades. As part of Evergreen's graduate-level professional studies program, and through personal and professional reflection and growth, the MIT faculty are committed to bridging theory and practice for meaningful, lifelong learning.

The MIT program is founded upon a strong theory base, substantial involvement with schools, sensitivity to multicultural and human relations, a variety of instructional strategies, emphasis on new technology and research, and close cooperation with K-12 teachers and administrators. In fact, the mission of the college and its guiding principles remain firmly in place.

As mentioned earlier, program content is informed by the knowledge and skills of the faculty and candidates in each cohort, research in education, and by the WACs and endorsement competencies specified by the State of Washington and by the standards of recognized professional organizations. MIT faculty assert that the program's success lies as much in the collaborative learning process as it does in its curricular content. Through exploring academic subjects and content area pedagogies, candidates are exposed to a wide range of community-building activities, small-group seminars,

hands-on field experiences and group problem-solving activities. These skills reinforce critical and reflective thinking and demonstrate important principles of effective and meaningful classroom teaching. Furthermore, they help graduate students become knowledgeable, competent professionals who can assume leadership roles in curriculum development, child advocacy, assessment and anti-bias work.

Evergreen's Master in Teaching Program is a nationally recognized[1] teacher education program. Based on the guiding principles of The Evergreen State College, and its own, research-based Conceptual Framework, the MIT program, like the college, is firmly on the path to enacting the visions embodied in the *Washington Learns* report. The program reflects the original, alternative nature of The Evergreen State College with its cross-curricular programs organized around themes and questions, while at the same time meeting all State of Washington Administrative Code standards for program quality and beginning teacher competence.

[1] Awarded the 2003 Richard Wisniewski Award by the Society of Professors of Education in recognition of outstanding contributions to the field of teacher education

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARDS

This report is organized according to the notation system used on the program approval worksheets for Standards I – V provided by the Professional Education and Certification Office of The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The discussion and evidence address the criteria listed under the "Met" and/or "Exemplary" columns on these worksheets.

The MIT program's thorough self-study based on the criteria in Standards I through V indicates that the program is in compliance with the program approval standards of WAC 181-78A.

STANDARD I

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD (PEAB)

Introduction. Evergreen's Master in Teaching Program (MIT) has enjoyed a productive relationship with its Professional Education Advisory Board since its formation in 1997. Since the last accreditation visit in 2002, MIT faculty and staff and members of the PEAB have continued to meet regularly, share important information, insights, and suggestions, and work collaboratively. In addition to meeting the criteria outlined in this standard, MIT's PEAB members have participated in seminars with teacher candidates, observed a variety of workshops, served on "mock" interview panels, attended presentations of Master's papers, and served as speakers in the program. Our members have also contributed to education in this state through mentoring student teachers, serving on WASL committees, attending state PEAB conferences, and participating in a variety of professional organizations. Having members who have been with us since our PEAB was formed as well as members who have joined us this year enriches us. One of our members requested that she become a community representative upon retirement from teaching.

Extensive data that provides evidence for each criterion is available at **http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_I** and in the Evidence Room

The PEAB has:

- been established and maintained with diversity representation in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, public school and community roles (teachers, principals, district-level administrators, MIT faculty, staff, and administration), years of experience, and size and location of schools and districts
- adopted and reviewed by-laws
- met four times a year in order to:
    - review all five program standards every five years, and to review and approve plans for the Professional Certificate program as well as the M.Ed. program (currently being reviewed by the HEC Board)
    - review follow-up studies, placement records, Title II reports, EBI reports, and summaries of performances on the pedagogy assessment, West-B and West-E tests, and
    - make recommendations to the program and review responses from the faculty

- submitted annual reports to the State Board of Education or the Professional Educator Standards Board
- examined exemplar candidate work samples that document positive impact on student learning
- submitted an executive summary of PEAB's work and been apprised of OSPI's response
- read and provided input on the *Institutional Report* for the 2007 state re-accreditation site-visit

Based on MIT's experiences with the PEAB and our evaluation of the data supplied in this report, on the MIT Accreditation web page, and in the Evidence Room, the program meets or exceeds standard for each criterion in Standard I.

STANDARD II

ACCOUNTABILITY

Introduction. A key principle of education at The Evergreen State College is the on-going attention of faculty and staff to "review, assess and modify programs and services to fit changing needs of students and society" (retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/about/mission.htm on 8/13/07).

Assessment in the MIT program begins with a review of potential candidates through the collection and analysis of their college transcripts and endorsement worksheets, two written essays, WEST B and WEST E scores, and letters of recommendation. The Admissions Committee analyzes each application using a standard review sheet to ensure that decisions are equitable. Once applicants enter the program, assessment becomes an on-going part of their educational experiences.

The MIT program has, from its inception, used formative and summative assessments to support candidates' work and to make decisions about continuation in, and graduation from, the program. Formative assessments are used to evaluate candidates' work in order to identify areas that faculty may need to re-visit or strengthen and to help candidates set goals for their own growth and development. Formative assessments include rubric and narrative feedback from faculty and peers and candidates' self-assessments on a variety of program work, including in-progress seminar and master's papers, lesson and unit plans, and teacher knowledge and skills. The MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* is used during practicum and student teaching experiences to provide candidates with clear and specific language through which to identify areas of strength and ways to improve their planning, instruction, classroom management, and professional development. Summative assessments in the form of quarterly faculty narrative evaluations, end-of-student-teaching rubrics, the *Pedagogy Assessment*, mentor teacher feedback and candidates' self-assessments provide information about knowledge and skills that have been attained.

One of the conceptual frameworks of the MIT program is titled, *Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning*. The MIT faculty understand that research in this domain applies as much to the development of teacher candidates as to the development of children and youth. Thus, the assessment system is intended to provide many opportunities for candidates to explore, develop, and try out new knowledge and skills; receive feedback from faculty, their colleagues, and P-12 teachers; and then try new or modified strategies with previous experiences and feedback to inform their choices. It is also intended to help candidates set and articulate professional development goals for themselves.

Based on a wide range of assessment data, successful candidates are recommended for Residency Certification and for the MIT degree. However, because faculty in the MIT program have a serious responsibility to the children and youth in our public schools, candidates who are unable to meet the stated criteria for program completion receive neither the master's degree nor recommendation for certification.

The MIT program has also, from its inceptions, sought feedback from the PEAB, candidates, alumni, and P-12 teachers and principals about strengths of the program and ways the program can be improved. Information gathered while program cohorts are in progress, from new program completers, from mentor teachers and principals, from alumni who have taught for three or more years, and from EBI data are used to evaluate program strengths and areas that need attention.

Data from MIT surveys, EBI surveys, the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric*, and the *Pedagogy Assessment* are electronically stored, aggregated, and analyzed and discussed with MIT faculty and PEAB members. Narrative evaluations of candidates' work, faculty assessments of their own work,

and candidates' evaluations of faculty work are kept in faculty portfolios, which are available for review in the Evidence Room. EALR projects (positive impact on student learning) are archived by MIT administrative staff.

Assessment is, and has always been, an integral part of the program, and data is used to inform faculty and program decisions. Continued efforts are underway to further improve the assessment system and uses of data.

Standard II A (1): Learner Expectations: Submit for approval to the Professional Educator Standards Board a performance-based program for the preparation of teachers. The Master in Teaching program was granted re-accreditation after its last site visit in October of 2002. All areas were rated as acceptable or on target except for two. *Unit Evaluation of Professional Development* and *Qualified Faculty* were rated as Unacceptable Approaching Acceptable. A March 25, 2005 response from OSPI about the *2003-04 Annual Reports for Teacher Preparation Programs* stated:

> Update regarding "unacceptable ratings" from 2002 site visit: Unit Evaluation of Professional Development and Qualified Faculty
>
> Discussions were held [with the PEAB] regarding the preparation of liberal arts faculty in recent cycles to supervise student teachers and PEAB consensus was that these faculty were well prepared for their roles as supervisors due to their prior professional experiences and intense work with students and schools during year one of the MIT program. The other concern regarding unit evaluation was discussed and the consensus was that faculty review process should continue to be a topic of discussion but was operating acceptably at this time. Good progress has definitely been made by the program to address these two areas. Continued efforts and outcomes will be verified at the next site visit in 2007. (Connie Reichel, Program and Certification Specialist)

Data supplied in the current report and on the accreditation website demonstrate that the MIT program and faculty have successfully addressed the areas of concern.

2007 Response to Concerns

- *Unit Evaluation of Professional Development*. One concern was identified in the 2002 accreditation report under this category. The report stated, "no evidence supported a direct connection between evaluation data collected (self-analysis, peer evaluations or student evaluations) and the focus of professional development."

The MIT faculty understand the importance of linking their professional development choices to colleague and student feedback and to state standards and have offered explanations about their choices for professional development. Please see the following site for access to these statements: http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_N%2811%29. For example, MIT faculty professional development ranged from attendance and/or presentations at professional conferences, to grant-supported research projects, to self-guided study in areas of interest related to teacher preparation, equity, and theories of learning. These types of professional development are linked to the faculty's statements about self-analysis and peer and student evaluations.

Professional development at Evergreen is an active, constructive faculty-directed process determined by an individual's self-evaluations, feedback from colleagues, and curricular or emerging interests. The Faculty Handbook, which governs MIT faculty as well as faculty in the undergraduate curriculum,

states, "A faculty member should continue his or her professional development *as evidenced by his or her new learning in Evergreen programs, and, if appropriate, as evidenced in his or her independent work*" (Retrieved from Section 12, http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/f-4300.htm#9 on 8/13/07). Faculty members' contract with the college, which is congruent with the college's mission and values described at the beginning of this report, leaves them great individual discretion in determining the areas they need to strengthen or want to explore. This individual discretion is in the service of enhancing faculty members' abilities to develop innovative and creative curricula that address emerging issues relevant to students, the community, the state, and the world.

- *Qualified Faculty*. Two concerns were listed under this category. The first questioned whether or not the liberal arts faculty who rotate into MIT faculty cohorts have the experience necessary to supervise MIT students in K-12 settings. The second addressed concerns related to consistency when program faculty and themes change every two years.

  1) Supervision of student teachers: Team members on the last site visit were concerned that liberal arts faculty might not have the knowledge and skills to effectively supervise and mentor student teachers. As documented at http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_B%283%29, the MIT Director and faculty have taken steps to ensure that people who have the necessary experience in K-12 classrooms or with K-12 students and teachers supervise all candidates. All supervisors in the last five years have taught in K-12 schools and/or have experience with supervision. Further, faculty teams have met and reviewed MIT's *Student Teaching Handbook*, the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric*, and the state *Pedagogy Assessment*. All core MIT faculty hold terminal degrees in education or closely associated disciplines and liberal arts and visiting faculty hold either terminal degrees or master's degrees.

     The MIT program at Evergreen is committed to providing the best possible learning experiences for its candidates. From Evergreen's perspective and the assessment of the last accreditation team, the presence of liberal arts faculty on MIT teams is an asset. Their presence reflects the mission and guiding principles of the college as a whole. Liberal arts faculty who have been members of MIT teams in the past five years have, for example, brought expertise in cognitive psychology, theories of motivation, research methods, technology, ESL, conflict resolution, special education, dance, anthropology, and literature, as well as significant experiences with collaboration and inter-disciplinary teaching and learning.

  2) Consistency: The last site-visit team referenced some candidates' concerns about the effects of faculty rotating into, and out of, cohort teams every two years. The MIT faculty have examined candidates' concerns and have taken steps to assure *appropriate* consistency. However, at Evergreen, as at any college, faculty embody a range of personalities, teaching styles, and disciplinary knowledge. In addition, faculty teams, and the themes around which they structure learning experiences, change because of:

     (a) institutional values
     (b) criteria for faculty evaluation and reappointment listed in the *Faculty Handbook*, and,
     (c) professional renewal.

     (a) Evergreen's Institutional Values: The college's founding principles placed a high value on innovation, fresh perspectives, and drawing on the knowledge and interests of a range of faculty colleagues and students. In addition, the college values the on-going professional development, as well as the deepening and broadening of concepts and content, that result when colleagues from diverse disciplines plan and teach together. Thus, from an Evergreen values' perspective, MIT faculty are abiding by and supporting the guiding principles of The Evergreen State College by meeting their

rotational obligations. Further, the changes in cohort themes each year is an outcome expected by the college. The evolving themes represent faculty's awareness of, and engagement with, the changing needs and perspectives of public education, national and world issues, and the new blend of expertise that each team represents. While *themes* change, the underlying, core principles and conceptual framework of the program continue to inform curricular decisions. Further, the rotation of liberal arts faculty into MIT cohort teams brings important disciplinary perspectives, as addressed earlier, as well as expertise in collaborative planning, teaching, and learning.

(b) Criteria for Evaluation and Reappointment: As Members of the Faculty at The Evergreen State College, MIT faculty are governed by the *Faculty Handbook*, which includes policies through which new faculty are converted (tenured). This policy requires that a faculty member teach for nine quarters and with at least six other faculty, four of whom must already be converted (tenured). In addition, "regular faculty members on continuing appointment must teach with at least five different faculty members during every 15 quarters." The following excerpt speaks to the question of MIT faculty rotation but does not provide the full text for evaluation and reappointment. All criteria for evaluation and reappointment are located in Section 12, at http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/f-4300.htm#9.

> **Meeting commitments**. A faculty member should regularly and cooperatively meet commitments made to students, colleagues, staff, and the college, as judged by peers, students, the deans, and provost. *These commitments include, but are not limited to: meeting rotation and team teaching requirements* [italics added] . . .

(c) Professional Renewal: Working with the same team and the same group of candidates for two years is a strength of the program in that collaboration, innovation, and coaching are constantly modeled. On the other hand, working in this program is mentally and physically demanding. Rotating into the undergraduate curriculum after two such full and intense years provides a refreshing and educative opportunity to further develop particular knowledge and pedagogical strategies relevant to teacher education, explore other content areas, and/or work with fresh perspectives. This rotational expectation serves, in fact, as an important form of faculty development. In addition, the rotation serves the college because undergraduate faculty and students benefit from MIT faculty's knowledge of teacher preparation in the state, from their disciplinary areas, and from their expertise in developmentally and culturally relevant pedagogies.

The Master in Teaching Program at Evergreen is unusual in its structure, staffing, and interdisciplinary approach. However, the consistently high rate at which our graduates secure teaching positions (see Table 1), feedback from program completers and alumni (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/alumsurvey/gradsurvey.doc http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/alumsurvey/3yrsummary.doc),

scores on the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/evals_summary.xls)

and the state *Pedagogy Assessment* (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/state_ped_summary.xls) as well as principals' on-going interest in our graduates and willingness to work directly with the program in mock interviews, on-campus job fairs, and information panels strongly suggest that the

content, structure, and staffing of the program are educationally sound and effective in preparing our candidates to be teachers who can take their places as leaders in inclusive, culturally relevant education and who have a positive impact on student learning.

Standard II A (1a): A comprehensive set of learner expectations for each preparation program. Learner expectations reflect professional, state, and institutional standards.

As documented at http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29, the Master in Teaching program clearly states its expectations for program participants on its website, in its catalog, in the *Master in Teaching Program Guidebook to Policies, Procedures, and Resources*, in the *Student Teaching Handboo*k, and on cohort websites. From criteria for admission to the program, to criteria for benchmark portfolios and projects, to expectations for the master's project, to clear explanations about the program's Conceptual Framework and the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a performance-based teacher education program, candidates have ready access to expectations. In addition, these expectations reflect the Conceptual Framework and state standards (please see Tables 2A-2C). Candidates are regularly asked to demonstrate that they have developed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions articulated in the expectations. For ways in which candidate performance is assessed, please see http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29

ALIGNMENT OF LEARNER EXPECTATIONS WITH CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND STATE STANDARDS

TABLE 2A

LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT PROGRAM CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK (See page 56)	STATE STANDARDS WAC 181-78A-270	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
To remain in good academic standing, to receive the master's degree, and to be recommended for Residency Certification, a candidate must demonstrate: • ability to earn full credit every quarter • graduate-level critical and analytical thinking skills • mastery of program knowledge and skill requirements as well as endorsement competencies • ability to work with and respect diversity in all its forms • interpersonal verbal and written communication skills necessary for K-12 teaching and for interacting effectively with professional colleagues, and students' families and communities	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) – (k) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (v) Element C: Professional Development (w) – (y)	• WEST B and WEST E Scores • Transcripts and endorsement worksheets • Integration papers • Lesson and unit plans • Program assignments • Ethnic Autobiographies and cultural encapsulation papers • Advancement to Candidacy, Advancement to Student Teaching, Presentation, and Professional Portfolios • MIT Student Teaching Rubric and Pedagogy Assessment • EALR Projects • Elements of Effective Teaching Survey • Master's papers
To advance to candidacy*, candidates must: • demonstrate the competencies and knowledge necessary to successfully complete *graduate level work* • submit assessment of ability to help students achieve learning goals specified in the State of Washington EALRs	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element C: Professional Development (w) & (y) Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) & (b)	▪ Advancement to Candidacy Portfolio • Integration papers • Seminar participation • Field journal reflections • Cooperative group work • Peer feedback on group work participation • Lesson plans • EALR self-assessment and plan

*Advancement to Candidacy Portfolios and interviews are used at the end of fall quarter or the beginning of winter quarter in Year 1 to assess candidates' skills in graduate-level critical reasoning, writing, and reading; to determine their potential to successfully complete graduate-level work; and to identify areas they need to

strengthen in order to have a positive impact on student learning.

TABLE 2B

LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT PROGRAM CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STATE STANDARDS WAC 181-78A-270	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
To advance to the first student teaching quarter, candidates must demonstrate their: • ability to plan effective, developmentally, and culturally appropriate learning experiences that reflect the appropriate EALRs, • understanding of cultural encapsulation and the efforts and strategies they employ to monitor their own cultural filters • understanding of themselves as a person, including appropriate clarity of personal identities, values, moral commitments, and awareness of personal needs being fulfilled through teaching, • successful completion of all endorsement work • progress on the master's paper • evidence of current fingerprints and clearance by WA Office of Professional Practices and FBI	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) – (k) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (v) Element C: Professional Development (w) – (y)	• Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio • Lesson plans & curriculum development unit aligned with EALRs, GLEs, and/or Frameworks • Various program assignments • Cultural encapsulation paper • Draft of teaching philosophy and classroom management plan • Seminar integration papers • Completed endorsement worksheets & official transcripts • Completed master's paper or substantial draft • Fingerprint and clearance verifications
To advance to 2nd quarter of student teaching, candidates must demonstrate: • positive impact on student learning • ability to meet all criteria on the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric* and the state *Pedagogy Assessment* • identification of areas for development in teaching and professional work and plan of action • successful completion and presentation of the master's paper	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) – (k) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (v) Element C (w) – (y)	• Presentation Portfolio • MIT Student Teaching Rubric • Pedagogy Assessment • Cultural Encapsulation paper • EALR Project (positive impact on student learning) • Lesson plans with reflections • Revised teaching philosophy and classroom management plan • Professional Growth Plan • Completed master's paper and presentation

TABLE 2C

LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT PROGRAM CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STATE STANDARDS WAC 181-78A-270	SOURCES OF EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
To be recommended for Residency Certification, candidates must: • meet or exceed standards in the MIT Student Teaching Rubric and the Pedagogy Assessment • demonstrate a positive impact on student learning • successfully complete and present the master's paper • demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions.	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) – (k) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (v) Element C (w) – (y)	• Professional Portfolio • MIT Student Teaching Rubric • Pedagogy Assessment • Revised cultural Encapsulation paper • 2nd EALR Project (positive impact on student learning) • Completed master's paper and presentation

Standard II B (b, c): The Assessment System: (b) The unit has an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework(s) and state standards and collects and analyzes data on qualification, candidate and graduate performances, unit operations, and program quality. (c) Explicit connections between professional, state and institutional standards and candidate assessments.

The MIT program, like Evergreen in general (http://www.evergreen.edu/institutionalresearch/assessmentreports.htm), values on-going, substantive assessment that supports the work of candidates and faculty and that helps faculty shape effective learning experiences. Because MIT is modeled on the larger, nationally recognized undergraduate interdisciplinary, team-taught, cohort model, some of the most significant assessment occurs on a day-to-day basis and is verbal or narrative in form. Faculty and candidates compose narrative, written assessments at the end of each quarter to evaluate the quality of the candidate's work, and of the faculty member's work. Evaluations are shared and discussed in one-on-one meetings.

The majority of MIT cohorts consist of three full-time faculty members and 45 candidates. These people stay together for two years. The same faculty who teach history and foundations of education, content area pedagogies, culturally relevant teaching and learning, lesson planning, research methods, etc., are the people who read the candidates' masters papers and who supervise them in their student teaching placements. Faculty become very familiar with the strengths and needs of the candidates through:

- observing and engaging with candidates as they work in small groups

- reading and responding to weekly seminar papers and guided field journals
- working closely with candidates on lesson and unit planning
- reading and responding to papers about candidates' cultural encapsulation, understandings about the nature of learning, their identities as teachers, and emerging understandings about what it means to be a culturally responsive teacher
- reading and responding to multiple drafts of the master's paper or conference paper

These same faculty read, respond to, and meet one-on-one with candidates about their portfolios (major forms of assessment in the program), curriculum unit projects, and assessments during student teaching. Thus, faculty in MIT have a unique opportunity to observe and re-structure their teaching BECAUSE they see how the lessons of the first year are applied in public school classrooms. They also have a unique opportunity to help each other improve as educators because they are almost always observed by their team-mates while teaching and because teams meet weekly to plan and de-brief.

Further, one of the major foci of the program is the development of a community of learners in which candidates frequently collaborate in group projects and provide each other feedback. Candidates also provide regular, on-going feedback to each other about their written papers.

The Director, Associate Director, and the Field Placement Officer collect, aggregate, and report data from graduating candidates, alumni, mentor teachers, principals, the WEST B and E, the EBI surveys, the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey*, the state *Pedagogy Assessment* and MIT's *Student Teaching Rubric*. Faculty and the PEAB receive updates regarding aggregated information from these assessments and information from these sources is used to inform program decisions. Please see Standard I for links to PEAB documentation. Information about the impact of data on program decisions is discussed later in this report. For the past two years, the college has supported a summer institute for MIT faculty in which they examined assessment data, discussed curriculum issues, shared successes and challenges, and utilized assessment data to affirm or modify program content or structures.

We have a written assessment plan that specifies program-wide admission assessments; checkpoint assessments within the two years; and exit assessments. Further, we have centrally located in electronic form a range of assessments used within the cohorts so that faculty members on all teams have easy access to their colleagues' work (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29). Last year we were able to arrange for MIT faculty and staff meetings to be acknowledged as part of the governance assignments required of faculty. At these meetings and through emails, faculty have been reviewing assessment data and making program improvements based on this information.

As already stated, the MIT program administrators do collect and assess quantitative data. We rely on the state to ascertain the reliability and validity of the WEST B and E, EBI, and the *Pedagogy Assessment*. The MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* was derived, with her permission, from Charlotte Danielson's work on effective teaching (*Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching,* 1996; *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*, 2000). We are in the process of revising the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey* after determining that the Likert scale descriptors inadequately captured the 3rd and 4th points on the scale. We will also change some of the content of the survey as soon as the new Standard V is in WAC. When we revise the instrument to reflect the changes in Standard V, the MIT Director will ask the college's Institutional Research Office to assess the reliability of the survey; construct and content validity are assured by the close alignment of questions to Standard V content.

The narrative assessments we use are better evaluated using criteria established for qualitative

research under the general umbrella of *trustworthiness* (Isaac, S. & Michael, W., 1995, *Handbook in Research and Evaluation, Third Edition, pp. 218-224).* Faculty evaluate *transferability* and *dependability* by comparing their evaluations of portfolio evidence, master's papers, integration papers, and unit and lesson plans with other faculty. Through this process, faculty fine-tune their collective understanding of how to ensure that feedback is addressing key indicators of success and that there is consistency across evaluators. Another hallmark of qualitative research is *member checking*. Member checking allows the researcher, or evaluator, to test her/his conclusions against the perceptions of the person or group under scrutiny. MIT faculty accomplish this member checking through the quarterly evaluation conferences each holds with candidates and also through providing opportunities for the cohort as a whole to hear and respond to emerging assessments about the *program*. Issues of fairness and bias are addressed and controlled for by regular discussions with cohort participants in which faculty solicit their feedback and through regular conversations with colleagues to check perceptions and to examine accuracy of evaluations.

The tables that follow outline:
1) the relationship of the assessments to learner expectations, our Conceptual Framework, and state standards, and,
2) the schedule of assessments and their uses.

To access the chart that provides links to actual assessments and to data, please see
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29

ALIGNMENT OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS WITH LEARNER EXPECTATIONS, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND STATE STANDARDS

TABLE 3A

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
WEST B and WEST E ***Two application essays*** ***Endorsement worksheets and transcripts of all college work*** For **entry** into the program, candidates must pass all relevant tests and submit two essays, endorsement worksheets, and transcripts of all college work which are evaluated. Candidates whose test scores are below the state average, whose essays are weak, or who have not completed all expected endorsement coursework are often admitted conditionally until their program work demonstrates: • graduate level critical and analytical thinking and writing skills • ability to assist students in working toward EALRs, GLEs, and Frameworks • satisfactory completion of endorsement coursework	Demonstrate: • graduate-level critical and analytical thinking skills • interpersonal verbal and written communication skills necessary for K-12 teaching and for interacting effectively with professional colleagues, and students' families and communities • depth and breadth in endorsement area(s)	Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (b) Element B: Effective Teaching (s) Element C: Professional Development (w)
Advancement to Candidacy Portfolio This portfolio, submitted at the end of the first quarter of the program, serves as a major gateway for continuation in the program.	Demonstrate: • competencies necessary to successfully complete *graduate level work* • ability to reflect on one's strengths and weaknesses and to propose plans for improvement • ability to help students achieve learning goals specified in the State of Washington EALRs • appropriate professional dispositions	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element C: Professional Development (w) & (y) Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a) & (b)

TABLE 3B

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio This portfolio, submitted in spring quarter of the first year of the program, determines admission to student teaching.	Demonstrate: • ability to plan effective, developmentally, and culturally appropriate learning experiences that reflect the appropriate EALRs, • understanding of cultural encapsulation and the efforts and strategies they employ to monitor their own cultural filters • understanding of themselves as a person, including appropriate clarity of personal identities, values, moral commitments, and awareness of personal needs being fulfilled through teaching, • progress on the master's paper	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, c, f) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (s) Element C: Professional Development (w) – (y)
EALR Project (Positive Impact on Student Learning) Included in Presentation and Professional Portfolios. This project contributes to determinations about continuance in the program and recommendation for Residency Certification.	Demonstrate: • a positive impact on student learning and student development toward mastery of Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), or Frameworks • ability to assess student data and use the data to make decisions about learning experiences • ability to assess and reflect on teaching choices and areas of needed improvement.	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, e, f, h) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (s) Element C: Professional Development (w)

TABLE 3C

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
Inter-disciplinary Curriculum Development Project Included in Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio spring quarter of Year 1. Used in determination about admittance to student teaching.	Ability: • to plan effective, developmentally, and culturally appropriate learning experiences that reflect the appropriate EALRs • to create integrative, interdisciplinary, conceptually based unit, built around a guiding question that promotes equity, embraces diversity, develops critical and creative thinking, and leaves no child behind. Unit must represent best practices as discussed in Zemelman et al. and as represented in the Washington State Pedagogy Assessment and WAC 181-78A-220	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, e) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (s) Element C: Professional Development (w – y)
Presentation Portfolio Submitted at end of Fall Quarter Student Teaching. Includes EALR project***, MIT Student Teaching Rubric*** and ***Pedagogy Assessment***. Determines continuation in program. ***Professional Portfolio*** Submitted at end of Spring Quarter Student Teaching. Includes ***EALR project, MIT Student Teaching Rubric and Pedagogy Assessment.*** Determines whether candidate is recommended for Residency Certification.	Demonstrate: • a positive impact on student learning • ability to meet all criteria on the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* & *Pedagogy Assessment* • ability to reflect on strengths and needs and plan for improvement • ability to create Professional Growth Plan • ability to state one's beliefs about teaching and learning • ability to craft and support a classroom management plan • ability to identify and manage cultural encapsulation and biases	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, f, h, k) Element B: Effective Teaching (l) – (s) Element C: Professional Development (w) – (y)

TABLE 3D

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
Integrative seminar papers Submitted in Fall and Winter quarters of Year 1. Used in decisions about continuation in program.	Demonstrate: • graduate-level critical and analytical thinking skills • written communication skills necessary for K-12 teaching and for interacting effectively with professional colleagues, and students' families and communities • knowledge of social and historical foundations of education • an understanding of theories of learning and relationships to teaching and schooling in the U.S.	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (c, d, e, f) Element B: Effective Teaching (l & m) Element C: Professional Development (w)
Master's Paper Used in decisions about continuation in program and recommendation for Residency Certification	Demonstrate: • graduate-level critical and analytical thinking skills • understanding of relationship of historical foundations of public education and contemporary practices as well as effects of systemic bias on the educational opportunities of traditionally marginalized children and youth • knowledge of subject matter and pedagogical approaches • knowledge of research based principles and practices for effective teaching for all people's children • inquiry and research skills	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (b, c, d, f, g) Element B: Effective Teaching (l, m, o, p, r, s) Element C: Professional Development (w)

TABLE 3E

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	LEARNER EXPECTATIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
Dispositions Survey Used in first and second quarters of Year 1. Contributes to decisions about continuation in the program (Based on NCATE statement, June 6, 2006)	Demonstrate: • professional habits necessary for effective teaching: empathy, timeliness, participation, pursuit of knowledge, and completion of quality work • valuing effective communication through using clear and effective oral and written language, effective listening skills, and language appropriate for the particular context • a commitment to teaching all people's children • meaningful purposes for creating effective learning interactions with children and youth • the value of working both independently and collaboratively to learn new ideas and to solve problems.	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (h, i) Element B: Effective Teaching (l - s) Element C: Professional Development (w, y)
Elements of Effective Teaching Survey Administered after fall and spring student teaching Used to help shape content of winter quarter of Year 2 and to consider changes to over-all program foci.	• demonstrate ability to assess one's own preparation to teach and ability to apply knowledge and skills in the classroom	Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, d, j) Element B: Effective Teaching (l - s)

TABLE 3F

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	TO INFORM AND REFINE LEARNER EXPECTATIONS AND PROGRAM DECISIONS	MIT CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	STANDARD V WAC 181-78A-270
Alumni Surveys – MIT and EBI Administered after program completion (MIT), after one year of teaching (EBI), and after three years of teaching (MIT) ***Principal and Mentor Teacher Surveys*** Mentor Teacher surveys administered after each student teaching quarter (MIT). Principal surveys administered after one year (EBI) ***PEAB Surveys - MIT*** Administered yearly starting in 2007 All surveys used to help assess program strengths and weaknesses and to guide program content and structure	• For MIT candidates, to assess their own preparation to teach and ability to apply knowledge and skills in the classroom and to • For MIT alumni, PEAB members, mentor teachers, and principals to contribute to on-going development of the MIT program	Democracy and Schooling Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning	Element A: Foundational Knowledge (a, b, c) Element B: Effective Teaching (l - s) Element C: Professional Development (w-y)

MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE
TABLE 4A

SCHEDULE	MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	USE OF INFORMATION Purpose and Audience
Winter and Spring Annually	**WEST B and WEST E** **Two application essays** **Endorsement worksheets and transcripts of all college work**	To determine admission to the program Information used by Admissions Committee WEST B and E scores shared with PEAB
June Annually	**MIT Alumni Survey**	To assess strengths and needs of program To determine possible changes to program content and structure Information used by MIT faculty and staff Major concerns shared with PEAB
June Annually for alumni who have been teaching for three years	**MIT 3-Year Alumni Survey**	To assess strengths and needs of program To determine possible changes to program content and structure Information used by MIT faculty and staff Major concerns shared with PEAB
December and June Annually	**MIT Mentor Teacher Survey**	To assess strengths and needs of program To determine possible changes to program content and structure Information used by MIT faculty and staff Major concerns shared with PEAB
Annually	**EBI First Year Teacher and Principal Surveys**	Contributes to assessment of program effectiveness Information shared with MIT faculty and staff and with PEAB
Field-tested in 2006/07 Implementing in Fall, 2007	**MIT Dispositions Survey** To be administered in Fall and Winter Quarters of Year 1 for each cohort	Candidates use information to self-assess and make plans for improvement MIT faculty use information to advise and counsel students and to make decisions about continuation in program

TABLE 4B

SCHEDULE	MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	USE OF INFORMATION Purpose and Audience
Submitted and assessed at the end of fall quarter of Year 1 for each cohort	**Advancement to Candidacy Portfolio**	Candidates use to self-assess and make plans for improvement MIT faculty assess content and use to make decisions about program continuance for each candidate
Submitted in Fall and Winter quarters of Year 1	**Integrative seminar papers**	MIT faculty assess to determine writing and critical thinking skills and knowledge of program content related to theories of learning, developmentally appropriate teaching, democracy and schooling, and diversity. Used in decisions about continuation in program.
Submitted and assessed during spring quarter of Year 1 for each cohort	**Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio**	Candidates use to self-assess and make plans for improvement MIT faculty assess content and use to make decisions about whether or not the candidate will be advanced to the first quarter of student teaching
Submitted during spring quarter of Year 1 for each cohort	**Inter-disciplinary Curriculum Development Project** Included in Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio	Candidates self-assess and make plans for improvement of knowledge and skills MIT faculty assess and use to help make decisions about admission to student teaching
Submitted and assessed at the end of fall and spring quarters of Year 2 for each cohort	**EALR Project (Positive Impact on Student Learning)** Included in Presentation and Professional Portfolios	MIT faculty use this project to help determine continuance in the program and recommendation for Residency Certification Exemplar projects kept on file for accreditation and shared with PEAB

TABLE 4C

SCHEDULE	MAJOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	USE OF INFORMATION Purpose and Audience
Administered after fall and spring student teaching quarters for each cohort (Begun in fall 2006)	**Elements of Effective Teaching Survey**	Used to help shape content of winter quarter of Year 2 and to consider changes to over-all program foci *Note: Likert Scale descriptors to be changed Fall 2007 because of uneven intervals. Content will be changed when new Standard V is in WAC.
Submitted at end of Fall Quarter Student Teaching for each cohort	**Presentation Portfolio** Includes EALR project, ***MIT Student Teaching Rubric*** and **Pedagogy Assessment.** Determines continuation in program	MIT faculty assess and use to make decisions about continuation in program EALR projects are shared with PEAB
Submitted no later than the end of winter quarter of Year 2 of the program for each cohort	**Master's Paper**	MIT faculty evaluate and use in decisions about continuation in program and recommendation for Residency Certification PEAB members attend formal presentations of papers
Submitted at end of Spring Quarter Student Teaching for each cohort	**Professional Portfolio** Includes EALR project, ***MIT Student Teaching Rubric*** and ***Pedagogy Assessment***	MIT faculty assess and use to decide on recommendations for Residency Certification
Administered yearly starting in 2007	**PEAB Survey**	Used to help assess program strengths and weaknesses and to guide program content and structure Information shared with MIT faculty and staff and with PEAB

Standard IIC (2): Use of Data for Program Improvement: During the first year following program completion, the unit solicits feedback from program completers employed in education, and their supervisors, regarding the program's effectiveness.

Please see http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/datatochange.doc for data sources and their impact as well as the relationship of changes to the MIT Conceptual Framework and to WAC 181-78A-270.

As the tables in Standard IIB indicate, assessment data is collected throughout the MIT program and is shared with faculty, candidates, and the PEAB. This data includes maintaining and utilizing information from program completers. *In the past five years, four categories of program content or procedures have been affected by assessment information.*

1. **Program Application Review Form:** The committee members who review applications for admission to the program use a common review form to assist in a consistent and equitable examination of candidate qualifications. The admissions committee members, composed of the Director, Associate Director, and MIT faculty, read each application with the intention to select applicants who are qualified to complete graduate-level work, who are interested in MIT's conceptual framework, who have experiences with diverse populations, who are well prepared in their endorsement areas, and who have a commitment to help all children and youth learn. However, the review form has evolved over the years as program and state expectations have changed (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29)

   Faculty evaluations of the MIT program based on candidate performance and feedback from candidates strongly indicated that solid professional dispositions such as timeliness, an inclination toward inquiry, breadth and depth in undergraduate studies, inclusive approaches to diversity, and above average writing and reading skills were essential to candidate success. In winter of 2007, after a formal review of candidates who left or were asked to leave the program in the previous five years, the most recent application review form was adjusted to allow committee members to flag and discuss particular strengths and particular areas of concern in candidates' files. Based on information about the newly admitted candidates from this review, the first year faculty team for 2007 decided to create specific learning opportunities within the program to help candidates develop stronger skills in writing thesis-based papers, and to provide more extensive advising support for candidates whose first language is not English. The content of the review form will be re-evaluated in winter of 2008, taking into account the performance of candidates in the 2007-09 cohort.

2. **Master's Paper:** Alumni surveys, candidate feedback, and faculty member's discussions raised questions about the content, structure, and timing of the master's paper. What faculty and candidates have come to call the "long form" of the master's paper has been in place since the early 1990s. Clear expectations for the content are provided to candidates and rubrics are used to provide formative and summative assessments. In addition, applicants are advised of time commitments in the MIT catalog. Three years ago one faculty member requested and received support from the MIT core faculty to try out a conference paper version of the master's paper, which also provided clear expectations for candidates. To see rubrics and expectations for both forms of the paper, please Standard II Criteria A (1a) under Masters Paper/Conference Paper at http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#Masters_Paper.2FConference_Paper

The faculty member was concerned that the "long form" was unfair in its expectations that candidates work on it over the summer, that the faculty workload was too heavy, and that the "long form" did not represent the type of writing that teachers might become involved in during their professional lives. The faculty and candidates involved were pleased with the pilot, but other faculty concluded that they preferred the "long form" because they felt it required candidates to delve more deeply and more objectively into a particular question. Candidates have since questioned the practice of requiring different types of papers for different cohorts and of expecting them to work on the "long form" papers over the summer. The PEAB was consulted and concluded that both forms helped candidates develop crucial skills related to accessing and evaluating education research. Since 2004, two cohorts have used the conference paper form, one used the long form, and the up-coming faculty team is working on a modified long-form. Survey data and verbal information are inconclusive regarding which form should be used. Alumni advocates for each form make clear statements about the value of the particular form they completed and reveal (mis)perceptions about the form they didn't write. Faculty members are continuing to explore formats that serve to develop thoughtful, critical, and active consumers of educational research, while taking into account candidates' time and energy, faculty workload, and other program content.

3. **Pedagogies and Teaching Strategies in Math, Literacy, Special Education, and ESL:** Program content in MIT is developed based on Evergreen's approach to inter-disciplinary, integrated curriculum. All cohorts in the last five years have provided opportunities for candidates to develop a deep understanding of learning, of the diverse students in the K-12 public school system, and of the inter-relationships of learning, teaching, and schooling. Subject-specific content has, historically, been approached in a variety of ways from full integration into an inter-disciplinary theme to providing subject-specific strands, called grade bands, that address particular content area pedagogies. Alumni surveys from 2003-2006 and data from the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey* in fall of 2006 suggested that subject-specific pedagogies and differentiated teaching strategies needed more attention in some cohorts. Since 2003, faculty have ensured that research-based teaching strategies for literacy instruction, special education, and English as a Second Language (K-12) were systematically included. EBI data gathered from alumni and principals show a steady growth in satisfaction with first-year teachers' knowledge and skills in all areas (see reports in Evidence Room). In fact, all EBI scores in the last two years fell in the "good" or "excellent" categories. Please see Standard V, Element B: Effective Teaching beginning on page 78 of this report for a thorough discussion of data related to candidate preparation in these areas. The MIT program is in the process of hiring an additional literacy educator to enhance our abilities to prepare teachers who are skilled in helping students develop their reading. Our ability to systematically address math pedagogies was strengthened by hiring an additional, outstanding math educator in 2005. The Director will request new hires from the college in ESL and math education. She is also seeking, as did the previous director, to ensure that math and literacy educators are part of every MIT faculty team or that resources are available to hire public school teachers as adjunct faculty in these areas.

4. **Involvement of Students' Families and Communities:** Fundamental to all MIT cohorts is the understanding that children and youth are inextricably shaped by, and connected to, their families and communities. Candidates read and discuss texts by people such as Banks, Dewey, Piaget, Tatum, Vygotsky, Rogoff, Delpit, and Cohen. Working with diverse students and teachers in a variety of field and intern placements provides candidates with opportunities to apply, test, and contextualize their theoretical understandings. The *MIT Student Teaching Rubric* and the *Pedagogy Assessment* clearly indicate that candidates are expected to involve families and communities in learning opportunities for students. Some of our candidates have

been fortunate to be student teachers in schools or classrooms that value and engage families and communities. For many others, this opportunity was not available in the schools where they taught. Data from the *Elements of Effective Teaching* survey and some alumni surveys indicated that candidates either feel they have the knowledge but not the opportunities, or that they need more concrete strategies for including parents and communities OR more insight into how to effect changes in schools that discourage this involvement. The 2005-07 and 2006-08 faculty teams included specific workshops to help candidates understand more about involving families and communities. The 2007-09 cohort will continue this practice and also plans to implement a strand on the dynamics of systems, such as public schools, and strategies through which individuals can effect changes. Despite candidates' and alumni perceptions, EBI reports for 2006 and 2007 indicated that principals' and alumni ratings for involvement of parents fell in the "good" or "excellent" categories.

Standard II C (3): Use of Data for Program Improvement: Maintain placement records for all program completers during the first year following program completion. MIT's Associate Director maintains extensive records on program completers. Aggregated data is shared annually with the PEAB.

Standard II D (4) & (5): Positive Impact on Student Learning: (4) Candidates and program faculty understand the meaning of the term "positive impact on student learning" and know how to document when positive impact on student learning has occurred. (5) Collect and maintain exemplar candidate work samples that document a positive impact on student learning.

(4) & (5) Both faculty and students understand the definitions of positive impact on student learning and how to assess when student learning has occurred. The MIT Director and Associate Director collect and maintain exemplar projects of candidates' positive impact on student learning, in which candidates must explicitly address how they know the degree to which positive impact has occurred. These projects may be seen in the Evidence Room. EBI analyses in the 2006 and 2007 reports indicated that both principals and alumni rated alumni's abilities to "use reflective analysis to assess 'positive impact on student learning'" in the high or extremely high categories.

During two student teaching experiences (fall and spring quarters of the second year of the program), all MIT candidates develop and implement what is called the EALR project. In a sense, this is a small classroom-based, action research project. With the advice of their mentor teachers, candidates select three to five students to follow during the implementation of a curriculum unit. Candidates identify key concepts, knowledge, and skills to be addressed; align those with EALRs, GLEs, and/or Frameworks; pre-assess student knowledge and conceptions; use that information to inform instruction; and then teach and employ formative and summative assessments. Using data from the students identified, the candidates assess the effectiveness of the unit for each student, and use the data to draw conclusions, suggest next steps, and reflect on her/his impact on student learning. Beginning in Fall 2007, MIT candidates will provide evidence of student behaviors (Descriptions of Practice) articulated by OSPI that demonstrate that students had been positively impacted by the teacher's instruction and assessment. Current and future cohorts will be asked to ensure that their students can articulate the learning goals, steps toward the goal and resources available, and the perceived value of what was to be learned.

The MIT program has always had at its center the children and youth with whom our candidates work and will work in the future. In fact, it is accurate to say that the MIT program has been requiring its candidates to demonstrate a positive impact on student learning since its approval in1992. From the first quarter of the program through the last, all texts, workshops, projects, writing and field

assignments, and reflections on teaching and learning continuously pose our candidates with the challenge of determining how to help diverse students learn in the context of public schools, how to determine *how* they know when student learning occurs, and how they know what students learned. Faculty regularly confront candidates with the requirement that they make decisions about what to teach next based on information about the students' current knowledge, perceptions, and misperceptions. Further, the processes and content of all MIT cohorts draw from research that strongly suggests that learning is stabilized when the learner (student, candidate, citizen) poses questions, takes an active role in learning, and can articulate to another what she/he has learned and why it matters. Long ago, Plato (trans. 1986) talked about the need for "tying down" knowledge and Dewey (1938) went to great lengths to articulate the qualities of educative vs. mis-educative learning experiences. More recently Walsh (2004) has written extensively about research on the value of student questioning and Zull (2002) has provided a brain-based explanation for the essential requirement that the learner be actively involved in learning experiences. Our candidates read, discuss, and apply concepts and information from these sources to their work with students.

Based on our evaluation of the data supplied in this report, on the MIT Accreditation web page, and in the Evidence Room, the program has successfully implemented all criteria related to Accountability.

STANDARD III

UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

Standard III A (1) & (2) Unit Leadership and Authority: (1) A separate administrative unit whose composition and organization are clearly described in writing support the preparation program. (2) An officially designated administrator is responsible for the management of operations and resources for the preparation program.

(1) Page two of the *Master in Teaching Program Guidebook to Policies, Procedures, and Resources* provides a clear representation of the organization of the unit and its relationships to the Academic Deans and Provost at The Evergreen State College and to the Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB), the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook2007.htm#StandardIII).

(2) The MIT Director (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_A%282%29, in collaboration with faculty, the certification officer, and the field placement officer, has the authority to oversee the management of the MIT program and its resources to ensure that it represents the core values of The Evergreen State College, the conceptual framework of the program itself, and state and professional standards.

Evaluations of candidates on the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/evals_summary.xls)

and the *Pedagogy Assessment* (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/state_ped_summary.xls) as well as the percentage of candidates who secure teaching positions (see Table 1 of this report) and persist in teaching attest to the unit's ability to create and manage programs that prepare candidates to meet expected standards. As explained later in this report under Standard V, responses on surveys reveal that ninety percent of new completers intend to teach; after three to five years, 91% of respondents to an alumni survey were still involved in teaching. The University of Washington's retention and mobility study indicated that approximately 80% of MIT graduates from 2001 are still teaching. On MIT surveys, 90% of new completers and 98% of the experienced alumni agreed that the program helped prepare them to be effective teachers. The 2007 EBI principal survey reported that 75% of respondents indicated that MIT alumni were exceptionally or excellently well-prepared to take on teaching responsibilities and another 25% indicated that the alumni were well prepared.

Standard III (B - D): Qualified Faculty and Modeling Best Practices in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service: 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. The MIT program faculty are highly qualified and dedicated educators who model best practices in self-assessment, teaching, scholarship, and service. Support for this assertion is most clearly obvious in the evaluations candidates write of their faculty and in the evaluations faculty write for each other. These evaluations can be seen in faculty portfolios in the Evidence Room. Information in the following summaries can be verified by perusing the links provided at the end of each section of commentary.

Qualified: All of the core faculty hold terminal degrees and all have been teachers in K-12 schools. All of the liberal arts faculty who have taught in the academic portion of the program in the last five years also hold terminal degrees. Visiting educators hired to teach in the program

and/or to supervise student teachers have earned at least the masters degree and are often practicing or recently retired public school teachers or administrators.
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_B%283%29

Best Practices in Teaching and Self-Assessment: The Evergreen State College is, first and foremost, an institution that is about teaching and learning. Educators come to Evergreen because they know that supporting learning is what the college is about. MIT faculty, like the liberal arts faculty, are dedicated to creating learning experiences that reflect what Evergreen's first president, Charles McCann, envisioned when he said:

> We hoped to outline an environment which stimulates the learning process, encourages the student to come to grips with his mind and ideas at the beginning of his undergraduate [graduate] years, expects him to know not only the facts but how they are found, how to deal with them and how to articulate them. . . . We assumed that the most valuable service a college can offer a student is to initiate a process of continuing learning: by preparing him with the methods of learning and experimentation, by encouraging independence in pursuing inquiries that interest and motivate him, by providing him with resources to test his knowledge and ability (Archives, The Evergreen State College).

The MIT faculty are skilled at creating learning experiences that support candidates in aspiring to McCann's vision. An essential aspect of those learning experiences is the process of self-evaluation – all faculty and candidates regularly review, assess, and critique their work. For evidence to support the above, please see faculty portfolios in the Evidence Room that contain faculty self-evaluations, evaluations from colleagues, and evaluations from candidates. Also please access faculty summaries about their teaching at
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_C%283%29.
Finally, please see faculty syllabi at http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/programWebSites.htm

Best Practices in Scholarship and Service: Though Evergreen does not require faculty to publish in order to gain tenure, all of the six core MIT faculty have presented at national, state, or local conferences and have published books, software, and/or articles in scholarly journals. Three of the core faculty (Coleman, Lenges, Vavrus) are currently involved in significant research projects in their areas of interest. All of the core and liberal arts faculty, and the two current visiting faculty, participate in substantial service to the college, to public schools, and to the larger community. For example, MIT core faculty members have served as Chair for the Faculty Agenda Committee (analogous to a faculty senate); Planning Unit Coordinator for all social sciences programs in the undergraduate and graduate colleges; Convener for the Scientific Inquiry faculty; member of college-wide committee on diversity; co-chair of the committee on the first-year student experience; chairs of search committees; interim director for Academic Advising and Access Services; and readers for Human Subject Review proposals. For a full list of faculty scholarship and service to the college, please see (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_D%283%29).

Examples of how core and visiting faculty have served public schools and the community include, but are not limited to, participating in WEA and the ACLU; mentoring a high school teacher; collaborating to provide support to middle school students who did not pass the math WASL; acting as the project evaluator for a project that assessed the effectiveness of a district-wide science project; meeting with school board members and offering study sessions; teaching math in UpWard Bound; helping to organize and support a group of teachers interested in teaching for social justice; assessing the reading abilities of middle school students and providing extensive written assessments and suggestions for interventions; offering math workshops in various districts; and participating as the college partner with a local elementary school in the League of Small Democratic Schools. Please access the following link for an extensive list of faculty engagement with P-12 educators and schools,

as well as the larger community.
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_I%2812%29

Because MIT's conceptual framework has the well-being of ALL students at the center of its focus, faculty members have as a priority to remain abreast of, implement, and model for candidates, best practices in pedagogy, collaboration, critical thinking, reflection, self-assessment and on-going professional development. Team meeting notes, faculty members' yearly self-assessments, five year portfolios, and candidates' written evaluations of faculty reveal ways in which faculty use best practices to support candidate learning, faculty strengths, and areas faculty strive to improve. And this is an essential point – MIT faculty do not claim perfection but various assessments clearly indicate that the faculty do engage in serious, on-going efforts to create effective learning experiences for candidates that reflect best practices.

Standard III (E - G): Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty, Candidates, and P-12 Students: The institution has and implements an explicit plan to ensure that candidates interact with higher education faculty, school faculty, other candidates and P-12 students representing diverse populations.

Higher Education Faculty and Other Candidates: The Evergreen State College is "committed to equal opportunity and diversity as principles necessary for a just society and a quality education. An important goal of the College is to create a learning and working environment that is inclusive, hospitable to, and reflective of our diverse society - an environment that nurtures respect for cultural diversity and encourages excellence" (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/g-aa.htm on 8/11/07). When faculty positions, including those for MIT faculty, are advertised, each contains the following statement, "**Commitment to equity**: The Evergreen State College particularly encourages applications from candidates whose race, national origin, sex, age, religion, marital status, sexual orientation, veteran status or physical disability has caused them to be under-represented in hiring" (Retrieved from http://www.evergreen.edu/facultyhiring/hiringprocess.htm on 8/11/07). In addition, applicants are required to submit an essay in which they describe how their teaching was changed by an experience with diverse cultural groups.

Evergreen as an institution, and MIT as a program, are committed to increasing the representation of diverse people in the faculty and staff and the enrollment of students from diverse groups. Avenues through which Evergreen enacts its commitment to diversity and equity include hiring policies, the Social Contract that governs all members of Evergreen's community (http://www.evergreen.edu/about/social.htm), written procedures for reporting and addressing harassment, (http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/g-sexhar.htm), maintaining a campus in Tacoma, supporting a reservation-based program, and offering an MPA tribal program. Further, Evergreen, and the MIT program, continue to seek to understand the systems through which racism, homophobia, classism, sexism, ageism, and able-ism are maintained. The college supports on-going initiatives to recruit diverse peoples, to affirm the contribution of diversities to the learning community, and to identify and seek to ameliorate systemic and individual patterns of bias and oppression (http://www.evergreen.edu/institutionalresearch/diversityreports.htm; http://www.evergreen.edu/equalop/docs/presidentreport.pdf).

Table 5 indicates the racial and ethnic, gender, and degree distribution of Evergreen and MIT faculty and staff. Table 6 provides information about the distribution of students who attend Evergreen and of candidates in the MIT program.

TABLE 5

DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE (TESC) AND MASTER IN TEACHING (MIT) FACULTY

The Evergreen State College (TESC) 2006		**The Master in Teaching Program (MIT) 2002-2007**	
Number of instructional faculty	232	Number of instructional faculty *	20
Number and percent full-time TESC faculty	158 68.1%	Number of MIT Core faculty	8
		Number of full-time liberal arts faculty on rotation to MIT	4
		Number of full time MIT visiting faculty	2
Number and percent part-time TESC faculty	74 31.9%	Number of liberal arts faculty on part-time rotation to MIT	3
		Number of visiting faculty (MIT)	3
Number and percent TESC faculty of color	56 24.1%	Number of MIT faculty of color or international faculty	5
Number and percent TESC female faculty	112 48.7%	Number of MIT female faculty	15
Number and percent TESC male faculty	119 51.3%	Number of MIT male faculty	5
TESC Ph.D. or other terminal degrees	72.8%	MIT Core faculty Ph.D.	100%
		Ph.D. (Liberal arts faculty on full-time rotation)	100%
		Ph.D. (Liberal arts faculty on part-time-time rotation)	66%
		Ph.D Visiting Faculty	60%

* The norm for each cohort is 3 full-time faculty during Year 1 and 3 full-time faculty and one visiting faculty in Year 2. The 2004-06 cohort had more faculty visitors than is usual for MIT.

TABLE 6

DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE (TESC) AND MASTER IN TEACHING (MIT) STUDENT BODY

The Evergreen State College (TESC) 2006 *		**The Master in Teaching Program (MIT) 2002-2006**	
Number of students	4416	Number of students	219
Number and percent TESC students of color	811 18%	Number and percent MIT students of color	30 13.7%
Number and percent TESC female students	2475 56%	Number and percent MIT female students	155 70.6%
Number and percent TESC male students	1941 44%	Number and percent MIT male students	64 29.4%

* Retrieved on 8/25/07 from http://www.evergreen.edu/institutionalresearch/factpage.htm

Diversity, of course, includes far more than ethnicity and gender. In the last five years, the MIT faculty teams have included two Japanese-American faculty, college educators from Argentina, India, and Israel, people who were the first in their families to attend college, tenured college faculty, new faculty, emeritus faculty, K-12 educators and administrators, liberal arts faculty, heterosexual and homosexual individuals, and individuals ranging in age from their early 40's to their mid-60's. The MIT program makes a concerted effort to ensure that candidates have experiences with faculty from a variety of backgrounds.

As regards the candidates in the program, the MIT web-site http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/home.htm#underrepresented and *Guidebook to Policies, Procedures, and Resources* http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/Guidebook2007.pdf) clearly indicate that the program seeks candidates from diverse backgrounds and that a central focus of the program is preparing teachers who can support the development of the diverse learners in the public schools of this country (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/program/themes.htm).

The Director, Associate Director, and Field Placement Officer pursued a number of avenues in 2006-07 to increase applications to the program from students of color. The Associate Director's new diversity outreach efforts included attending the First Peoples' Orientation, conducting an information session on MIT at Huxley College for students and advisors at Western Washington University, and conducting an information session for students and counselors at Northwest Indian College. The new MIT brochure was also sent to all education coordinators for the tribes in the state. In addition, she continued quarterly information sessions on Evergreen's Tacoma Campus. The program continues to offer two scholarships to applicants who are tribal members. In addition, one of the MIT core faculty members sponsors a diversity scholarship. While the numbers of applicants of color increased from fall 2006 to fall 2007 (from 5 to 9), the number of students of color enrolling in MIT did not increase (5 for fall 2006 to 4 for fall 2007). The number of applicants and enrolled students of color remains a significant concern for faculty and staff and we continue exploring ways to address this.

Diversity in the cohorts is similar to that of the faculty. Candidates from a wide range of geographic locations, socio-economic and language backgrounds, religions, ages, sexual orientation, and life experiences come together to create learning communities. In addition, MIT candidates have included people with learning disabilities, ADHD, and physical and health challenges. Within each cohort,

faculty members assume as a central responsibility the process of helping candidates articulate their own cultural and ethnic backgrounds and biases, become knowledgeable about cultural and ethnic similarities and differences, and develop ways to become culturally responsive educators. As one aspect of our Conceptual Framework (Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective) states:

> The (MIT) curriculum reflects Evergreen's strong commitment to diversity because we believe that both teaching and learning must draw from many perspectives and include a multiplicity of ideas. We believe in preserving and articulating differences of ethnicity, race, gender and sexual orientation rather than erasing or marginalizing them. We seek to expose MIT students to the consequences of their cultural encapsulation in an effort to assist future teachers in the acquisition of a critical consciousness. We believe that future teachers must be ready to provide children and youth with culturally responsive and equitable schooling opportunities (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/Guidebook2007.pdf).

A perusal of cohort websites (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/programWebSites.htm) and a list of texts commonly used in MIT cohorts will provide the reader with a good sense of the central role of diversity in the program (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/program/samplereadings.htm and pages 56 - 59 of this report).

P-12 School Faculty and Students: The MIT program has an explicit plan to ensure that our candidates interact with P-12 students and teachers representing diverse populations. In addition to on-campus work, each MIT teacher candidate spends time in rural, suburban, and urban practicum placements (at least 30 hours a quarter for three quarters) and has *two full-time* student teaching experiences (20 weeks). Practicum and student teaching assignments include, but are not limited to, attending IEP meetings if possible, surveying and identifying community's funds of knowledge, communicating with parents, differentiating instruction, and interviewing P-12 faculty and staff who work with diverse learners.

In most cases the two student teaching placements are at different grade levels and in different schools so that the MIT graduate will have a well-rounded exposure to teaching in their particular subject endorsement area(s) with a variety of public school students who embody a range of diverse attributes including gender, ethnicity, class, age, abilities, and sexual orientation. MIT student teachers are placed in public school classrooms where cooperating teachers have been identified by school districts as appropriate mentors for our teacher candidates. Before placement, each candidate fills out an application that includes any requests for particular schools and a letter of introduction that includes the candidates' particular interests, experiences, and strengths. Once district personnel have identified possible placements, our candidates meet with prospective mentors to help ensure that the placements will be mutually beneficial. When, on occasion, either the candidate or the mentor teacher decides the placement is not appropriate, the MIT Field Placement Officer seeks a different placement. One student teaching placement is generally in a diverse urban setting http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook2007.htm#standardIIIB

Table 7 provides information about the districts in which our candidates are placed in order to ensure their interactions with diverse students and mentor teachers. For information about the demographics of each district, including the specific schools in which our candidates teach, percentage of students of color, and percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch, please see http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_H%284%29

TABLE 7
LOCATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHING PLACEMENTS

School District	County
Bethel	Pierce
Centralia	Lewis
Chehalis	Lewis
Chief Leschi	Pierce
Clover Park	Pierce
Elma	Grays Harbor
Griffin	Thurston
Hood Canal	Mason
Mary M. Knight	Mason
Montesano	Grays Harbor
North Mason	Mason
North Thurston	Thurston
Oakville	Grays Harbor
Olympia	Thurston
Pioneer	Mason
Rochester	Thurston
Rainier	Thurston
Shelton	Mason
Southside	Mason
Steilacoom	Pierce
Tacoma	Pierce
Tenino	Thurston
Tumwater	Thurston
Wa He Lut	Thurston
Yelm	Thurston

Standard III H (5) & (12): Collaboration: (5) The unit provides a mechanism and facilitates collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved in preparation of educators. (12) Faculty regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and the preparation of educators.

MIT faculty and staff are "actively engaged as a community of learners" and are in significant collaborative relationships with liberal arts faculty, faculty at other institutions of higher education, and with P-12 educators. The alphabetized list below provides quotes from the faculty about their collaborative activities in the last five years. In addition to the information below, MIT faculty and staff meet regularly to discuss theories and practices that support our conceptual framework. Faculty meet weekly in their teams to explore a variety of texts related to theories of learning, best practices, history of education, democracy and schooling, and issues of power, privilege, and discrimination. Faculty and staff also meet regularly with the PEAB to discuss the program and emerging issues in P-12 schools.

Scott Coleman

As director from 2001-2006:

- met regularly with the faculty and staff in the Master of Public Administration and Master of Environmental Studies programs collaborating on planning, recruitment , hiring and other issues
- met regularly with the directors of the Tacoma and Reservation Based Program regarding common interests between their programs and MIT, including teacher preparation
- met regularly with the deans and directors of all the teacher education programs in Washington State through WACTE, working with them regarding state changes in teacher education
- applied for and received a grant through which I developed video clips that OSPI could use in training for the Pedagogy Assessment
- met with planning units at Evergreen to help liberal arts faculty understand endorsement competencies
- was a sponsor for indivdiual learning contracts for P-12 teachers
- facilitated Pre-Asssement and Culminating Seminars for ProCert classes for three years
- served on a state elementary education committee related to direct transfer agreements
- facilitated discussions with ESD and liberal arts educators to develop and implement a special education endorsement sequence at Evergreen
- read and responded to NSF and 2+2+1 proposals

Jacque Ensign

- founding member of Washington National Association of Multicultural Education Steering Committee to found Washington Educators for Social Justice. This has entailed meetings as well as listserv communications all this year (2006-07)
- coached former students who are currently teaching in public schools in Seattle, Chicago, Connecticut, and greater Puget Sound region
- participated and worked with liberal arts faculty in TESC summer institutes: Diversity Institute, Olympic Natural History, Diversity Program Institute, Sustainability in Action
- attended the Bioregional Literacy workshop at PLU March 9, 2007 as part of The Curriculum for the Bioregion initiative of the Washington Center- this helped me prepare for introducing place-based education into spring quarter of MIT
- extensive readings and meetings with current literacy teachers and coaches to get updated on literacy before teaching both elementary and secondary literacy grade bands this year

Terry Ford

K-12 Schools

- Jason Lee 8th grade portfolio reader, Tacoma School District
- WASL practice scoring, North Thurston School District
- Reading Assessment of all seventh graders, Oakville School District
- Diversity consultant at Black Hills High School, Tumwater School District

Federal GEAR Up Grant (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs

- Facilitator for 7th grade visitation, Summer 03
- Presented an Assessment Workshop with Kathe Taylor for Oakville School District Summer 2003
- Presented workshops on Middle School Development and ReQuest Reading for college tutors' training, Jan. 04

Explaining Evergreen to Others: Evergreen often has visitors who come to find out how our integrated curriculum works. I have been part of a faculty panel to do this on a number of occasions.

- Structure and organization of MIT for Russian exchange faculty
- Bell South Foundation educators
- Met with DEEP team during site visit
- Met with WSU Vancouver team and team from Simon Frasier University's teacher education faculty

College Collaborations with Student and Academic Support Services (SASS)

- Participated in Academic Festivals in dorms
- Attended Washington Scholars Reception
- Facilitated seminar with Academic Advising staff on *Frameworks of Poverty*
- *Beginning the Journey* (introductory program for first-year college students) meetings and data analysis
- Attended National Academic Advising Association conference, American Association of Colleges and Universities Conference, First Year Experience Conference, and Bridging Theory to Practice Conference
- Advisor to Athletic committee
- Staff Retreat
- Participated in search committees for: Director Academic Advising, Prime Time Advising, Key Academic Specialist
- MIT advising workshops
- Faculty Advisor
- Interim Director Academic Advising
- Interim Director Access Services
- Organized and hosted weekly faculty teas in Advising
- Presented to Seattle University students on Best Practices in the "Teacher and Student Affairs Practitioner Interface"

College Collaborations with First Year Experience/Core

- Orientation Panel for parents
- Learning to Learn Workshop for first year students
- Panelist on Core Planning Institute (06, 05)
- First Year Experience DTF
- Presenter at Core and Faculty Planning institutes summer 06
- Core Connector – liaison between first year programs and Academic Advising

Collaborations with Tacoma Campus

- Orientation Sept. 03
- Bridge Orientation Sept. 03
- Tacoma Education overview Jan. 04
- West B test preparation for undergraduates Tacoma Feb. 04

Collaborations with Olympia Campus Colleagues

- Participated in six 5 Year Reviews for teaching colleagues
- Reviewed two Growth Enrollment proposals: Gateway, Tacoma 2+2+1
- Participated in SPBC Planning Retreat Summer 05
- Read and responded to proposals for Human Subjects Review
- Enrollment Coordinating Committee
- Hosted New Faculty dinner 2005
- Pre-Med/pre-health Advising with Paula Schofield (Scientific Inquiry faculty)
- Facilitator, Day of Presence Discussion Group on making Seminar more Inclusive.
- Scored Freshman writing papers to compare with ETS
- Participant State Writing Assessment Project
- Participant State Information Technology Assessment Project

Collaboration with MIT Colleagues

- PEAB Meetings
- MIT Core planning, retreats
- MIT Math Hire Subcommittee
- MIT Literacy Hire Subcommittee

Presentations in MIT cycles (that I'm not teaching in)

- Literature Circles
- Reading Process
- Content Area Reading
- 6 trait writing
- Jane Schaffer writing
- Secondary reading strategies
- Middle School Management and Discipline
- Vygotsky, Piaget and Constructivist Learning

George Freeman

Collaboration Serving K-12 Students

2005-2006: Tacoma Art Museum-Greeter and volunteer-The Tacoma Art Museum serves children in K-12 education through a variety of functions both in the museum and in workshops at schools and other public gathering places. In my capacity as a volunteer I often serve in other settings as well as at the museum. The museum has a "hands-on" art studio that provides support to students' working independently on art projects. The museum provides two events every year to help K-12 teachers consider local resources and the incorporation of all three Tacoma museums into their curriculum.

2000-2002: Thurston Council on Cultural Diversity and Human Rights-At large member-The Thurston Council on Cultural Diversity and Human Rights serves all of Thurston County and provides focus on the ongoing work in the community focused on diversity concerns and issues. This includes the annual Diversity Calendar, a range of public events, and incorporates K-12 education as a focus through the youth outreach programs. Every year the Council supports three students for their diversity work at their schools.

Colllaboration with Evergreen Colleagues, Colleagues from Other Colleges, and K-12 Educators

In the course of the past five years I've worked closely with the undergraduate faculty of The Evergreen State College in a wide range of programs from advanced, senior level work to first-year, freshmen level work. Each program is designed to provide clear structure and experience allowing students to work towards greater independence and self-directed work. The central themes of these programs include: concepts of democracy (Diaspora: A Journey towards Destiny, Making Change Happen), multicultural literacy and anti-oppression themes (all programs), and personal responsibility to conduct service in the community through internships and community service programs.

I have supported independent contracts that included students working for the K-12 school system, mental health services such as DSHS foster care programs and adoption programs, and Behavioral Health Resources' Children and Families First program as well as students engaged in the Dept. of Corrections such as Maple Lane School in Grand Mound. I spend the majority of my time in the classroom although I usually provide students with 2-3 hours/week for advising when teaching. During the academic year 2006-2007, I served in Student Affairs and Students Services as the faculty Academic Advisor advising students re: their academic pathways including K-12 education endorsements and career pathways.

2005-2006: First-Year Experience DTF-Examined the role of faculty and staff in improving the quality of educational experience for high school direct students. Explored current research, policies, educational theory and issues, and provided recommendations to The Evergreen State College regarding how to better serve this population.

2004-2006: Cleveland Gestalt Institute-Organization and Systems Development Program-Most current direction of my professional development. Use of the theory and practice to understand K-12 education through a Systems Theory lens and methods of intervention in all levels of systems, from the dyadic to the largest present system.

2003-2004: Curriculum Planning Retreat; National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology-This organization and conference includes K-12 education and provides opportunities for faculty to think about the integration of K-12 education as it prepares students for college-level study in psychology and research.

2002-2003: Curriculum Planning Retreat-Ongoing opportunity to think through curricular planning for upcoming programs. This year served for planning Something Out of the Ordinary, a Core-Level program that served mostly high school direct students transitioning to higher education.

2000-2004: Critical Moments & Academic Advising-Served as a mentor and support to Academic Advising with a focus on First Peoples. First People's Advising serves all students with a focus on support for students of color. Critical Moments is a diversity initiative at The Evergreen State College.

The Washington Center for Undergraduate Education "Critical Moments Training"-A multi-year project serving The Evergreen State College to construct opportunities for further education in cultural diversity including race, gender, sexual orientation, class, and religious affiliation. Included work interviewing students in higher education to obtain their "critical moment" that served as a turning point in their education despite obstacles and barriers based on one or more of their "identities."

Gery Gerst

- Workshop on Washington Education Association to year one and two MIT cohorts various years
- Designed and presented demonstration lesson on historical perspective for Upward Bound on campus
- Serve on local after-school tutoring program's advisor
- Consultant to Olympia School District for on-site coaching to current teachers

- Created curriculum for grades 9-12 for Secretary of State's Office (Voter Outreach Through Education)- online http://www.secstate.wa.gov/elections/outreach/teachers.aspx
- Training for area educators and teen groups on the political process and how to lobby in person; accompanied groups for on-site help
- Workshops each year for program candidates on school law, both statute and case, around students'/teachers' rights and responsibilities
- Consultant, curriculum designer, teacher for local private school / home school consortium
- Member: steering/design Committees for:
  a) TVW's creation of a Civics video / curriculum series for classroom use
  b) State Legislature's project to design & create an Oral history curriculum for WW2, including video interviews of Washington State veterans. (2000-2003). Product online and sent to all school districts
- Personal onsite lobbying at the state and national level for improved funding for education, revisions to the state and national accountability laws, and academic freedom for students and teachers
- Active member: Washington Education Association
- Active Member: Washington State Retired Educators' Association
- Active Member: National Council for the Social Studies
- Organized and executed an educational and civil rights campaign to get each school district in Thurston County to submit a written description of how it protects student and parent rights while complying with the military recruiters' provision of NCLB

Anita Lenges

Collaborating with Math colleagues: I began to work with mathematics education colleagues from the University of Washington in 1996 and continue now with many of the same people as part of the *Mathematics Education Project (MEP).* The MEP is focused on developing mathematics teacher leadership in the Puget Sound region. We have found that the demand for professional development is far beyond the capacity of math educational leaders in the region, that we need to support teachers in becoming teacher leaders to develop capacity. We received a grant for a 3-year project to help math teachers and teacher leaders learn about the vast professional development resources available, and then develop the skills and knowledge to facilitate other teachers using these materials. Our final summer institute is in August 2007. However the MEP will continue to work on teacher leadership.

I also work with faculty from Eastern Washington University, the University of Michigan, University of Washington, and Horizon Research to develop materials that enhance *the Mathematics Knowledge for Teaching Mathematics (MKT)*. This particular focus on a specialized body of mathematics knowledge for teaching has been developed in elementary education. Our group is one of a small handful of groups focused on secondary mathematics teacher knowledge. Our materials are tied together with a Lesson Study model of professional development. Beyond learning MKT, we also are working on helping teacher develop the dispositions toward investigating mathematical ideas in those special ways when they encounter areas of mathematics outside of our materials.

I am doing some work with Mathematics educators from WestEd, Oregon State University and the University of Washington on learning the Sociomathematical Norms associated with teacher leaders who lead mathematics professional development. The research focus is on what are those sociomathematical norms, and to what degree are they *picked up* by participants in facilitation training institutes led by the teacher leaders from WestEd.

Collaborating with other colleagues: Simon Fraser University (British Columbia) sent a contingent of 3 faculty members to TESC MIT to learn about our Master in Teaching program as it is founded on Teaching for Social Justice. They are in a review process, considering ways they could improve their program. They spent 3 days at TESC meeting, observing, and talking with MIT faculty and students and left with many ideas.

K-12 and Teacher Collaboration

Educational Consultant: Shelton Public Schools, 2006-07

Developed and provided professional development workshops for K-12 math educators on topics such as Developing Computational Fluency, Establishing and Maintaining High Cognitive Demand, and Algebraic Thinking K-12.

Curriculum Author: Canoes on Puget Sound; MESA – University of Washington, 2002-04

Authored mathematics units for upper elementary students relating canoe carving practices of Coast Salish master carvers to the mathematics of Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements.

Reviewer: Bias and Fairness Committee, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction , 2003

Reviewed Washington State Standards and Frameworks in mathematics and reading for bias pertaining to race, language, socioeconomics, religion, and sexual orientation.

Reviewer/Advisor: Bias and Fairness Review Board, Washington State Commission on Student Learning, 2003, 2004

Reviewed Washington State Mathematics, Reading, and Science Grade-Level Expectations for bias and fairness. Provided critique, suggestions, and support in writing summary.

Over the past 5 years I have facilitated seminars and institutes in Shelton Public Schools (2006-2007) on Algebraic thinking, Computational Fluency, and Establishing and Maintaining High Cognitive Demand tasks. I worked with teacher leaders across the full year, and then with Bordeaux Elementary School and Olympic Middle School. I will continue to work with Olympic Middle School over the next school year as they are in their 2nd year of AYP and making significant changes in their schedule and approaches to teaching math.

I have led Developing Mathematical Ideas seminars in Clover Park, Seattle, Lake Washington, Tacoma, Northshore, and Shoreline Public Schools on topics such as number and operation, algebraic thinking, and data and statistics. In addition I have led summer institutes focused on rational number, geometry and measurement, probability and statistics, computational fluency, and algebraic thinking.

I have collaborated with teachers and University of Washington faculty to offer facilitation training institutes for teachers to learn to facilitate Developing Mathematical Ideas as well as Young Mathematicians at Work.

Masao Sugiyama

- Faculty in liberal arts program “So You Want to be a Teacher?” with Bill Bruner and Frances Rains
- Participated in various summer institutes at Evergreen
- Worked with Tacoma campus to advise their students about certification and advanced degrees in education
- Planned with UpWard Bound teachers and taught math to UpWard Bound students
- Taught pottery to young children through Olympia Community Center

Michael Vavrus

- My governance work for Evergreen over the past five years was eye-opening in the sense that I gained a deeper understanding of how the college functions, insights that I would have been unable to understand as MIT director or simply as a teaching faculty member. That work included serving on the Hiring DTF, Hiring Priorities DTF, the Agenda Committee for three years with one year as Faculty Chair, and one year as a Planning Unit Coordinator.

- I served 2006-07 as the chair of the search committee for a new MIT faculty member in collaboration with undergraduate faculty representatives.

- Also, for the Tacoma campus, based on the Tacoma director's desire to have more endorsement courses available to students, I taught two undergraduate classes that meet endorsement requirements for a number of our pre-service students: Pacific Northwest History (Fall 06) & Cultural Geography (W 07).

- This past summer I co-facilitated a 3-day faculty Summer Institute on "Teaching and Learning About Race."

- Meet periodically with local K-12 teachers who identify as "critical educators" in their efforts to bring a social justice orientation perspective to their teaching and to their schools.

- Presented in Summer 2003 in-service workshops for "Gear-up" teachers from "low-performing" middle schools – perspectives on democratic classroom management and on the rationale and techniques for using heterogeneous cooperative learning groups on a regular basis.

- Presented lesson on working class labor in Spring 2005 with a MIT student to middle school students as part of the college's "Gear-up" federal grant

- Organized and led presentation in collaboration with OSPI in Winter 2003 the symposium *Multicultural Pedagogical Assessment of Teacher Candidates: The Case of a High-Stakes Statewide Collaboration* at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher in New Orleans

- Served on the executive committee of the Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education as the organization's immediate past president, having "passed the gavel" in October 2002

- Involved deeply at the state level in the development of a state-wide pedagogy assessment instrument for all students graduating from teacher education programs that included speaking/advocating before teacher educators, K-12 teachers & principles, and legislators

Sherry Walton

<u>At Evergreen and State-Wide</u>

- Guest speaker in undergraduate programs and MIT cohorts
- Collaboration with Academic Advising concerning issues of diversity and developmental needs of 18 and 19-year old students
- Coordinator for the Social Sciences Planning Unit for two years (includes faculty who teach undergraduate and graduate programs)
- Designed and facilitated SPBC Planning Retreat Summer 05
- Co-Chair of the First Year Experience committee
- Presenter at summer CORE institute (for faculty who would be teaching first year students)
- Participant in summer institutes with liberal arts faculty and with staff
- Member of three 5 Year Review committees
- As MIT Director, collaborated with liberal arts faculty and public school personnel to design a proposal for the M.Ed.
- Co-authored the M.Ed. HEC Board proposal
- Member of faculty panel and workshop presenter during undergraduate Orientation Week

- Collaborated with faculty at Tacoma campus and Native American faculty from the Reservation-based program to design possible certification programs
- Co-authored two Growth Enrollment proposals: Gateway, Tacoma 2+2+1
- Hosted New Faculty dinner 2005
- Scored Freshman writing papers to compare with ETS
- Participant State Writing Assessment Project
- Participant State Information Technology Assessment Project

Public Schools and Public Organizations

- Member and participant in WACTE
- Member of the Professional Development Council – OSPI
- Served on OSPI site-accreditation team
- Member and participant in ProCert Directors' meetings
- Participant in Deans and Directors State-wide meetings
- Through Gear Up, worked with Terry Ford to assess reading abilities of all 7th grade students at Oakville Middle School and to write student-specific, and school-level recommendations for the principal
- WASL Reader - Scored 7th and 10th grade practice WASL tests, North Thurston School District
- Provided extensive workshop for Oakville teachers on content area reading strategies
- Partner with Lincoln Elementary School in Small Democratic Schools League, Olympia
- Portfolio Reader - Jason Lee Middle School, Tacoma
- Provided 3-day workshop on the use of rubrics, portfolios, and narrative evaluations for teachers at an academy for gifted students
- Served on PEAB
- As MIT Director, met with district administrative personnel and principals from ten districts to gather their suggestions about how to improve our program, especially in regards to the student teaching experience
- Met with district-level special education personnel to review and improve our special education endorsement sequence
- Collaborated with public school personnel to design an M.Ed. program with emphases in math and ESL. Co-wrote the HEC Board proposal with Magda Costantino, Director of the Evergreen Center for Excellence in Education
- Corresponded with Olympia School Board members about math curriculum adoption and presented research about the brain and learning at a school board study session
- Collaborated with a local middle school to offer tutoring for students who did not meet standard on the math WASL
- Met with public school personnel to determine ways our program might form partnerships to offer ProCert and special education endorsement classes
- Facilitated a discussion about diversity with the Pacific Peaks Girl Scout Council
- Served on the diversity sub-committee for the Pacific Peaks Girl Scout Council

Sonja Wiedenhaupt

Faculty Summer Institutes

Evergreen Faculty Summer Institute Coordinator and Facilitator: Facilitating Hot Topics 2004 (co-coordinated with Heesun Jun in 2005)

Governance

Diversity DTF – Group charged by president of college to develop a five-year strategic plan that (i) identifies priorities and goals for campus diversity work; (ii) proposes a data collection

framework; and (iii) identifies resources involved in doing the work. See recommendations. 2005-2007

Agenda Committee (faculty governing body that reviews and sets agenda for faculty meetings/decision making; reviews representation on committees; and acts as proxy for faculty when appropriate/necessary) 2001-2004

Academics Budget Council and College Budge Council 2002-2004

Campus Events

Day of absence/Day of presence: 2003, 2005, 2007 – supported event by participating in planning and/or facilitation of events

Orientation and Advising

Orientation to learning at Evergreen for Families and Friends, 2001-present

Scholars program - Workshops to introduce new students to the nature of seminar during fall orientation 2005

Beginning the Journey – five-week program to support first year undergraduate students transition to college. 2001, 2002 & 2007

Advising Fests for undergraduate students

Workshops, Presentations, and Resource Faculty

Resource Faculty National Summer Institute on Learning Communities 2003-present

Resource faculty at several curriculum planning retreats run by the Washington Center for the Improvement of the Quality of Undergraduate Education, Rainbow Lodge 2000-present

Professional workshops led on teaching and learning

Workshops for the National Summer Institute on Learning Communities 2003-2007 include:

- Using E-Portfolios as Frameworks for Integration and Reflection with Judy Patton (Portland State University)
- Aha! Metamoments – students identify catalysts to learning.
- On Seminar with Jim Harnish (North Seattle Community College)
- Metamoments and Reflection with Audrey Sharp (Seattle Central C.C.)
- Brain based learning with Rita Smilkstein (Western Washington U.)

"Going Meta: Purposeful Pedagogy Across Contexts in LC' a presentation given to the National Learning Communities Project Conference "Learning Communities and Reforming Undergraduate Education" 2004

"Learning Communities and Interdisciplinary Programs" two days of workshops for Antioch College, Ohio. April 2005

"Engaging Learning" day-long workshop for University of Montana, August 2005

As the above summary indicates, MIT Core faculty, visiting faculty, and liberal arts faculty who teach in MIT demonstrate leadership and collegiality, especially in relationship to diversity and pedagogy.

Standard III (I): Unit Budget: The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations at least proportional to other institutional units.

The institution has been responsive in providing adequate funds to cover the costs of day-to-day operations of the program, including faculty and staff salaries, mileage reimbursement for travel to supervise student teachers, money to pay work-study students and a graduate assistant, honoraria for mentor teachers and guest speakers within the program, printing of catalogs and recruiting materials, and office supplies, etc., as well as unusual costs such as those incurred as part of preparing for and hosting the accreditation visit. Computer upgrades for faculty and staff are regularly available and some funds are available to support the director and associate director to attend state meetings. The program receives 18 one-quarter tuition waivers to award to AmeriCorps volunteers and applicants with demonstrated financial need. In addition, the program requested and received $30,000 in 2005 and 2006 to help recruit and retain out-of-state candidates. In the last year, the MIT Director and Associate Director have regularly requested more systematic support for out-of-state students and more tuition waivers for AmeriCorps candidates and candidates with financial need. The MIT Director has also requested increased budget support for faculty and staff development and for an increase in honoraria for mentor teachers**.** For particulars about MIT's current budget and a comparison to the budgets for the Master in Public Administration and Master in Environmental Education programs, see http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/unit/mitbudget.xls and http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/unit/gradbudgetcomp.xls

Standard III J (7) & (8): (7) Personnel: Workload policies allow faculty members to be actively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work with P-12 schools, and service. (8) Specific staff and/or faculty members in the unit are assigned the responsibility of advising applicants for certification and endorsements and for maintaining certification records.

(7) Personnel: As evidenced earlier in this standard, MIT faculty are outstanding educators who make time to engage in scholarship, collaboration, and service to the community. MIT graduate faculty carry a 16 quarter-hour credit teaching load and offer their services to the college, and the larger community, in a myriad of ways. Faculty spend two to four hours a week in planning meetings with the team, several hours planning alone, two hours a week in faculty seminars, 16 hours a week in workshops and lectures, time every day meeting with and advising students, and numerous hours reading and responding to candidates' written work and preparing for workshops and seminars. In the second year of the program, each faculty member supervises ten student teachers, reads and responds to lesson plans, prepares for seminar, reads and responds to drafts of the master's papers, and teaches a full load in winter quarter. In addition, they attend college-wide planning unit and faculty meetings and serve on college-wide committees. MIT faculty are expected to rotate into an undergraduate, liberal arts program every two or three years.

(8) Advising: MIT faculty are involved in advising candidates on a day-to-day basis. In addition, the Certification Officer provides clear information about certification and endorsement requirements through the MIT catalog, phone conversations, email correspondence, individual appointments and through regular information meetings on the Olympia and Tacoma campuses and at the Olympia public library. In addition, she maintains a secure file of certification records. The Field Placement officer provides information through printed program materials and via phone calls and email to interested teachers about our Professional Certification program; the faculty in the second year of the MIT program provide workshops for candidates about professional growth plans and the Professional Certificate. Please see materials in Evidence Room and at following links for data related to this standard http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/unit/jobs/assocdircertspecial.pdf http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/unit/jobs/field_exp_officer.doc.

Standard III K (9): Unit Facilities: The unit has adequate facilities to support candidates in meeting standards. Facilities available at Evergreen, and through the library, computer center,

and media loan center, provide excellent support for candidates' learning and well-being. The MIT administrative offices, and most of the classroom space for MIT classes, are located in the new, ecologically friendly complex called Seminar 2. MIT shares two conference rooms with the Evergreen Center and the Washington Center, one of which is now used for PEAB meetings and meeting with public school personnel. A joint Evergreen Center/MIT resource room provides candidates with access to a range of research and curriculum materials. The lecture halls, seminar rooms, and workshop spaces are spacious, well lit, and supported by current audio-visual and web-based technologies.

As is true for all Evergreen students, MIT candidates are served by:

- the Writing Center http://www.evergreen.edu/writingcenter/,
- the Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning Center http://www.evergreen.edu/mathcenter/,
- Access Services for students with disabilities http://www.evergreen.edu/access/,
- Financial Aid Office http://www.evergreen.edu/financialaid/,
- and the health and counseling centers http://www.evergreen.edu/health/

The Evergreen Library has a collection of 275,047 books, 11,175 hard copy reference volumes, on-line journals, a video production system, 17,256 periodicals, and 5,706 items of media loan equipment. In addition, the library maintains a Curriculum Room to support MIT students and local teachers.

The MIT program is directly allocated approximately $15,000 to support acquisitions to support the program. In addition, $10,000 is allocated within the general library budget for education-related periodicals. Faculty recommendations, program focus, and materials being used by surrounding districts influence purchase decisions.

The library is part of the Interagency of College Libraries, the Cascade, and the South Sound Libraries systems. It also supports links to ERIC and has an on-line request service for inter-library loans.

Library staff provide workshops for MIT students at faculty request.

Given the heavy emphasis on the integration of media across all Evergreen programs, academic computing, media loan, and library staff collaborate, reflecting the interdisciplinary approach to learning that is promoted at Evergreen. A technology support person is assigned as a liaison to each academic program. This facilitates a high degree of responsiveness to students and faculty (i.e., instruction for students, summer institute for MIT faculty, personnel to support student projects, support to faculty to explore new technologies, working with faculty teams to plan the technology component for cohorts). MIT faculty are viewed as skilled in technology.

MIT candidates also benefit from the resources and recent renovation of the library, computer center, and the media loan center. In preparation for the accreditation visit, MIT candidate, Greg Saunders, interviewed the Dean of the Library, MIT's computer center liaison, and the Manager for Media Loan about the enhanced facilities and services. The following summaries are based on his interviews:

The number of study rooms and spaces in the library has almost doubled since the renovation. Study spaces have been redesigned into small group pods accommodating groups of 2, 3, 4, or 5 students. Glass walls installed around the library make it feel more inviting to students. The capacity for the

main collection has been increased by 20-50%. Databases are being moved from paper to online sources, making them more available to students. The reach of the wireless network has also been expanded giving students a greater access to the Internet.

The resource room for students with disabilities has been expanded to four times its original size, and has been renamed the Adaptive Technologies [AT] lab. It has also been moved to the first floor for better access to students with physical disabilities. The room has two computers, one of which has been upgraded for use by students with speech impairments. Voice activated programs have been added as well as larger monitors and a book reader. There is a new station behind the reference desk that has adjustable tables to accommodate wheel chairs.

The children's section of the main library has been moved adjacent to the MIT curriculum room. The library is currently enhancing this collection based on feedback from MIT. Some of the materials located within include: word and math games, books covering many topics such as literacy, activities, educational theory, math, and ESL. Also included in the room are posters, math and word manipulatives, stuffed animals, writing prompts, and numerous other materials. (From interview with Lee Lyttle, Dean of the Library, 3/07). For an overview of library holdings and databases, see http://www.evergreen.edu/library/catalog/librarycatalog.htm

The renovation expanded the size of the computer lab area and enhanced the area as well. With the renovations, the Computer Center has added 55-60 new computers, with a gross gain of 40 computers. Because of the larger size and additional computers, it is a rare event that students have to wait in line to use a computer. The classrooms have also been fitted with new and improved Audio/Visual equipment. The addition of document cameras as well as projectors and audio equipment enable the computer classrooms to be used for multiple purposes. Their layouts are useful for either small group work or direct instruction.

Some other resources that the computer lab provides to support student learning are several www2 tools such as Blogs, Wiki, Drupal, and Moodle, all of which are collaborative web applications. The computer center has plans for the future to expand personal my.evergreen.edu pages which will be used by students for everything from writing evaluations to registration, paying bills, and even access to the aforementioned www2 tools. The college is also switching from paper mailings to strictly electronic mailings to save paper and money.

Both the Library and the Computer Center have brand new Adaptive Technology stations with the following specific software and hardware:

Software	Hardware
Dragon 9 (voice recognition) Jaws 10 (screen reader) WriteAssist (learning disability help) ZoomText (screen enlarger) WYNN Reader (learning disability help) Open Book (scans pages and reads aloud) Inspiration (learning disability help)	RollerPad Mouse (for individuals with mobility impairments) TracBall Mouse (very ergonomic and easy to use) Wave Keyboards (ergonomic) Scanner Height Adjustable Table (automatic) Headsets with microphones

A Mac Station and hopefully a Kurzweil 3000 (for students with learning disabilities) will shortly be added in the Computer Center.

Two new programs have been added to the computers in the computer center: Endnote, a bibliographic database program, specifically requested by the MIT program, and Sketch Up, a three-dimensional modeling program. In addition to installing new programs, the staff members at the computer center are constantly trying to increase compatibility between Macs and PCs, such as the ability to use system specific files. (From interview with John McGee, MIT Computer Center liaison, 3/07) For additional information about the computer center, please see http://www.evergreen.edu/computercenter/

The Media Loan Center, a lending library for a wide range of media equipment, has expanded. There are plans for expanding the TV studio area, slated for two years from now. New Access services equipment has arrived, including: listening equipment for those with hearing disabilities, and user-friendly keyboards. Ramps for wheelchair access have also been added.

Equipment in Media Loan is constantly upgraded each year. Equipment purchases are chosen through collaboration with faculty to meet program needs. Some new equipment includes: WAVE Digital Voice Recorders, Telecaption Decoders, Talking Book Players, Point and Shoot Digital Cameras and Mini Disc Recorders. (From interview with Lin Crowley, Media Loan Operations Manager, 3/07) For additional information about Media Services, please see http://www.evergreen.edu/media/

Standard III L (10): Unit Resources Including Technology: The unit has adequate information technology resources, library, and electronic information to support faculty and candidates. Under "Criteria" on the standards rubric, this standard speaks specifically to the availability of information technology and library resources, and electronic information to support faculty and candidates. As described above under Standard III K (9), MIT faculty and candidates are well supported by information technology, electronic media, and library resources. In addition to resources available through the library, media center, and computer center, the MIT program owns a video camera that faculty and candidates use to document program activities and to create video to document professional growth plans. MIT faculty also teach candidates how to create and maintain their own web pages.

However, the criteria in the MET column of the standards rubric also speak specifically to whether adequate resources to develop and implement the unit's assessment plan exist. As was described earlier in this report, the MIT program regularly assesses and provides feedback to its candidates and regularly assesses the program. Assessment data is both quantitative and narrative in form.

Faculty and the PEAB receive updates regarding aggregated quantitative information from West B and E scores, the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric* and *Pedagogy Assessments*, the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey*, and feedback from EBI, and from program completers and alumni. Information from these sources is used to inform decisions about the content and structure of the program.

Survey and quantitative data have been collected electronically. Data have been entered into and aggregated through Excel spreadsheets or through FileMaker Pro. Analysis of program data has fallen primarily to the MIT director and associate director. Evergreen is currently supporting the MIT program in creating and maintaining a centralized web-based mechanism to gather, store, and aggregate data. The MIT director and staff and the managers of academic (Rip Hemingway) and administrative (Tony Alfonso) computing have created an implementation plan that should greatly facilitate the ease with which assessment information is collected, aggregated, and analyzed.

In addition, MIT's approach to assessment is modeled on the larger, undergraduate interdisciplinary, team-taught, cohort model. Thus, some of the most significant assessment occurs on a day-to-day

basis and is verbal or narrative in form. This type of assessment does not lend itself to being notated in quantitative form or to being easily stored electronically. However, the faculty do have adequate support to engage in qualitative and narrative assessment:

- Faculty help each other improve their capacities in these areas through sharing their approaches and insights in weekly team meetings.
- Evergreen provides a full week at the end of each quarter for faculty to meet individually with students/candidates to share and discuss assessment information and evaluations of candidates' work.
- The Agenda Committee has granted permission for regular cross-team meetings to count as governance and so faculty are now able to more easily share assessment information across cohorts.
- The institution increased the college's Institutional Research office staff by one FTE beginning July 2007 to pursue more systematic evaluations of narrative assessments, including those written by MIT faculty.

Standard III M (11): Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance: The unit systematically evaluates faculty performances and facilitates professional development. Evaluations of faculty may be seen in faculty portfolios in the Evidence Room. Please also see the following sites for data from faculty evaluations and the connections to professional development:
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_C%283%29#Faculty_Evaluations and
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_N%2811%29

Evergreen (and MIT) faculty on continuing contract are expected to:

1. write self-evaluations and evaluations of each teaching colleague every year. These evaluations are shared and discussed at year-end meetings. During those conversations, colleagues provide feedback about strengths and areas that could be improved. MIT faculty have been asked to offer each other explicit suggestions about professional development opportunities to strengthen teaching and scholarship.
2. write narrative evaluations for all students/candidates with whom the faculty member has worked and to request written evaluations from all her/his students/candidates. During quarterly and yearly evaluation conferences, faculty are expected to facilitate a conversation in which both the students/candidates and the faculty member share information about strengths and areas for potential growth.
3. maintain professional portfolios that are reviewed every five years and that contain all evaluations the faculty member writes of students/candidates and colleagues; all evaluations written by colleagues and students/candidates about the faculty member's work; a reflection about the work accomplished and any challenges; and a plan for the next five years that may address changes in teaching, plans for new programs, and professional development. The 5 Year Review meeting includes an academic dean and all the colleagues with whom the faculty member taught in the previous five years.

New faculty who have not yet been converted to a continuing contract (tenure), and visiting faculty, meet yearly with an academic dean who observes the person's teaching and who reviews the portfolio. Evaluation conferences include discussions about teaching strengths and areas to improve, the faculty member's plans for the next year, and suggestions for professional development.

The MIT Director reports to the Provost. She/he writes yearly objectives which are shared with, and approved by, the Provost; meets regularly with the Provost during the year to discuss emerging

information and issues related to the MIT program; and meets annually with the Provost for an evaluation conference based on the director's written self-evaluation and any feedback that faculty and staff provide. The objectives, self-evaluation, and Provost's evaluation for the director for 2006-2007 is located in the Evidence Room.

Based on our evaluation of the data supplied in this report, on the MIT Accreditation web page, and in the Evidence Room, the program meets or exceeds standard for each criterion in Standard III.

STANDARD IV

PROGRAM DESIGN

Standard IV(A): The Conceptual Framework: The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides the basis for coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice and evaluation. The conceptual framework is based on current research and best practice, is cohesive and integrated, supports the state's student learning goals and for teacher preparation programs, and reflects the essential academic learning requirements. The conceptual framework reflects the unit's commitment to preparing candidates to support learning for all students and the unit's commitment to preparing candidates who are able to use educational technology to help all students learn.

Conceptual Framework and Program Themes

http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook2007.htm#concept

As stated in the MIT catalog:

> The Master in Teaching (MIT) program faculty believe the MIT program's success lies as much in the learning processes used to investigate the content as it does in the content itself. Though particular subject matter content is taught, the processes are also "content". Community building, seminars, collaborative learning, group problem solving, extensive field experiences and critical and reflective thinking are not just ideas MIT students read about and are then directed to use when they teach. Rather, these are the processes used daily in the program to help graduate students learn to become skilled, competent professionals who can assume leadership roles in curriculum development, child advocacy, assessment and anti-bias work.
>
> The MIT program is centered on the exploration of how public education might meet the needs of the diverse groups of people who live in this democracy. The program examines what it means to base teacher education and public education on a multicultural, democratic, developmental perspective and how performance-based assessment can promote these values. Using an interdisciplinary approach, the following three major themes inform both the content and associated processes of the program throughout the MIT curriculum.
>
> **Democracy and Schooling:** We look at schooling from the perspective of what it means to work and learn in our democracy. We help students both to understand the evolution of our current democracy and to critique the practices that exclude particular groups from equitable participation in our society. Democracy is presented as a multidimensional concept as prospective teachers are guided toward professional action and reflection on the implications for the role of the teacher in enacting (a) democratic school-based decision making that is inclusive of parents, community members, school personnel and students and (b) democratic classroom learning environments that are learner-centered and collaborative.

Research Base

Cohen, E. & Goodlad, J. (1994). *Designing Groupwork: Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom*. NY: Teachers College Press.

deTocqueville, A. (Reeve, H. trans.). (1998). *Democracy in America.* Hertforshire: Wordsworth.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and Education*. NY: Touchstone.

Hunter, J. (1992). *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. NY: Basic Books.

Irons, P. (2002). *Jim Crow's Children: The Broken Promise of the Brown Decision*. NY: Viking.
Johnson, A. (1997). *Power, Privilege, and Difference*. NJ: McGraw-Hill.
Kohl, H. (1994). *I Won't Learn From You and Other Thoughts on Creative Maladjustment*. NY: New Press.
Moses, R., & Cobb Jr, C. (2001). *Radical Equations: Math Literacy and Civil Rights*. MA: Beacon Press.
Payne, R. (1998). *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*. TX: Aha Process Inc.
Rousseau, J. (2006 edition). *The Social Contract.* NY: Penguin.
Spring, J. (2004). *The American School.* NJ: McGraw-Hill.
Takaki, R. (1994). *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. NY: Back Bay.
Zinn, H. (2001). *A People's History of the United States: 1492 to Present*. NY: HarperCollins.

Multicultural and Anti-Bias Perspective: The curriculum reflects Evergreen's strong commitment to diversity because we believe that both teaching and learning must draw from many perspectives and include a multiplicity of ideas. We believe in preserving and articulating differences of ethnicity, race, gender and sexual orientation rather than erasing or marginalizing them. We seek to expose MIT students to the consequences of their cultural encapsulation in an effort to assist future teachers in the acquisition of a critical consciousness. We believe that future teachers must be ready to provide children and youth with culturally responsive and equitable schooling opportunities.

Research Base

Banks, J.A. (1993). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J.A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon. □
Choate, J. (1996). *Successful Inclusive Teaching: Proven Ways to Detect and Correct Special Needs.* NJ: Allyn and Bacon.
Delpit, L. (1996). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. NY: New York Press.
Delpit, L. & Dowdy, J. (2002). *The Skin that we Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom*. NY: W. W. Norton.
Flores-Gonzalez, N. (2002). *School Kids/Street Kids: Identity Development in Latino Students*. NY: Teachers College Press.
Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press. □
Igoa, C. (1995). *Inner Lives of Immigrant Children*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Kindlon, D., Thompson, M. (2000). *Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Life of Boys*. NY: Ballantine Books.
Klug, B. & Whitfield, P. (2003). *Widening the Circle: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy for American Indian Children*. NY: RouteledgeFalmer.
McIntyre, E., Rosebery, A. S., & Gonzalez, N. (Eds.). (2001). *Classroom Diversity: Connecting Curriculum to Students' Lives*. NH: Heinemann.
Orenstein, P. (1995). *Schoolgirls*. *Young Women, Self Esteem, and the Confidence Gap*. NY: Anchor.
Pang, V. & Cheng, L. (1998). *Struggling to Be Heard: The Unmet Needs of Asian Pacific American Children.* NY: State University of New York Press.
Santa Anna, O. (2004). *Tongue-Tied: The Lives of Multilingual Children in the Public Schools*. MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Tatum, B. (1999). *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?" and Other Conversations About Race*. NY: Basic Books.
Vaughn, S., Bos, C. & Schumm, J. (2005). *Teaching Exceptional, Diverse, and At-Risk Students, IDEA 2004 Update Edition (3rd Edition).* NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S. Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. NY: State University of New York Press.
Vavrus, M. (2002). *Transforming the Multicultural Education of Teachers: Theory, Research, and Practice*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Developmentally Appropriate Teaching and Learning: We understand that no instructional model or limited set of methods responds to the complex cognitive processes associated with K-12 subject matter learning. Our curriculum reflects the social, emotional, physiological and cognitive growth processes that shape how children and youth receive, construct, interpret and act on their experiences of the world. A broad-based curriculum that is interdisciplinary, developmentally appropriate, meaningful and guided by a competent and informed teacher, as well as by learner interests, results in active learning.

Research Base

Arends, R. (1996). *Classroom Instruction and Management*. NJ: McGraw-Hill.

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the Middle: New Understanding About Writing, Reading, and Learning*. NH: Boynton/Cook.

Brooks, J. & Brooks, M. (1999). *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms.* NJ: Prentice Hall.

Daniels, H. (1994). *Literature Circles: Voice and Choice in the Student-Centered Classroom*. ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Daniels, H. (1998). *Methods that Matter*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Donovan, M.S. & Bransford (eds). *How Students Learn: Science in the Classroom*. Committee on How People Learn: A Targeted Report for Teachers, National Research Council. *http://lab.nap.edu/nap-cgi/discover.cgi?term=How+students+learn+science*

Duckworth, E. (2001). *"The Having of Wonderful Ideas" and Other Essays on Teaching and Learning, 2nd Edition*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Erikson, E. (1994). *Identity and the Life Cycle*. NY: W.W. Norton.

Feldman, S. & Elliott, G. (eds). (1993). *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent*. MA: Harvard University Press.

Fountas, I., Pinnell, G. (2001). *Guiding Readers and Writers, Grades 3-6, Teaching Comprehension, Genre, and Content Literacy.* NH: Heinemann.

Furth, H. (1970). *Piaget for Teachers*. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gauvain, M, & Cole, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Readings on the Development of Children: 3rd Edition.* NY: Worth Publishers.

Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). *Language Stories and Literacy Lessons*. NH: Heinemann.

Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the Brain in Mind.* VA: ASCD.

Kennedy, L., Tipps, S., Johnson, A. (2004). *Guiding Children's Learning of Mathematics*. Wadsworth Publishing.

Marek, E. (1997). *The Learning Cycle Elementary School Science and Beyond.* NH: Heinemann.

McKenna, M. & Robinson, R. (2001). *Teaching Through Text: Reading and Writing in the Content Areas (Third Edition).* NJ: Allyn and Bacon.

Miller, D. (2002) *Reading with Meaning: Teaching Comprehension in the Primary Grades.* ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Miller, P. (1996). *Theories of Developmental Psychology*. NY: Worth Publishers.

National Council of Teachers of English Standards (2006) http://www.ncte.org/about/over/standards

National Council for Social Studies Standards (2007) http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/introduction/ http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/strands/

National Council for Teachers of Mathematics Standards (2007) http://www.nctm.org/standards/default.aspx?id=58

Piaget, J. (1968). *Six Psychological Studies*. NY: Vintage.

Plato. (trans. Bloom, A.). (1991).The Republic. NY: Basic Books.

Rogoff. B. (1991). *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. NY: Oxford University Press.
Rousseau. *Emile* available at http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/pedagogies/rousseau/index.html
Singer, D. & Revenson, T. (1996). *A Piaget Primer: How a Child Thinks*. CT: International Universities Press.
Skinner, B.F. (2002). *Beyond Freedom and Dignity.* IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
Stiggins, R. (2000). *Student-Involved Classroom Assessment (3rd Edition)*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
Vaughn, S., Bos, C. & Schumm, J. (2005). *Teaching Exceptional, Diverse, and At-Risk Students, IDEA 2004 Update Edition (3rd Edition).* NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
Washington State Reading EALRs and GLEs. http://www.K12.wa.us/ealrs/GradeLevelSearch.aspx?.ca=1&gl=1 or http://www.k12.wa.us/ealrs/default.aspx?ca=1
Weaver, C. (2002) *Reading Process and Practice (Third Edition).* NH: Heinemann.
Wertsch, J. (1988). *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind*. MA: Harvard University Press.
Wolfgang, C. (2001). *Solving Discipline and Classroom Management Problems: Methods and Models for Today's Teachers*. 5th Edition. NJ: Wiley.
Zemelman, S. & Daniels, H., Hyde, A. (2005). *Best Practice, Third Edition: Today's Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools*. NH: Heinemann.
Zull, J. (2002). *The Art of Changing the Brain: Enriching the Practice of Teaching by Exploring the Biology of Learning*. VA: Stylus Publishing.

When educators in the State of Washington, through the Washington Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (WACTE), collaborated to create the State Pedagogy Assessment, the MIT Director and WACTE President at the time, Michael Vavrus, wrote much of the text to explain key foci of the assessment. Information contained in his discussion about:

- engaging low status/historically marginalized students
- multicultural perspective
- transformative academic knowledge
- culturally responsive teaching
- classroom management for inclusive, supportive learning communities, and,
- caring and democratic classrooms

drew from, and reflects, the work that MIT faculty and candidates engage in through learning opportunities organized around the conceptual framework described above. The sources cited following the text are the same sources that offer a research-based support for the MIT conceptual framework (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/placement/studenttchhnbk.htm pages 43-53 in PDF file of Section 2, Assessment guide).

Standard IV(B): Recruitment, Admission, and Retention: Candidates who demonstrate potential for acquiring the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills for success as educators in schools are recruited, admitted and retained. These candidates include members from under-represented groups. MIT's catalog, information brochure, website, and regular information sessions both on and off campus, and the Associate Director's outreach to diverse populations, demonstrate that we are clear about the type of candidate we wish to recruit and that we desire and seek diverse representations within our cohorts (please see Standard III E-G for more information). Standard II B(b) provides extensive information about the multiple assessments and checkpoints used to determine candidate admission and retention in the program. The MIT *Guidebook to Policies, Procedures, and Resources,* as well as the faculty, make clear to candidates within the program that they have access to, and are encouraged to use, services such as the health center, counseling center, writing center, and quantitative reasoning center (see Standard III(K).

Standard IV(C-E):
C. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates: Programs shall assure that candidates are provided with opportunities to learn the pedagogical knowledge and skills required for the particular certificate, and for teacher preparation programs, the endorsement competencies.

D. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates: Programs shall assure that candidates are provided with opportunities to learn the professional knowledge and skill for the particular certificate.
E. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates Including Endorsements: Programs shall assure that candidates are provided with opportunities to learn the competencies for endorsement areas.

As described in Standard IV(H), MIT candidates are both expected to enter the program with endorsement content competencies met (or largely met in the case of those endorsing in Elementary Education) AND they have ample opportunities within the program to expand their content knowledge and to develop pedagogies that support student learning. Rich learning opportunities on campus related to pedagogy and content, including how to use technology and differentiate instruction, extensive experiences teaching in their first year practicum placements and teaching their fellow candidates, as well as extensive student teaching placements allow candidates to try out new skills and knowledge, reflect on what did and didn't work, and try again! Keeping guided field journals, completing two EALR projects that demonstrate a positive impact on student learning, demonstrating during student teaching that they either have actually included students' families and communities or have plans for such inclusion, and drafting a professional growth plan support the candidate's ability to become a reflective teacher. Cohort syllabi, assignment expectations, and professional development plans outlined below, and linked on the MIT accreditation website, provide documentation that candidates have these learning opportunities. The aggregated data from the MIT Student Teaching Rubric (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/evals_summary.xls) Pedagogy Assessment (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/state_ped_summary.xls), and *Elements of Effective Teaching* Survey (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/surveysummary.doc) attest to candidates' abilities to apply their knowledge and skills. Sample unit plans, EALR Projects, and Student Teaching Portfolios, other sources of evidence of candidates' content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skill, are available in the Evidence Room.

Outline

Lesson Planning and Unit Development
2008 Cohort: Models of Teaching Lesson Plans; Models of Teaching Lesson Plan Rubric; Curriculum Project Description; Lessons from Curriculum Project
2007 Cohort: Models of Teaching Lesson Plans; Models of Teaching Lesson Plan Format; Models of Teaching Lesson Plan Rubric; Curriculum Project Description; Transformative Unit Plan
2006 Cohort: Curriculum Project Description; Lessons from Curriculum Project
2005 Cohort: Models of Teaching Lesson Plans; Models of Teaching Lesson Plan Formats; Curriculum Project Description; Internet Lessons Project Expectations; Second Curriculum Project Plan and Evaluation
2004 Cohort: Curriculum Project Guide

Content Area Pedagogies
Arts: Learning and the Artistic Brain Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Learning and the Musical Brain Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Theatre, Dance, and Movement Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Art for Elementary Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Art for Elementary Rubric (2005 Cohort)
English/Language Arts: Literacy in Content Areas Syllabus (2008 Cohort) Literacy in Content Areas Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Literacy in Content Areas Goals (2007 Cohort) Language Arts Syllabus (2005 Cohort)
Literacy: Reading Literacy Syllabus (2008 Cohort) Elementary Writing and Literacy Syllabus (2008

Cohort) Elementary Literacy 1st Quarter Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Elementary Literacy 2nd Quarter Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Elementary Literacy 1st Quarter Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Elementary Literacy 2nd Quarter Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Secondary Literacy Syllabus (2005 Cohort)
Math: Secondary Math Methods Syllabus (2008 Cohort) Elementary Math Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Secondary Math Methods Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Elementary Math Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Elementary Math Portfolio Requirements (2005 Cohort) Elementary Math Sample Lesson (2005 Cohort)
Science: Secondary Science Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Elementary Science Syllabus (2007 Cohort)
Secondary Methods: Secondary Methods Syllabus (2008 Cohort) Secondary Methodology Syllabus (2007 Cohort)
Social Studies: Social Justice Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Elementary Social Studies Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Secondary Social Studies Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Secondary Social Studies Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Elementary Social Studies Syllabus (2005 Cohort)
Special Education: Special Education Syllabus (2007 Cohort) Special Education Syllabus (2005 Cohort) Special Education Portfolio Requirements (2005 Cohort)

Cohort Workshops (Samples)
Assessment Workshop (2008 Cohort)
Building Lessons Workshop (2008 Cohort)
Testing and Grading Workshop (2008 Cohort)
History of U.S. Education Objectives (2007 Cohort)
History of U.S. Education Assignments (2007 Cohort)
Visual Map Workshop (2007 Cohort)
Constructivist Camp (2002 Cohort)

Classroom Management
Syllabus (2007 Cohort)
Final Paper (2008 Cohort)

EALR Projects (Positive Impact on Student Learning)
Student Teaching Handbook: EALR Project Description

Professional Growth Plans
Reflections on Practice Syllabus (2007 Cohort)
Professional Growth Plans (2006 Cohort)
Professional Development Project (2004 Cohort)
Professional Growth Plan Form (2003 Cohort)

Cohort Syllabi
2008 Cohort: Spring 2007 Winter 2007 Fall 2006
2007 Cohort: Stated Expectations for 2007 Cohort Spring 2007 Winter 2007 Fall 2006 Spring 2006 Winter 2006 Fall 2005
2006 Cohort: Spring 2006 Winter 2006 Fall 2005 Spring 2005 Winter 2005 Fall 2004
2005 Cohort: Spring 2005 Winter 2005 Fall 2004 Spring 2004 Winter 2004 Fall 2003
2004 Cohort: Spring 2004 Winter 2004 Fall 2003 Spring 2003 Winter 2003 Fall 2002
2003 Cohort: Winter 2003 Spring 2002 Winter 2002 Fall 2001

Standard IV(F): Learner Expectations: A set of learner expectations for program completion are identified and published. As explained in Standard IIA(a) of this report, the Master in Teaching program clearly states its expectations for program participants on its website (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit), in its catalog, in the *Student Guidebook to Policies, Procedures, and*

Resources (www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook.htm), in the Student Teaching Handbook (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/placement/studenttchhnbk.htm), *and on cohort websites (*www.evergreen.edu/mit/programwebsites.htm).

From criteria for admission to the program, to criteria for benchmark portfolios and projects, to expectations for the master's project, to clear explanations about the program's Conceptual Framework and the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a performance-based teacher education program and in student teaching, candidates have ready access to expectations. In addition, these expectations reflect the *Conceptual Framework* and state standards (please see Table 2). Candidates are regularly asked to demonstrate that they have developed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions articulated in the expectations (please see http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29).

Standard IV(G a-c): Field Experiences and Clinical Practices: The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practices so that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn.

One of the strengths of the program identified by alumni and public school principals is the plan for, and extensive nature of, experiences in public schools. One principal commented that hiring an MIT graduate is like getting a teacher with a year of experience under her/his belt because of the extensive first year field experiences and the two 10-week student teaching placements in Year 2 of the program.

All candidates spend time in rural, urban, and suburban schools and in elementary, middle school, and high school classrooms during the first quarter of the program. In the second and third quarters of the program, candidates work in one classroom under the guidance of a certified teacher. Each quarter of the first year, candidates spend approximately 40 – 50 guided hours a quarter working in a public school classroom. MIT faculty have several goals for the field experiences including:

- helping candidates become familiar with the differing cultures of schools;
- improving candidates' abilities to differentiate between observation and description as compared to assumption and projection;
- guiding candidates to become familiar with a range of teachers' classroom management and questioning strategies;
- helping candidates become familiar with policies related to working with students with special needs and students for whom English in not their first language;
- providing ways for candidates to become familiar with students' communities; supporting candidates in developing skills in working one-on-one with students, in small groups, and with the whole class;
- shaping opportunities for candidates to gain skills in planning and implementing conceptually-based, connected lessons that address appropriate EALRs;
- helping candidates develop professional attributes.

The following outline, with links available on the MIT accreditation web page, contains information about observation guidelines, field notebook assignments, and practicum teaching experiences expected of candidates in their field (practicum) experiences..

Field Observation Guides (Year 1)
2008 Cohort: Spring Guide; Winter Guide; Fall Guide
2007 Cohort: Winter/Spring Guide; Fall Guide
2006 Cohort: Field Guidelines
2005 Cohort: Spring Guide; Winter Guide; Fall Guide

2004 Cohort: Winter-Spring Guide; Fall Guide

Teaching in Field Observation Sites (Year 1)
Teaching in Field Placement (2007 Cohort)
Teaching in Field Placement (2005 Cohort)
Teaching in Field Placement (2004 Cohort)

In the second year of the program, candidates complete two, ten-week student teaching (intern) experiences. One of these is usually in an urban setting to provide significant experiences with diverse populations of students. The Student Teaching Handbook http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/ST_hb07_sec1.pdf outlines the responsibilities of the student teacher, the mentor teacher, and the college supervisor. In both quarters, student teachers are expected to take full responsibility for the classroom for a minimum of three weeks (for a total of six weeks). The Handbook includes very specific information about how the student teacher is to assume progressive responsibility for the classroom and the requirements for lesson planning and for meeting the requirement that she/he demonstrate a positive impact on student learning.

The Field Placement Officer and the MIT Director have developed good working relationships with a number of districts (Table 7) and appreciate that the ultimate decision about placements is up to each district. Candidates fill out applications for placements in which they may request a specific site, and in which they include a letter of introduction to the school principal and teachers. These are sent to districts and schools to help in the decisions about placements. We require that our student teachers make appointments with their assigned mentor before the quarter begins to allow the mentor teacher and the student teacher the opportunity to determine if the placement is likely to be mutually beneficial. When, occasionally, the match is not a good one, the Field Placement Officer secures another placement. We also expect every college supervisor to meet with the mentor teacher and the student teacher before the quarter begins to clarify expectations and set goals, at midterm to assess progress and set goals, and at the end of the quarter to collaboratively evaluate the student teacher's work. Please see the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* for requirements and data related to candidates' range of teaching and professional development activities within their student teaching placements, including school-based activities and use of information technology.

MIT has a formal agreement with Lincoln Elementary School concerning field and clinical placements. The MIT program is also Lincoln's college partner in the League of Small Democratic Schools. Faculty and staff from MIT and Lincoln meet yearly to review placements and requirements and to consider adjustments.

In addition, the program solicits information from mentor teachers twice a year through a written survey and uses the information to evaluate the structure and content of the field and clinical practices. Dr. Scott Coleman, the former MIT director, summarized data from mentor teachers from fall 2002 through fall 2006 in the report below. This information suggests that the structure and content of field and clinical placements are satisfactory and are helping candidates develop the knowledge and skills necessary to support the learning of children and youth.

> Introduction
> This report summarizes the feedback we have received on the written, relatively open-ended survey we ask mentor teachers to complete soon after they have finished mentoring their Evergreen MIT student teachers. The return rate on these surveys has been a very consistent 50-60%. The survey was implemented to provide an easy way for cooperating teachers to share their overall impressions and any concerns or problems they encountered during the experience to help us identify any problems that need to be addressed at the program level with the student teaching experience. In fall 2006, for the first time, the purpose of the survey

was expanded by additionally asking teachers to specifically comment on the planning, instruction, and classroom management skills of their student teachers with the intent of providing a new source of feedback on student performance.

Overview: Questions and Response Summaries

We ask our mentor teachers if they are interested in having another student teacher in the future, which gives us an overall sense of their satisfaction with our program and helps us in finding future student teaching placements. Over five years, 80% of the cooperating teachers returning the survey have said that they are interested in having another Evergreen MIT student teacher.

We ask our cooperating teachers if they have any suggestions for us about our student teachers or student teaching and then ask if they have any suggestions for us that would make our program better. Both questions are designed to encourage teachers to tell us about any problems they may have experienced. A third to a half of the written responses are positive comments about the program or about a student teacher. A small number of comments describe concerns that appear to be very unique to the particular student teacher in that classroom. The remainder of the responses can be easily categorized into 11 different recurring concerns. These concerns and the frequency with which they occur are shared in Table 8.

In fall 2006, of the 22 teachers who completed the survey, four commented that classroom management is the one area in most need of attention or improvement but they were not concerned about their student teacher's level of performance in this area. One comment was made that classroom management was a strength of their student teacher. One comment was made about the need for better preparation in reading instruction. Nine comments specifically mentioned exemplary planning. Five comments specifically mentioned good instruction and one comment suggested some difficulty with large group instruction. This question will likely be included in future surveys.

The results over five years to the other questions are organized below in a way that helps draw out the "patterns of concern" that cooperating teachers have shared over the past five years. This information has been shared with PEAB members and the MIT faculty and analysis of this data is expected to continue over the next few months. Two initial findings are:

1) While several concerns appear consistently and are of high concern to some cooperating teachers, only a small minority of teachers express those concerns and for many issues stated as concerns there are one or more comments that see the same thing as a "positive." For example, many teachers commend the MIT rubric and share support for two 10-week student teaching experiences, though others state these as concerns.

2) In the spring, though not in the fall, a small but consistent number of cooperating teachers comment on lack of communication with the faculty supervisor. One tentative explanation is that in the spring faculty are fully involved with winter quarter evaluations right up until the day student teaching begins, and have a more difficult time seeing cooperating teachers very early in the quarter than they do in the fall.

TABLE 8

MENTOR TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS
2002-2007

Year	2006	2005-06		2004-05		2003-04		2002-03		Mean
	F	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	
Number of surveys returned	22	17	18	21	22	21	14	22	21	20
PERCENTAGE OF MENTOR TEACHERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO MENTOR ANOTHER MIT STUDENT TEACHER										
	77	88	89	86	82	67	79	73	79	80%
CATEGORES AND NUMBER OF COMMENTS OFFERED										
Made a complementary statement about the program or an individual student	10	6	8	5	11	11	5	7	9	
Stated a concern about an individual student	2	4	2	3	3	2	3	2	5	
A student teacher's experience in one school should be longer than 10 weeks	3	5	0	5	2	2	0	5	1	
The timing of the student teaching experience is not optimal; starts too early or too late in the school calendar	2	0	4	1	0	2	1	0	0	
Student teachers are asked by their faculty to do too much work that is "in addition" to their teaching	1	4	0	3	2	3	1	4	0	
I have concerns about the classroom management skills of my student teacher	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	1	
Cooperating teachers should be given a larger stipend	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Evergreen's student teaching rubric is too long and complex	2	3	2	2	2	0	1	1	5	
The principal should have been invited to be more involved in the student teaching experience	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
There is a need for more consistency between faculty supervisors	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	
More effort should be made to properly match student teachers with cooperating teachers or schools	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	
I experienced a lack of consistent communication with the college supervisor	0	0	6	0	4	0	3	0	0	
There was a conflict between school norms and Evergreen's philosophy of teacher education	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	

Standard IV(H): Endorsement Preparation: The preparing institution shall assure that candidates are provided with appropriate course work and experiences in teaching methods for each endorsement area.

Candidates are expected to be prepared in the *content* of their endorsement areas, with the exception of some areas for those pursuing an Elementary Education endorsement, when they enter the program AND learning experiences within MIT provide further opportunities to expand subject area knowledge as well as to learn about instructional strategies, curriculum frameworks, assessment, and lesson and unit planning.

Since 2004, the first year that applicants were required to pass the WEST E in their endorsement areas, the MIT program has required candidates to pass these tests ***before*** entry into the program. Because MIT is a graduate program that accepts candidates from a variety of institutions of higher education, we have little direct control over much of candidates' *content* preparation. All students accepted into the MIT program at Evergreen have completed their bachelor's degree and their endorsement subject matter preparation, except in some areas for students who apply for elementary education endorsements. Therefore it is reasonable and necessary to expect that students enter the program having verified their endorsement subject matter knowledge. We rely on the state-approved measure of content knowledge, applicant transcripts and grades, and the MIT endorsement worksheet to make determinations about applicants' preparation in content areas.

Applicants' letters of acceptance state the specific endorsements for which they are approved. When, occasionally, a candidate petitions to add an endorsement during the first year of the program, permission may be granted provided that the candidate successfully passes the relevant WEST E test before student teaching. In addition to providing evidence of successful completion of the appropriate WEST E test(s), applicants must also complete endorsement worksheets and submit official transcripts of all college work. A grade point average of 3.0 or the equivalent in narrative evaluations is required.

Once applicants enter the program, the above pieces of data, along with MIT program assessments (EALR self-assessment, Advancement to Candidacy Portfolio, lesson and unit plans in endorsement areas, EALR Project – Positive Impact on Student Learning, the MIT Student Teaching Rubric, the master's paper, and the state Pedagogy Assessment) are used to verify a candidate's **content knowledge** in her/his subject area(s), as well as pedagogical knowledge and skills.

According to the *Praxis Institutional Summary Reports*, the average scores of candidates who did their endorsement preparation work at The Evergreen State College met or exceeded the state and/or national averages in 2004 and/or 2005 except in English/LA (two points below the state average), Middle Level English/LA (one point below the state average), and Math (eight points below the state average). Even in those areas, however, the average scores exceeded the state passing score by nine to twenty points. MIT candidates whose endorsement preparation was at other institutions exceeded the state average in all areas except Middle Level English/LA (ten points below the state average). For that endorsement, the average score was eleven points above the state passing score. WEST E scores for graduates in 2006 and 2007 exceeded the passing score in all areas by 15 to 20 points.

Aggregated data from MIT's *Elements of Effective Teaching* Survey, MIT *Student Teaching Rubric*, and the *Pedagogy Assessment* confirmed that MIT graduates were well grounded in their subject areas and pedagogical skills. In addition, MIT's EALR project, which candidates completed in both fall and spring student teaching experiences, verified that MIT graduates had a positive impact on student learning and could use data to evaluate student learning and make decisions about instruction.

Plans for Implementing the New Standard V Endorsement Competencies

The MIT program has taken immediate steps to ensure that candidates will be aware of, and be expected to demonstrate, the new competencies outlined for Endorsements in Group 1 that the program supports (Biology, Dance, Theater Arts, Visual Arts, Earth & Space Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, History, English/Language Arts, Chemistry, and Physics). Again, because this is a

graduate program, content preparation in the Group 1 endorsements is expected to occur before admission to the program. *Competencies related to pedagogies, reading, positive impact on student learning, and diversity will be addressed and evaluated within MIT cohorts.*

A. Evaluating Applicants' and Candidates' Preparation to Personalize Learning for All Students

1. Applicants will continue to be required to take the appropriate WEST E test and meet or exceed the score specified by the state. The Admissions Committee will continue to consider test scores, transcripts and grades or narrative evaluations, and applicants' essays to determine if applicants are sufficiently prepared in their content areas.
2. Existing MIT endorsement worksheets that outline credit distributions and requirements for Social Studies and English/Language Arts have been revised to reflect new content competencies.
3. New endorsement worksheets have been created and included in the catalog, and on-line, for applicants to the 2008 – 2010 cohort for all Group 1 endorsements. (As Group II and III endorsements are approved, further endorsement worksheets will be created and published.) These worksheets require applicants to provide information about how and where they acquired content knowledge.
4. In the first quarter of the program, candidates complete an Advancement to Candidacy Portfolio which includes a detailed analysis of their preparation to teach the subjects for which they are seeking endorsement and their ability to help students work toward appropriate EALRs, GLEs, and Frameworks. Candidates will be asked to draft a plan specifying how they intend to strengthen areas not verified on the new endorsement worksheets or in the EALR self-assessment. This plan will be shared with faculty during Advancement to Candidacy review meetings; the outcome of this plan will be reviewed prior to the start of student teaching.
5. Competencies related to pedagogy and diversity are, and will continue to be, offered and evaluated within the MIT program. Please note that even though determination of subject matter competence takes place before candidates enter the program, subject matter competence continues to be developed and assessed throughout the program in combination with the development and assessment of pedagogical competencies. Evaluations of content preparation and pedagogical knowledge and skill occur through assessing integration papers, lesson and unit plans, the EALR project (positive impact on student learning), and two student teaching experiences using the MIT Student Teaching Rubric and the Pedagogy Assessment.

During each quarter of year one, candidates develop extensive portfolios of their work to provide evidence of their successful performance in many areas, including pedagogical theory and practice. The year one portfolios, including the spring Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio, must include evidence of the candidates' understanding and ability to apply the EALRs related to endorsement area(s). Portfolios are also kept each quarter of year 2, assessing the student teaching experiences during the Fall and Spring and to verify a positive impact on student learning, as well as during the Winter reflective quarter when a variety of teaching competencies are assessed.

All cohorts become quite familiar with the Essential Academic Learning Requirements the first and second quarters of the program through two avenues: 1) by conducting a thorough examination of all EALRs and an assessment of their ability to help children and/or youth gain the required knowledge and skills, and 2) through aligning all lesson and unit plans in the first year of the program and during student teaching with appropriate EALRs, GLEs, and/or Frameworks.

All cohorts require candidates to develop interdisciplinary, theme-based curriculum units that include lesson plans that clearly outline the scope and sequence of differentiated learning experiences. All cohorts explore how to choose and employ culturally relevant and useful formative and summative assessments. Lesson and unit plans, as well as the EALR project completed during the first and second student teaching quarters, must indicate the ways in which student knowledge is assessed

and how the information is used to inform teaching choices. All candidates are expected to practice their developing teaching skills in two field placements during Year 1 of the program and in two student teaching experiences during Year 2 of the program. Each cohort team determines how to provide candidates with content-specific pedagogies. Samples of cohort syllabi and workshops found at the following website provide documentation that candidates are prepared with appropriate opportunities to learn and practice teaching methods for their endorsement areas. http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#cohort_syllabi

Standard IV(I): Entry and Exit Criteria: Entry and exit criteria exist for candidates in clinical practice. Links to documents that clearly specify entry and exit criteria may be seen at http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#Admission_to_Program

A partial outline of the above site provides information specifically about sources for clear, public, easily accessible information for candidates about entry and exit criteria related to clinical practices. The full site contains entry and exit criteria related to the two full years of the program.

Admission to Program
Outcomes and Expectations: MIT Website 2009 Catalog 2008 Catalog 2007 Catalog 2006 Catalog

Remaining in Good Standing
Student Guidebook: Differences Between Calendars in Years 1 and 2
Student Guidebook: Program Expectations for Faculty and Students
Student Teaching Handbook: Withdrawal or Removal of Candidate from Student Teaching

Portfolio Reviews
General Description and Sequence of Portfolios
Advancement to Student Teaching Portfolio: Portfolio Description (2008 Cohort) Portfolio Description (2007 Cohort) Portfolio Description (2006 Cohort) Portfolio Description (2005 Cohort) Portfolio Description (2004 Cohort)

Student Teaching (Year 2)
Student Teaching Handbook: Handbook Introduction; Evergreen's Student Teaching Rubric; State Pedagogy Assessment; Roles of the Candidate as Student and as Teacher, Role of the College Faculty, and Role of the Cooperating Teacher; Withdrawal or Removal of Candidate from Student Teaching

EALR Projects (Positive Impact on Student Learning)
Student Teaching Handbook: EALR Project Description

Standard IV(J): Collaboration with P-12 Schools: Programs reflect ongoing collaboration with P-12 schools. Faculty statements about their collaborative activities, interviews with P-12 and other educators, feedback from PEAB members, and examples of MIT collaborations with public schools and districts attest to the program's on-going involvement with public education and dialogue with public educators. Information in all these categories may be examined at http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_III_Criteria_I%2812%29

A sample of collaborations and conversations between MIT Administration and public schools, as well as specific ways in which MIT faculty have collaborated with P-12 educators, follows. These

examples highlight the diverse and significant ways our faculty stay involved in educational dialogues. Because the faculty work in teams, each person's activities benefit her/his colleagues, as well as candidates in multiple cohorts.

Collaboration and Conversations Between MIT Administration and P-12 Public Schools (2006-07)

Targeted outreach & conversations about teacher preparation and student teaching:

- Linda Arnold, Human Resources (Shelton School District)
- Beth Scouller and Starla Hoff, Human Resources (Olympia School District)
- Matt McCauley, K-12 Teaching and Learning (Olympia School District)
- Brian Wharton, Debbie Kovacs, and Lissa Kelsey, Human Resources (North Thurston School District)
- Bob Kuehl and Ginny Wicklund, Human Resources (Tumwater School District)
- Joe Ruiz, Jr., Human Resources (Clover Park School District)
- Linda Hahn and Skip Gillis, Human Resources (Tacoma School District)
- Penny Jackson, Human Resources (Steilacoom School District)
- Lynn Stellick and Deb Christensen, Human Resources (Puyallup School District)
- John Bash, Human Resources (Centralia School District)
- Wyeth Jessee and Barbara Carlson, Special Education Directors (Olympia School District)
- Elementary School Principals Meeting (Olympia School District)
- Middle School Principals Meeting (Olympia School District)
- Math Study Sessions (Olympia School Board)

Emerging Collaboration:

- Jennie Reed Elementary (Tacoma School District)
- Komachin Middle School (North Thurston School District)
- Madison Elementary (Olympia School District)
- M.Ed. Program at Evergreen with North Thurston School District, Olympia School District, ESD 113, and Shelton School District

Collaboration:

- Democratic Schools (Lincoln Elementary, Olympia School District)
- Common Scoring Assessment (North Thurston School District)
- Math Program (Shelton School District)
- Math Program (Marshal Middle School, Olympia School District)
- PEAB – Program Assessment

Outreach Planned for 07-08:

- Olympia High School (Olympia School District)
- Capital High School (Olympia School District)
- Puyallup School District
- Sumner School District
- Bethel School District
- Rochester School District
- Oakville School District

Faculty's P-12 Collaborations

Scott Coleman

As director from 2001-2006:

- met regularly with the directors of the Tacoma and Reservation Based Program regarding common interests between their programs and MIT, including teacher preparation
- met regularly with the deans and directors of all the teacher education programs in Washington State through WACTE, working with them regarding state changes in teacher education
- applied for and received a grant through which I developed video clips that OSPI could use in training for the Pedagogy Assessment
- sponsor for indivdiual learning contracts for P-12 teachers
- facilitated Pre-Asssement and Culminating Seminars for ProCert classes for three years
- served on a state elementary education committee related to direct transfer agreements
- facilitated discussions with ESD and liberal arts educators to develop and implement a special education endorsement sequence at Evergreen
- read and responded to NSF and 2+2+1 proposals

Jacque Ensign

- founding member of Washington National Association of Multicultural Education Steering Committee to found Washington Educators for Social Justice. This has entailed meetings as well as listserv communications all this year (2006-07).
- coached former students who are currently teaching in public schools in Seattle, Chicago, Connecticut, and greater Puget Sound region
- extensive readings and meetings with current literacy teachers and coaches to get updated on literacy before teaching both elementary and secondary literacy grade bands this year

Terry Ford

K-12 Schools

- Jason Lee 8th grade portfolio reader, Tacoma School District
- WASL practice scoring, North Thurston School District
- Reading Assessment of all seventh graders, Oakville School District

Gear Up

- Facilitator for 7th grade visitation Summer 03
- Presented an Assessment Workshop with Kathe Taylor for Oakville School District Summer 2003
- Presented Middle School Development Workshop for CPA training Jan 04
- Planning meetings with Kathe Taylor, Magda Costantino
- Performed reading assessment on all seventh graders at Oakville Middle School
- Presented workshop on Request Reading for CPA training

George Freeman

2005-2006: Tacoma Art Museum-Greeter and volunteer-The Tacoma Art Museum serves children in K-12 education through a variety of functions both in the museum and in workshops at schools and other public gathering places. In my capacity as a volunteer I often serve in other settings as well as at the museum. The museum has a “hands-on” art studio that provides support to students’ working independently on art projects. The museum provides two events every year to help K-12 teachers consider local resources and the incorporation of all three Tacoma museums into their curriculum.

2000-2002: Thurston Council on Cultural Diversity and Human Rights-At large member-The Thurston Council on Cultural Diversity and Human Rights serves all of Thurston County and provides focus on the ongoing work in the community focused on diversity concerns and issues. This includes the annual Diversity Calendar, a range of public events, and incorporates K-12 education as a focus

through the youth outreach programs. Every year the Council supports three students for their diversity work at their schools.

My primary role at The Evergreen State College is as a member of the undergraduate faculty. Therefore my interface with the undergraduate student body and my faculty and staff colleagues is most evident in my teaching. What follows are my academic programs over the past 6 years. Each program includes a set of internships in organizations including K-12 schools placements.

- 2005-2006: ***Making Change Happen***-Upper division program explores how we engage institutions and organizations in transformation, effective change strategies that allow for both personal and institutional shifts, and how we become the leaders of the process. Included exploration of K-12 school systems based on DSHS divisions throughout the state.

- Spring, 2005: ***Reality Check: [Mis]representations of Indian Images***-Soph-Sr. division program addressed the images, representations, and misrepresentations of Indians through various mediums.

- 2003-2004: ***Something out of the Ordinary***-Core level program providing an integration of two disciplines: theatre performance and art production through and psychology.

- 2002-2003: ***Health and Human Development***-Soph-Sr. division program explored the intersection of human health and society in a thematic nature.

- 2001-2002: ***180 Degrees: A Multicultural Counseling Program***-a year-long, senior-level multicultural counseling program prepared students for work in the social service field and/or graduate education at either the masters or doctoral level.

- Fall, 2001: ***The Helping Professions-Tacoma Campus***-A group contract on the helping professions, mostly geared to ethics and multicultural counseling models.

- 2000-2001: ***Diaspora: A Journey toward Destiny***-an all-level, year-long program that explored the Diaspora of Jews and of people of African descent.

Gery Gerst

- Consultant to Olympia School District for on-site coaching to current teachers
- Consultant, curriculum designer, teacher for local private school / home school consortium
- Member: steering/design Committees for:
  a) TVW's creation of a Civics video / curriculum series for classroom use
  b) State Legislature's project to design & create an Oral history curriculum for WW2, including video interviews of Washington State veterans. (2000-2003). Product online and sent to all school districts.
- Created curriculum for grades 9-12 for Secretary of State's Office (Voter Outreach Through Education)- online http://www.secstate.wa.gov/elections/outreach/teachers.aspx
- Training for area educators and teen groups on the political process and how to lobby in person; accompanied groups for onsite help
- Personal on-site lobbying at the state and national level for improved funding for education, revisions to the state and national accountability laws, and academic freedom for students and teachers
  - Active member: Washington Education Association
  - Active Member: Washington State Retired Educators' Association
  - Active Member: National Council for the Social Studies
- Workshops each year for program students on school law, both statute and case, around

students'/teachers' rights and responsibilities
- Organized and executed an educational and civil rights campaign to get each school district in Thurston County to submit a written description of how it protects student and parent rights while complying with the military recruiters' provision of NCLB

Anita Lenges

Educational Consultant: Shelton Public Schools, 2006-07

Developed and provided professional development workshops for K-12 math educators on topics such as Developing Computational Fluency, Establishing and Maintaining High Cognitive Demand, and Algebraic Thinking K-12.

Curriculum Author: Canoes on Puget Sound; MESA – University of Washington, 2002-04

Authored mathematics units for upper elementary students relating canoe carving practices of Coast Salish master carvers to the mathematics of Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements.

Reviewer: Bias and Fairness Committee, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction , 2003

Reviewed Washington State Standards and Frameworks in mathematics and reading for bias pertaining to race, language, socioeconomics, religion, and sexual orientation.

Reviewer/Advisor: Bias and Fairness Review Board, Washington State Commission on Student Learning, 2003, 2004

Reviewed Washington State Mathematics, Reading, and Science Grade-Level Expectations for bias and fairness. Provided critique, suggestions, and support in writing summary.

Over the past 5 years I have facilitated seminars and institutes in Shelton Public Schools (2006-2007) on Algebraic thinking, Computational Fluency, and Establishing and Maintaining High Cognitive Demand tasks. I worked with teacher leaders across the full year, and then with Bordeaux Elementary School and Olympic Middle School. I will continue to work with Olympic Middle School over the next school year as they are in their 2nd year of AYP and making significant changes in their schedule and approaches to teaching math.

I have led Developing Mathematical Ideas seminars in Clover Park, Seattle, Lake Washington, Tacoma, Northshore, and Shoreline Public Schools on topics such as number and operation, algebraic thinking, and data and statistics. In addition I have led summer institutes focused on rational number, geometry and measurement, probability and statistics, computational fluency, and algebraic thinking.

I have collaborated with teachers and University of Washington faculty to offer facilitation-training institutes for teachers to learn to facilitate Developing Mathematical Ideas as well as Young Mathematicians at Work.

Simon Fraser University (British Columbia) sent a contingent of 3 faculty members to TESC MIT to learn about our Masters in Teaching program as it is founded on Teaching for Social Justice. They are in a review process, considering ways they could improve their program. They spent 3 days at TESC meeting, observing, and talking with MIT faculty and students and left with many ideas.

Masao Sugiyama
- Faculty in Upward Bound Program at TESC for the past 15 years
- Met with faculty at Lincoln Elementary about collaborating with them on various projects for the 2006-08 cohort

Michael Vavrus

- Presented in Summer 2003 in-service workshops for "Gear-up" teachers from "low-performing" middle schools – perspectives on democratic classroom management and on the rationale and techniques for using heterogeneous cooperative learning groups on a regular basis.
- Presented lesson on working class labor in Spring 2005 with a MIT student to middle school students as part of the college's "Gear-up" federal grant.
- Organized and led presentation in collaboration with OSPI in Winter 2003 the symposium *Multicultural Pedagogical Assessment of Teacher Candidates: The Case of a High-Stakes Statewide Collaboration* at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher in New Orleans.
- Served on the executive committee of the Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education as the organization's immediate past president, having "passed the gavel" in October 2002.
- Involved deeply at the state level in the development of a statewide pedagogy assessment instrument for all students graduating from teacher education programs that included speaking/advocating before teacher educators, K-12 teachers & principles, and legislators.
- Meet periodically with local K-12 teachers who identify as "critical educators" in their efforts to bring a social justice orientation perspective to their teaching and to their schools.

Sherry Walton
Public Schools and Public Organizations

- Current member of Professional Development Council
- Participant in ProCert Directors meetings
- Served on OSPI accreditation site team
- Through Gear Up, worked with Terry Ford to assess reading abilities of all 7th grade students at Oakville Middle School and to write student-specific, and school-level recommendations for the principal
- WASL Reader - Scored 7th and 10th grade practice WASL tests, North Thurston School District
- Provided extensive workshop for Oakville teachers on content area reading strategies
- Partner with Lincoln Elementary School in Small Democratic Schools League, Olympia
- Portfolio Reader - Jason Lee Middle School, Tacoma
- Provided 3-day workshop on the use of rubrics, portfolios, and narrative evaluations for teachers at an academy for gifted students
- Served on PEAB
- As MIT Director, met with district administrative personnel and principals from ten districts to gather their suggestions about how to improve our program, especially in regards to the student teaching experience
- Met with district-level special education personnel to review and improve our special education endorsement sequence
- Corresponded with Olympia School Board members about math curriculum adoption and presented research about the brain and learning at a school board study session
- Collaborated with a local middle school to offer tutoring for students who did not meet standard on the math WASL
- Met with public school personnel to determine ways our program might form partnerships to offer ProCert and special education endorsement classes
- Facilitated a discussion about diversity with the Pacific Peaks Girl Scout Council
- Served on the diversity sub-committee for the Pacific Peaks Girl Scout Council

In addition, all of the above faculty have supervised student teachers in a variety of locations and have collaborated with their mentor teachers to support their development as teachers.

Standard IV(K): Regionally Accredited Degrees: Accreditation Status – Candidates for a teacher certificate shall hold-obtain a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university pursuant to WAC 181-79A-030(5).

The MIT program verifies that all candidates hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university during the application process. The Evergreen State College's Master in Teaching Program is accredited under Washington Administrative Code (WAC) standards for preservice teacher education programs. The Evergreen Master in Teaching Program received its most recent five-year re-accreditation in January 2003.

The Evergreen State College is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Accreditation of The Evergreen State College occurs every 10 years. The last self study report for accreditation was completed in 1998.

Standard IV(L): Pedagogy Assessment Instrument: Beginning fall 2003, approved programs shall administer the pedagogy assessment adopted by the professional educator standards board and published by the superintendent of public instruction to all candidates in a residency certificate program. Candidates must take the pedagogy assessment as a condition of residency program completion. However, passage is not required for program completion as long as the program can provide other evidence, separately or in combination with the results of the pedagogy assessment, that the candidate has satisfied all program completion requirements.

All MIT candidates are assessed using the *Pedagogy Assessment*, supplemented by a range of written lesson plans and the EALR project, which verify the candidates' positive impact on student learning. Candidates who cannot successfully demonstrate the competencies addressed by the Pedagogy Assessment are not recommended for certification. Please see aggregated and individual candidate data from the Pedagogy Assessment at http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/state_ped_summary.xls).

Samples of the EALR projects may be viewed in the Evidence Room.

Based on our evaluation of the data supplied in this report, on the MIT Accreditation web page, and in the Evidence Room, the program meets or exceeds standard for each criterion in Standard IV.

STANDARD V

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: TEACHER

Standard V 1A (a-k): Foundational Knowledge Evergreen's Master in Teaching Program is a nationally recognized teacher education program[2]. Inquiry, critical thinking, the pursuit of multiple perspectives, and the development of essential inquiry skills necessary to the intelligent use of education research are central to the program. In addition, the program reflects the original, alternative nature of The Evergreen State College with its cross-curricular programs organized around themes and questions, while at the same time meeting all State of Washington Administrative Code standards for program quality and beginning teacher competence.

MIT candidates have well orchestrated opportunities to gain the knowledge base described in criteria (a) – (k), as evidenced through the Conceptual Framework (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook2007.htm#concept), cohort syllabi (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#Cohort_Syllabi), and the comparison of credit distributions across cohorts (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/teach/creditequiv.doc). Further, as described and documented under Standard II (http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/standard_II), candidates' knowledge and skills are regularly assessed through both formative and summative assessments.

As described earlier in this report, the structure of the MIT program is parallel to the organization of the undergraduate curriculum. The mission of the college is based on a set of principles that guide the development of all college programs and services, including the MIT program. Some of the principles assert that:

- Teaching is the central work of the faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Academic program offerings are interdisciplinary and collaborative, a structure that accurately reflects how people learn and work in their occupations and personal lives.
- Students are taught to be aware of what they know, how they learn, and how to apply what they know; this allows them to be responsible for their own education, both at college and throughout their lives.
- College offerings involve active participation in learning, rather than passive reception of information, and integrate theory with practical applications.
- Because learning is enhanced when topics are examined from the perspectives of diverse groups and because such differences reflect the world around us, the college strives to create a rich mix in the composition of its student body, staff, and faculty, and to give serious consideration to issues of social class, age, race, ethnicity, (dis)ability, gender, religious preference, and sexual orientation.
- Faculty and staff continually review, assess and modify programs and services to fit changing needs of students and society.

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, "The art of teaching at Evergreen should be the art of arranging the conditions and moments when the student encounters problems and ideas so that important learning takes place; lives are touched, shaped and changed so that they become responsible, critical and creative life-long learners. . . . Because the art of really effective teaching is something we all

[2] Awarded the 2003 Richard Wisniewski Award by the Society of Professors of Education in recognition of outstanding contributions to the field of teacher education.

learn together, and because the art of developing and teaching interdisciplinary programs is something that we will work at for years to come, the more experimental, creative, critical and self-corrective we are, the more successful we will all be." (Retrieved 8/13/07 from http://www.evergreen.edu/policies/f-2100.htm). Thus, programmatic offerings in the MIT program are not contained in a static sequence of repeated classes. Nevertheless, each two-year cohort is organized around the same predictable over-all structure:

Year 1

Fall Quarter	*Winter Quarter*	*Spring Quarter*
• Building a learning community • Seminars, lectures, workshops (theories, pedagogies, foundations of education, diversity and bias) • Guided observations in schools • Master's research	• Seminars, lectures, workshops (theories, content specific pedagogies, cultural encapsulation, assessment) • Lesson and unit planning • Guided participation in schools • Master's research • Portfolio review for Advancement to Candidacy	• Seminars, lectures, workshops (diversity & bias, democratic classroom management, content specific pedagogies, assessment) • Curriculum development & guided teaching in schools • Portfolio review for Advancement to Student Teaching

Between Year 1 & 2

Summer
- Complete any outstanding subject matter endorsement requirements prior to the beginning of Year 2 student teaching.
- If necessary, complete any work on master's paper

Year 2

Fall Quarter (late-August through November)	*Winter Quarter*	*Spring Quarter*
• Full-time student teaching • Weekly seminar (Problem-solving, classroom management, lesson planning, assessment) • EALR Project (Positive Impact on Student Learning Project) • Presentation Portfolio	• Reflection on teaching and learning • Seminars, lectures, workshops • Professional development related to job search • Responsibilities of the profession & law • Professional Growth Plan	• Full-time student teaching • Weekly seminar (Problem-solving, classroom management, lesson planning, assessment) • Program assessment • EALR Project (Positive Impact on Student Learning Project) • Professional Portfolio

This underlying structure is like the warp, the foundation, of a piece of weaving. Just as the wide range of possible weft patterns woven on a warp result in coherent variations in finished products, each faculty team creates variations in program design by drawing from the following sources to create integrated, well-connected learning opportunities within the particular cohort:

- the knowledge and strengths of their faculty team members
- the expertise of guest speakers and workshop presenters
- the emerging needs of the particular group of candidates
- relevant local, regional, national and international issues
- the standards specified in WAC 181-78A-270
- the criteria for each of the endorsement areas

Variety remains anchored to the same essential foundation.

MIT faculty assert that the program's (and candidates') successes result as much from the program's collaborative and critically-oriented learning processes as from the curricular content. Through exploring academic subjects and content area pedagogies collaboratively, critically, and from diverse perspectives, candidates engage with and develop:

- solid knowledge about social, historical, and psychological foundations of education;
- research-based theories of learning and teaching;
- culturally-appropriate community-building approaches;
- differentiated pedagogical strategies;
- the state learning goals and essential academic learning requirements;
- democratically-based classroom management;
- appropriate uses of technologies;
- inquiry and research;
- and educational policies, laws, and professional ethics and responsibilities, including, but not limited to, information related to students with special needs, abuse, and professional certification.

Through these investigations, and applications in public school classrooms, MIT candidates become knowledgeable, competent professionals who can assume leadership roles in curriculum development, child advocacy, assessment and anti-bias work.

Standard V 1B (l-v): Effective Teaching

Cohort syllabi
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#Cohort_Syllabi,

comparison of credit distributions across cohorts
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/teach/creditequiv.doc),

Elements of Effective Teaching Survey results
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/surveysummary.doc),

The MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* results
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/evals_summary.xls),

and the *Pedagogy Assessment* results
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/state_ped_summary.xls)
provide clear evidence that candidates are prepared to use research-based practices in all the areas covered by this part of Standard V. Please note that more recent assessment information supports the conclusion that MIT candidates have become steadily more prepared in the last five years to teach reading, students with special needs, and students with linguistic diversities. For example, though 59% of alumni respondents to a survey for those who graduated three to five years ago agreed that the MIT program had prepared them to teach reading, 94% of 2007 graduates stated that

they felt prepared to teach reading (*Elements of Effective Teaching Survey),* and principals and alumni ratings in the 2006 and 2007 EBI reports fell within good and excellent categories (to see average mean scores for all questions, please see EBI data in the Evidence Room).

The following discussion links results from self-report surveys generated by the MIT program, such as the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey* and new program completer and alumni surveys, with data from instruments such as the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric,* mentor teacher surveys and EBI's alumni and principal surveys. Because self-report data may suffer from reliability and validity concerns, data from other sources are useful in challenging or corroborating self-assessments. As the discussion below indicates, taken together, all the sources support the claim that MIT graduates have the knowledge and skills to effectively support student learning. Because all candidates must pass the *Pedagogy Assessment* to be recommended for certification*,* data from this instrument is not included in the following discussion.

Elements of Effective Teaching Survey:
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/surveysummary.doc)
Using a survey developed from OSPI's Standard V Elements of Effective Teaching, MIT candidates in the 2005-07 cohort responded to a 4-point Likert Scale indicating their degree of preparedness (4-very prepared to 1-very unprepared) and actual application of their knowledge and skills in their student teaching placements (4–applied regularly to 1–never applied). They provided this information at the end of their fall and spring student teaching experiences. Though Standard V lists 13 elements, this survey divided some of the more complicated elements into subsets in order to gain a clearer understanding of how the program is affecting its participants. Thus, the survey asked candidates to respond to 29 elements.

Eighty to 100 percent of the teacher candidates scored their preparation as a 4 or 3 and/or their application in the classroom as a 4 or 3 in 20 of the 29 elements in the survey. That is, they indicated they were very or somewhat prepared and/or applied the knowledge/skill regularly or occasionally both quarters. The strongest areas of preparation and application in both fall and spring were:

- adapting learning experiences to include ethnic and racial diversity, and,
- using research and experience based principles of effective practice to encourage the intellectual development of students.

In both of these areas, 100% of the candidates scored themselves as either a (4) – very prepared or a (3) – somewhat prepared in preparation and application. An interesting change was that in fall quarter, 52% of candidates indicated that they were very prepared (4) to adapt learning experiences based on ethnic and racial diversity, whereas in spring quarter, 90% of candidates scored themselves as very prepared (4). Likewise, there was an increase in application of knowledge and skills from fall to spring from 48% of the candidates regularly applying the knowledge in the fall to 90% of the candidates applying their knowledge in the classroom during spring quarter.

As regards being prepared to use research and experience-based practices, 66% of the candidates rated themselves as very prepared (4) in the fall, while in spring quarter, 84% felt very prepared. Application shifted from 50% of the candidates regularly applying their knowledge and skills in the fall to 77% in the spring. One hypothesis is that the length of the program (2 years) and the program structure that requires, among other things, a substantive research paper, and two student teaching experiences with an interim reflective quarter, allows candidates the time and opportunities to grow in these important areas.

Other areas of particular strength across the two quarters were:

- adapting learning experiences to address cultural diversity (100% felt very or somewhat prepared in the fall; 97% in the spring felt very or somewhat prepared)
- reflecting on one's teaching and setting goals for improving instruction and student learning (100% felt very or somewhat prepared both quarters)
- using instructional strategies to develop students' abilities in problem solving (97% felt very or somewhat prepared in the fall; 100% felt very or somewhat prepared in the spring)
- using knowledge of subject and content to plan and implement instruction (96% felt very or somewhat prepared in the fall; 100% felt very or somewhat prepared in the spring)
- using knowledge of curriculum goals to plan and implement instruction (96% felt very or somewhat prepared in the fall; 100% felt very or somewhat prepared in the spring)
- using instructional strategies to develop students' abilities in reading (93% in fall felt very or somewhat prepared; 100% in spring felt very or somewhat prepared)
- diagnosing reading difficulties and use research-based intervention strategies (97% felt very or somewhat prepared in both fall and spring)
- using individual and group motivation for encouraging active engagement in learning (97% felt very or somewhat prepared in the fall; 100% felt very or somewhat prepared in the spring)
- using instructional strategies to develop students' abilities in critical thinking (93% in fall felt very or somewhat prepared; 100% in spring felt very or somewhat prepared)
- using individual and group motivation for encouraging positive social interaction (93% in fall felt very or somewhat prepared; 100% in spring felt very or somewhat prepared)

The patterns in these categories mirrored those in the first two discussed. A greater percentage of students in spring quarter rated themselves as very prepared and as regularly applying their knowledge and skills in their classrooms.

Overall, it is clear from the data that the predominant trend was improvement in candidates' perceptions of readiness/preparation and their ability to apply knowledge and skills in spring quarter as compared to fall quarter. Part of the improvement could be attributed to a foundation of experience developed during fall quarter. In addition, the program deliberately spent concentrated time in winter quarter encouraging candidates to reflect on their work and to seek ways to improve their approaches to diverse learners, technology, and working with parents and communities. Given the focus in the MIT program on teaching all people's children, and the cohorts' attention to social justice, issues of diversity, developmentally appropriate education, democracy, research-based practices, collaborative learning, and the relationship of these factors to Washington's Essential Academic Learning Requirements, these numbers reinforce that the program is doing quite well attending to main conceptual frameworks as well as state standards. Further, faculty's evaluations of candidates' work using the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* corroborated the candidates' self-assessment on the *Elements of Effective Teaching* Surveys. While faculty ratings on the MIT rubric were somewhat more conservative than the candidates', the high percentage of candidates who scored as developing or skilled in important areas of teaching was impressive.

New Graduate and MIT Alumni Surveys:
(http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/alumsurvey/gradsurvey.doc
http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/alumsurvey/3yrsummary.doc),

Program completers are surveyed each year to gather information about program strengths and areas that need improvement. MIT faculty have reviewed the information and discussed ways to improve the program. The following aggregated data, which represents a 66% return rate, was gathered from alumni who graduated in 2003 through 2007. One hundred ten out of a possible 167 individuals completed the survey.

In 2007, MIT also instituted a survey to solicit information from alumni who had been teaching for at least three years. This first survey was sent to 102 alumni; 44 alumni submitted surveys for a 43% return rate. In both surveys, program completers were asked questions about program content and structure and their feelings of preparedness to teach, and then asked whether or not they would recommend the program to others.

Ninety percent of new completers stated that they intended to teach; after three to five years, 91% of respondents were still involved in teaching. Ninety percent of new completers and 98% of the experienced alumni agreed that the program helped prepare them to be effective teachers. Ninety percent of new completers and 89% of the alumni who responded said they would recommend the program to others.

Program Completers Not Yet Teachers
2003-07

1) **Teaching Plans?** 90% plan to teach full time
2) **Structure and content of the program?** 90% of the respondents felt MIT prepared them to meet state and national standards (MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, the Pedagogy Assessment, and Standard V) and 94% of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the two quarters of student teaching and interim quarter were a valuable part of their student teaching experience.
3) **Recommend to Others?** 91% of the respondents would recommend or highly recommend the program to others.
4) **Intend to address biased attitudes and actions?** 98% of respondents intend to always or sometimes address biased attitudes and actions. (MIT's Conceptual Framework, MIT Student Teaching Rubric, and the State Pedagogy Assessment)
5) **Intend to include collaborative learning and student-inclusive decision-making in their classrooms?** 99% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed somewhat (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the Pedagogy Assessment, and Standard V)
6) **Intend to incorporate student-centered, constructivist pedagogy into teaching?** 99% of respondents agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework, MIT Student Teaching Rubric)
7) **See yourself as leader or advocate for democracy in schooling, anti-bias and multicultural education, and developmentally appropriate pedagogy?** 96% of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the Pedagogy Assessment, MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, and Standard V)

MIT Alumni
3 – 5 Years of Teaching Experience
2002-04

1) **Persistence in Teaching?** 91% of respondents are involved in teaching: 77% teach full-time; 10% teach part-time; 4% substitute.
2) **Do you agree that the structure and content of the MIT program helped prepare you for a successful teaching career?** 98% of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the structure and content of the program helped prepare them for a successful teaching career.
3) **Recommend to Others?** 89% of the respondents would recommend or highly recommend the program to others.
4) **MIT prepared you to create a positive learning environment for students?** 95% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the Pedagogy Assessment, MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, and Standard V)
5) **MIT prepared you to use the EALRs?** 93% agreed (MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, the Pedagogy Assessment, and Standard V)

6) **Do you address equity for students?** 93% of respondents always or sometimes address equity. (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the MIT Student Teaching Rubric and the State Pedagogy Assessment)
7) **MIT helped prepare you to use assessment to inform planning and teaching?** 93% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed somewhat (MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, the Pedagogy Assessment, and Standard V)
8) **Is it important to be leaders or advocates for democracy in schooling, anti-bias and multicultural education, and developmentally appropriate pedagogy?** 89% of respondents said very important or important. (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the Pedagogy Assessment, MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, and Standard V)
9) **Are collaborative learning and student-inclusive decision-making very important or important in your classrooms?** 86% agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the Pedagogy Assessment, and Standard V)
10) **Do you incorporate constructivist pedagogy into your teaching?** 84% agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework and the MIT Student Teaching Rubric)
11) **MIT helped you learn how to develop appropriate learning experiences for students with disabilities?** 84% of respondents agreed (MIT's Conceptual Framework, the MIT Student Teaching Rubric, Pedagogy Assessment, Standard V)
12) **MIT helped prepare you to use technology to enhance student learning?** 73% of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed (The MIT Student Teaching Rubric, Pedagogy Assessment, Standard V)
13) **MIT helped prepare you to help your students develop reading skills? 59% strongly agreed or agreed somewhat (**MIT's Conceptual Framework and to components of the Pedagogy Assessment, MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, and Standard V)

As the information above indicates, responses from new program completers and from alumni strongly support data from the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey,* and are supported by data from the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric,* the *Pedagogy Assessment,* information from the mentor teacher surveys, and data from EBI that follow. All these sources confirm that MIT has been successful in helping candidates develop the knowledge and skills related to MIT's conceptual framework and to state and national standards that support them as teachers and that helps them have a positive impact on student learning.

MIT Student Teaching Rubric: The Master in Teaching Student Teaching Rubric was derived, with her permission, from Charlotte Danielson's research on effective teaching (*Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching,*1996; *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*, 2000). Student teachers are rated on a four-step rubric (unacceptable, emerging, developing, skilled) in four domains – Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Showing Professionalism. Each domain is divided into several subsets. Descriptors in each subset provide formative information for student teachers as they are honing their skills and summative assessment at the end of each student teaching quarter.

Aggregated data is provided for every fall and spring quarter between spring 2004 and spring 2007 (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/accred2007/account/sttchsurvey/evals_summary.xls), Typically, fall quarter evaluations (candidates' first quarter of student teaching) included a substantial number of ratings in the emerging categories. By the spring student teaching quarter, however, college supervisors rated the majority of student teachers in the developing and skilled categories in each domain. College supervisors' ratings were cross-checked with the ratings that mentor teachers and student teachers provided for the student teachers' work to check dependability. College supervisors' and candidates' ratings of the candidates' work tended to be somewhat lower than those of the mentor teachers. However, the triangulated data points confirm that candidates who successfully completed their student teaching between spring 2004 and spring 2007 demonstrated solid skills in:

- planning relevant lessons connected to the essential academic learning requirements;
- creating safe learning environments that supported student learning;
- providing instruction that engaged students and helped them learn; and,
- fulfilling professional responsibilities such as reflecting on teaching, communicating with parents, and contributing to the school.

A ***sample*** of the aggregated information from the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric* scores for the 2006-07 cohort who also completed the *Elements of Effective Teaching* Survey include:

- 83% of candidates demonstrated developing and skilled knowledge of content in fall quarter while 100% demonstrated developing and skilled knowledge of content in spring quarter
- 67% demonstrated developing and skilled knowledge of content-related pedagogy in the fall compared to 89% in the spring
- 69% demonstrated knowledge of multicultural, anti-bias planning in the fall as compared to 78% in the spring
- 92% showed developing and skilled abilities to apply the EALRs to selecting instructional goals in the fall, 100% demonstrated these abilities in the spring
- 64% selected appropriate goals for diverse learners in fall quarter, while 92% accomplished this in the spring.

As in the *Elements of Effective Teaching* Survey, assessment ratings increased considerably from the fall to the spring. The scores on the *MIT Student Teaching Rubric* suggest that candidates' self-assessments on the *Elements* survey were realistic.

Mentor Teacher Surveys: As described under Standard IV(G), the MIT program collected feedback from mentor teachers between 2002 and 2007. The rate of return was a very consistent 50-60%. The survey was implemented to provide an easy way for mentor teachers to share their overall impressions and any concerns or problems they encountered during the experience to help us identify any problems that need to be addressed at the program level with the student teaching experience.

We asked our mentor teachers if they were interested in having another student teacher in the future, a question which gives us an overall sense of their satisfaction with our program and helps us in finding future student teaching placements. Over five years, 80% of the cooperating teachers returning the survey said that they are interested in having another Evergreen MIT student teacher.

In fall 2006, we began asking cooperating teachers to comment on the planning, instruction, and classroom management skills of their student teachers. Of the 22 teachers who completed the survey, four commented that classroom management is the one area in most need of attention or improvement but they stated that they were not concerned about their student teacher's level of performance in this area. One comment was made that classroom management was a strength of their student teacher. One comment was made about the need for better preparation in reading instruction. Nine comments specifically mentioned exemplary planning. Five comments specifically mentioned good instruction and one comment suggested some difficulty with large group instruction.

Given the high percentage of mentor teachers who wanted another MIT student teacher, and the relatively few areas of concern, together with candidates' scores on the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* and the *Pedagogy Assessment*, we conclude that practicing K-12 teachers believe that our student teachers have developed the knowledge and skills needed by teachers newly entering the profession.

EBI Survey Results: Information from the EBI surveys must be interpreted cautiously because of fairly small response rates. This review begins with the 2004 report because it is the first one to provide information about alumni who graduated after our last re-accreditation in 2003.

The response rate for alumni increased steadily between 2004 and 2007, moving from 8 responses in 2004 to 14 responses each in 2006 and 2007. Still, these numbers represent less than half the alumni from each cohort. The response rates for principals also increased from 3 responses in 2004 to 8 responses in 2007.

Alumni: The five main factors addressed by EBI are *Develop Instructional Strategies, Develop Reading Skills Strategies, Develop Student Learning, Manage Learning Context and Environment*, and *Overall Program Effectiveness.* Each of these main factors is assessed through responses to a variety of questions within each category.

In each report year from 2004 through 2006, alumni mean scores placed *Overall Program Effectiveness* first in this set of five factors with means far above or moderately above expectations. Standard deviations were smaller than ~ .9, indicating, according to EBI, "high cohesion among respondents." In the 2007 report, *Overall Program Effectiveness* ranked second in the set of five factors, again with a mean score between moderately above and far above expectations. The lowest ranked area each year was *Develop Reading Skills Strategies* with mean scores classified as moderately prepared in 2004 and 2005 but shifting to above-moderately prepared in 2006 and 2007. As indicated earlier in this report, the MIT faculty will continue to develop candidates' knowledge and skills in teaching reading and using assessment in ways that help all children and youth learn. On the other three factors, the majority of alumni mean scores from the 2004 through the 2007 reports approached the extremely prepared category with standard deviations that EBI asserts indicate acceptable to high cohesion among respondents. In both 2006 and 2007, the mean scores on all five main factors, including *Develop Reading Skill Strategies,* were higher than the mean score of the six comparison institutions. When each question under the five main factors was examined, the lowest mean score in 2006 exceeded moderately prepared and the highest mean score approached extremely prepared. In 2007, the lowest mean score indicated above moderate preparation and the highest mean score closely approached extremely prepared.

Principals: In the 2007 report, principals' rated MIT alumni as strongest in *Developing Student Learning* with a mean score approaching extremely prepared. The other four main factor means fell well above the moderately prepared category with standard deviations indicating cohesion among respondents. The mean scores on all five main factors were higher than the mean score of the six comparison institutions. When each question under the five main factors was examined, the lowest mean score still exceeded the moderately prepared category and the highest mean approached extremely prepared. The standard deviations of scores in the 2006 report exceeded the range of acceptable cohesion, according to EBI, and the number of respondents in 2005 (5) and 2004 (3) render any conclusions highly suspect.

Conclusions:

Results from the 2004-2007 EBI Surveys suggest that the MIT program is doing an excellent job of preparing teachers to work with the diverse children and youth in our public schools. Further, the 2007 report corroborates the results of the MIT program Alumni and/or Mentor Teacher Surveys in several important ways:

- 93% of EBI alumni respondents reported that the program prepared them to be teachers; 98% of respondents to the MIT survey reported that the program structure and content prepared them for teaching
- 75% of the EBI principal respondents indicated that MIT alumni were exceptionally or excellently well-prepared to take on teaching responsibilities and another 25% indicated that the alumni were well prepared, reflecting information from MIT's mentor teacher surveys that

indicated satisfaction with our student teachers and the high rate at which our graduates secure teaching positions
- approximately 85% of EBI alumni respondents indicated that they are very likely to continue teaching; 90% of our respondents indicated that they were still teaching
- 92% of EBI alumni respondents indicated that they would recommend the program to others; 89%-91% of respondents to the MIT Alumni Survey said they would recommend the program

In both the 2006 and 2007 EBI surveys, responses to questions about persisting in teaching, satisfaction with the program, and willingness to recommend the program all fell within descriptors that indicated above average or excellent responses. Shifts in these areas between 2006 and 2007 were negligible and did not move the overall scores out of very acceptable ranges. Mean scores in both these years on the lowest and highest mean questions ranged from moderately prepared on two of the lowest mean questions to approaching extremely prepared on the remainder of questions in both the lowest and highest mean categories. In both 2006 and 2007, MIT alumni and principal mean scores for the five main factors were higher than the mean scores of the six comparison institutions.

EBI data alone is not sufficient to conclude that the MIT program is highly effective in preparing candidates to become knowledgeable and skilled teachers of all people's children. Taken together with the other assessments discussed, however, the conclusion IS clear. Candidates' responses to the *Elements of Effective Teaching Survey*, instituted in fall 2006, scores on the MIT *Student Teaching Rubric* and the *Pedagogy Assessment*, and alumni and mentor teacher surveys distributed, collected, and analyzed by the program from 2002-2007, support the assertion that MIT candidates have acquired the skills necessary to successfully teach the diverse students in Washington's schools.

Standard V 1C (w-y): Professional Development

(w) Candidate Reflection: A central focus of the Master in Teaching Program is the development of self-reflective educators who can make informed decisions about how to support student learning and advocate for just and equitable learning opportunities for all students. The process of self-reflection begins in the first quarter of the program as candidates learn how to identify their assumptions and projections through carefully structured field experience assignments. The development of self-reflection continues as candidates are guided to reflect on their preparation to help students achieve the targets set by the essential academic learning requirements through the EALR self-assessment, their cultural encapsulation, the effectiveness of their lesson and unit plans, their understanding of teaching and learning, their positive impact on student learning through their EALR projects, and their growth as teachers as evidenced in their professional growth plans. MIT candidates also participate in many collaborative group projects. These are usually accompanied by written reflections about the individual's participation in and contribution to the group as well as what the person learned. Finally, candidates are required to write self-evaluations as part of the narrative assessments required each quarter. Both formative and summative self-reflections are accompanied by proposals for ways to improve professional preparation, lessons, and effective interactions with others. The links below provide some examples of assignments that help candidates develop a self-reflective stance. Examples of candidates' reflections can be seen in the portfolios available in the Evidence Room.

Field Observation Guides (Year 1)

2008 Cohort: Spring Guide; Winter Guide; Fall Guide
2007 Cohort: Winter/Spring Guide; Fall Guide
2006 Cohort: Field Guidelines
2005 Cohort: Spring Guide; Winter Guide; Fall Guide
2004 Cohort: Winter-Spring Guide; Fall Guide

EALR Self-Assessment Directions
http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2007/fall2005/fall_handouts/assignments/EALR.htm

Portfolio Guidelines
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_A%281a%29#Portfolio_Reviews

EALR Projects (Positive Impact on Student Learning)
Student Teaching Handbook: EALR Project Description

Sample Candidates' Reflections for EALR Projects (Positive Impact on Student Learning)
http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_IV_Criteria_D%283b%29

Professional Growth Plans
Reflections on Practice Syllabus (2007 Cohort)
Professional Growth Plans (2006 Cohort)
Professional Development Project (2004 Cohort)
Professional Growth Plan Form (2003 Cohort)

(x) Educational Technology: Each cohort provides for a variety of experiences with educational technology. For example, candidates create and maintain web pages, use WebCrossing or similar platforms for discussions, locate research in education through a variety of on-line data bases, create PowerPoint presentations, and design web-based curriculum units.

For examples of **web-site development** guidelines, rubrics, and samples, please go to http://www2.evergreen.edu/wikis/teacheraccred/index.php?title=Standard_II_Criteria_B%281b%29#Description and scroll down to Website Development.

Also access the following link for more examples of candidates' **web-sites** http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2007/fall2005/fall_misc/Student_web.htm. The expectations for these web-sites is located at http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2007/fall2005/computer_help/Web pageRubric.htm

A sample set of goals for use on-line data bases for research is at http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2007/fall2005/fall_handouts/assignments/technology/researchQ_hw.htm

A sample presentation rubric, which includes a **PowerPoint** component, is located at http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2005/Winter/PowerPoint%20Rubric.htm

To see the guidelines for **web-based curriculum projects**, please see http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2005/2Winter/WebProject/webprojects.htm

> The rubrics for this project are at:
> http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2005/2Winter/WebProject/rubricann.htm and
> http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2005/2Winter/WebProject/rubriclp.htm
>
> The web-based assessment form for this project is located at
> http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/mit2005/2Winter/WebProject/projectnames.asp
>
> A sample project can be found at
> http://academic.evergreen.edu/p/peraud21/fuelshome.htm

(y) Strategies for Effective Decision Making: One of the components of MIT's Conceptual Framework is called *Democracy and Schooling***.** As part of the focus of this component, "Democracy is presented as a multidimensional concept as prospective teachers are guided toward professional action and reflection on the implications for the role of the teacher in enacting (a) democratic school-based decision making that is inclusive of parents, community members, school personnel and students and (b) democratic classroom learning environments that are learner-centered and collaborative" (http://www.evergreen.edu/mit/publications/guidebook.htm). Based on this commitment, candidates in each cohort study models and procedures developed by educators such as Dewey, Glasser, and Cohen. Each of these educators presents ways that teachers can nurture effective group participation and decision-making for students. Some cohorts also examine and critique decision-making strategies such as simple majority voting, super-majority voting, and consensus. Candidates then apply what they've studied to their work in collaborative project groups, seminars, cohort community meetings where decisions that affect the cohort may be made, and practicum and student teaching work with students.

Based on our evaluation of the data supplied in this report, on the MIT Accreditation web page, and in the Evidence Room, the program meets or exceeds standard for each criterion in Standard V.