

TITLE II INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Annual Institutional Report on Teacher Preparation: **Academic Year 2006-2007**

Institution name: University of Washington-Seattle
Respondent name: Charles Peck
Respondent title: Director of Teacher Education
Phone number: 206-616-1176
Fax: 206-221-3296
E-Mail address: capeck@u.washington.edu
Address: College of Education
211 Miller Hall, Box 353600
City: Seattle
State: Washington
Zip code: 98195-3600

Section IA. Pass Rates

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing residency certificate program requirements in the 2006-2007 **academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007)**. Do *not* include completers of alternative-route programs.

Table 1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program, 2006-2007

Institution Name: UW-Seattle					
Academic year: 2006-2007					
Number of program completers: 128					
Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	# taking assess.	# passing assess.	Institut. pass rate	Statewide pass rate
<i>Academic Content Areas (math, English, biology etc.)</i>					
Biology	0235	9			100%
Chemistry	0245	3			100%
Designated World Languages: French	0173	2			
Designated World Languages: German	0181				
Designated World Languages: Spanish	0191	5			93%
Earth Science	0571				100%
English Language Arts	0041	15	15	100%	99%
History	0081	8			100%
Mathematics	0061	7			100%
Music: Choral	0113	17	17	100%	100%
Music: General	0113	17	17	100%	100%
Music: Instrumental	0113	17	17	100%	100%
Physics	0265	2			93%
Science	0435	12	12	100%	100%
Social Studies	0081	8			100%
Theatre Arts	0640	2			100%
Visual Arts	0133				100%
<i>Other Content Areas (elementary education, career/technical education, health education, etc.)</i>					
Agriculture	0700				
Business Education	0100				
Early Childhood Education	0021				100%
Elementary Education	0014	27	27	100%	100%
Family and Consumer Sciences	0120				
Health/Fitness	0856				100%
Library Media	0310				
Marketing	0560				
Middle School English	0049				100%
Middle School Social Studies	0089				100%
Middle School Math	0069				95%
Middle School Science	0439				100%
Reading/Literacy	0300				95%

Technology Education	0050				
Traffic Safety	0867				
<i>Teaching Special Populations (special education, ESL etc.)</i>					
Early Childhood Special Education	0690				100%
Special Education	0353	37	37	100%	100%
Bilingual Education	0360	5			98%
English as a Second Language	0360	5			98%

Table 2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program, 2006-2007

Institution Name: UW-Seattle				
Academic year: 2006-2007				
Total number of program completers:				
Type of Assessment	# taking assess	# passing assess	Institut. pass rate	Statewide pass rate
<i>Aggregate: Basic Skills*</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Aggregate: Professional Knowledge*</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Aggregate: Academic Content Areas (math, English, biology etc.)*</i>	151	151	100%	3093
<i>Aggregate: Other Content Areas (career/technical education, health education, etc.)*</i>				
<i>Aggregate: Teaching Special Populations (special education, ESL,..)*</i>				
<i>Performance Assessments*</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA
Summary of Individual Assessments**	128	128	100%	2634
*Aggregate pass rate – Numerator: Number who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization). Denominator: Number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).				
**Summary pass rate – Numerator: Number who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization. Denominator: Number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).				

Section IB. Other strategies to assess content knowledge

Describe any **strategies** other than the WEST-E used to assess the content knowledge of your program completers.

Faculty and staff representatives from the appropriate University departments carry out initial screening of all transcripts and other evidence presented by the applicants when seeking subject specific endorsements, e.g. mathematics department evaluate materials for all those seeking mathematics endorsements. Those seeking the elementary endorsement present their transcripts for review by the admissions advisors within the College of Education. Grade transcripts, course syllabi,

and other materials are evaluated. Students must show satisfactory grades in the prerequisite courses. Each department or subject area field committee sets minimum grade point averages required in individual courses and/or across courses to assure that students are sufficiently competent in the subject matter to prepare to teach.

Students who have not completed all requirements for a specific subject endorsement prior to program entry are assisted in selecting and enrolling in appropriate courses toward that endorsement as available during the program.

The final portfolio required of all students at the completion of the MIT program includes evidence of specific pedagogical content knowledge, that is, the ability to translate content knowledge into learning activities for students. The final portfolio is assessed following a carefully designed rubric based on the learning goals and targets of the program

Section IC. Positive impact

Describe the **current strategies** used to assess the program completers' "positive impact on student learning".

Two strategies currently used to assess the positive impact on student learning are observation and portfolio review. Students are observed by highly qualified field supervisors for a minimum of nine times across the second, third, and fourth quarters of field experience. The observations by these trained university supervisors are based on the state Pedagogy Assessment and a carefully designed institutional instrument that includes specific data gathering and evaluation on positive impact on learning.

The final portfolio completed in the fifth quarter of the program must contain artifacts, e.g. lesson plans, assessments, student work, and reflective entry slips from the student teacher that specifically demonstrate positive impact on student learning. The portfolio entries are evaluated according to a rubric that includes this element.

Section II. Program information (Do not include candidates in alternative-route programs.)

(A) Number of students in your teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please consider the number of students enrolled (full admission status) in your teacher preparation program during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007), including all areas of specialization, in providing the following data.

1. Total number (headcount) of students enrolled (full admission status) during Fall Quarter or Fall Semester: 259 (**note: this number may not always be equal to the number of program completers for September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007**)

(B). Information about supervised student teaching: **(for the purpose of this report, student teaching refers to the culminating clinical experience used to determine candidates' competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing)**

1. Total number of students enrolled in supervised student teaching during the 2006-2007 academic year: 128

2. Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

12 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

0 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

20 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

3 Other, please describe. *Doctoral students*

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

3a. **Total faculty (headcount)** assigned to supervise student teaching during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 35

3b. **Total faculty FTE** assigned to supervise student teaching during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 7.53

Define the process that was used to calculate faculty FTE:

17 students = .5 FTE

4. The student/faculty ratio, based upon the **total number** of faculty was 1:3.66

5. The student/faculty ratio, based upon faculty **FTE** was: 1:17

6. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: 40 hours. The total

number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is 11. The total number of hours required is 440 hours.

7. If your teacher preparation program offers a range of hours of supervised student teaching/internship options, please describe:

(C) Please describe the range of field experiences required in your teacher preparation program per **WAC 181-78A-264 (6)**. “Field experience” is defined by WAC 181-78A-010 (5) as “a sequence of learning experiences which occur in actual school settings or clinical or laboratory settings. Such learning experiences are related to specific program outcomes and are designed to integrate educational theory, knowledge, and skills in actual practice under the direction of a qualified supervisor.”

FIELD EXPERIENCE REQUIRED HOURS

The elementary and secondary students spend blocks of time in the schools from the time they enter the program until they complete student teaching at the end of the fourth quarter. Students in both programs spend a minimum of 24 weeks in full-time placement (full teacher’s day). At least 11 of these are during the student teaching quarter.

The secondary students are placed in three different school placements during their program. Two placements during the first quarter allow students to experience a middle or junior high school and a high school – one school is more diverse in population and one is less. During their second through fourth quarters they are assigned to the level they desire for student teaching.

Elementary students typically experience three or four different school settings. They are in two different placements during the first quarter, one at the primary level and one at the intermediate level. One placement is a school with a relatively high level of cultural and socio-economic diversity and the other is a less diverse school. During the second quarter students are placed in a setting opposite to that in which they want to do their student teaching. During the third and fourth quarters students are placed in a school with a class in their desired grade range.

(D) Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

1. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?
 X Yes No
2. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as “at risk” or “low-performing” by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)?
 Yes X No

Section III. General Information (Do *not* include information on alternative-route programs.)

- (A) Identify the federal, state, and private grants to improve teacher quality received by your teacher preparation program for the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007):

Faculty

- * *Dr. Deborah McCutchen received a grant from the institute for Educational Sciences to study the processes that enable children to fuel their vocabulary growth via reading.*
- * *Dr Carol Davis was awarded \$1.6 million funding for a 4 year project on developing a model to provide tertiary or individualized positive behavior supports to students with challenging behaviors and their schools.*
- * *Dr Carol Davis received a 4-year, \$800,000 grant to prepare new special education teachers to work with students with severe disabilities.*
- * *Dr Joe Jenkins received a 4-year, \$800,00 grant to prepare special education teachers for students with learning disabilities.*
- * *Dr. Richard Neel received a 3-year IES grant for \$1.5 million to look into the ways children with behavioral disabilities can be helped to succeed in school.*
- * *Dr. Jennifer Stone received a Royalty Research Fund grant to conduct a survey of high school students' in- and out-of-school literacies and work with a local teacher study group who is interested in incorporating these literacies into their classroom practices.*
- * *Dr. Susan Sandal was awarded a research grant from the Institute of Education Sciences to study the impact of different approaches to professional development on preschool teachers' use of embedded instruction practices in inclusive preschools.*
- * *Dr. Beth West received a grant from the ARC Foundation for a study of the diagnosis and post-diagnosis needs and supports of Asian immigrant parents who have a child with a developmental disability.*

Students

- * *Doctoral student, Julie Kang, received one of the Huckabay awards for a project that will combine her oral history and multicultural education knowledge and expertise*

(B) Identify any awards received by your program, your program faculty, or your students during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007):

Faculty

- * *Dr. Debbie Kerdeman received an honorary doctorate from Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles.*
- * *Dr. Bill McDiarmid, chaired an International Review Committee for the doctoral program of the Institute for Education Development in Pakistan.*
- * *Dr. John Bransford was selected to present the annual Holland lecture at Washington State University.*
- * *Dr. Roxanne Hudson was invited to San Francisco to present information about reading fluency assessment and instruction at the Consortium on Reading Excellence Literacy Leadership Summit.*

Students

- * *Doctoral students, Pamela Trivedi and Erin Olson received the Student Research Award from the Washington State Association of School Psychologist for their poster at a recent WSSAP meeting.*
- * *Doctoral student, Lisa Hoyt, was featured in the Renton Online Reporter for her role in starting the Renton Academy, an new school modeled on the Re-Education model.*
- * *Doctoral graduate, Tony Smith, received the outstanding student research award from the National Reading conference for his dissertation, "The middle school literacy coach: Roles, contexts, and connections to teaching."*

(C) 1. Describe the applicant selection process for your program, including a list of specific admission requirements other than passage of the WEST-B:

GPA Letters of recommendation Interviews

GRE Personal essay or philosophy statement

Other writing sample?

Other: *Freewrite, 60 hours experience with youth*

A three- tiered evaluation process is used.

- Tier one: Files are reviewed for completeness and screened by an admissions counselor to determine if they meet the basic prerequisites. All applications determined to be complete are reviewed by a panel consisting of a College of Education faculty member, a teacher or administrator from our Professional Education Advisory Board, and the Administrative Field Coordinator. An appropriate Arts & Science department faculty member also reads the secondary applications. Panel members rate the applications on five characteristics: Academic background, evaluation from experience with youth, personal goal statement, potential for increasing diversity in the teaching profession, and recommendations. Applicants are also given a holistic rating based on the entire profile. The committee of readers meet to review their responses, talk over any disagreements, and reach consensus.*
- Tier II: The Director of Teacher Education and the Administrative Field Coordinator meet to review all ratings and identify individuals to advance to the interview stage. Each applicant participates in a group interview and is individually interviewed by a two- or three-person team composed minimally of a faculty member and the administrative field coordinator. Applicants in World Languages also are interviewed in their language by two faculty members from the appropriate language department in Arts & Sciences. Prior to the interview, applicants are given a written prompt to hand write a short essay (Freewrite). A rating form is used by the interview team to assess language usage and content as well as mechanics of spelling, grammar and vocabulary. Interviewees are asked several standard questions as well as additional questions based on their records or responses.*
- Tier III: Information is collated and the Director and Administrative Field Coordinator meet and review all data to insure the procedures have been followed and final decisions on admission are made.*

2. Number of applicants for the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 335

3. Number of applicants not admitted during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 160

4. Number of program completers for the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 128

5. Number of candidates who completed student teaching/internship, but did not complete the program during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 0

6. Number of candidates who completed the program, but were not recommended for certification during the 2006-2007 academic year (September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007): 0

(D) Identify the “screening” points for your program candidates:

1. Describe the types of “screening” activities for your candidates.

Each quarter multiple measures are used to evaluate student progress through the program. A student must earn at least a 2.7 in each graded course to progress to the next quarter and must clear any incomplete grades by the end of the following academic quarter. In no case is a student advanced to full-time student teaching with an incomplete grade or a grade below 2.7. The criteria for grading vary from course to course and include assessment of performance on written research papers, short essays, journals, role playing, reflections on lessons taught, e-mail discussion group participation, class participation in cooperative learning groups, oral presentations, lesson plans and micro-teaching, and formal examinations. In the field, students are observed by a University Supervisors and Cooperating teachers both independently and as a team. The minimum numbers of evaluations varies by quarter from one to four. Each student has a minimum of 9 observations and conferences with the University Supervisor during the program. The cooperating teacher must recommend the student as ready for student teaching before the full-time student teaching process can begin. Both the cooperating teacher and University Supervisor must also recommend the candidate for certification at the completion of the student teaching experience.

2. As the result of your screening process/activities, identify the number of candidates who did not continue in your program in 2006-2007: 4

(E) Describe how your program provides for experience(s) with diverse populations.

UW has a network of partner schools selected with specific attention to the issue of placing students in schools with high proportions of students receiving free and reduced lunch program, racial and language diversity. At present a network of 19 such schools (elementary, middle schools, and high schools) are the primary placement sites for all TEP students.

The secondary students are placed in three different schools during their program. Two placements during the first quarter allow students to experience middle or junior high school and high schools. During their second through fourth quarters they are assigned to the level they desire for student teaching.

Elementary students typically experience four different school settings. They are in two different placements during the first quarter, one at the primary level and one at the intermediate level. During the second quarter students are placed in a setting complementary to that in which they want to do their student teaching. During the third and fourth quarters students are placed in a school with a class in their desired grade range

Section IV. Contextual Information.

Please use this space to provide information that describes:

(A) Student population served by your institution

The University of Washington –Seattle serves a student population of approximately 39,250. More than 11,000 of these are graduate and professional students. About 56 percent of all graduate students, and 87 percent of all professional students are Washington State residents.

(B) Mission of the “unit”

The College of Education at the University of Washington believes that an effective public education system for a diverse citizenry is the cornerstone of a democratic society. To that end, we dedicate our resources to helping to make an excellent education a daily reality for every student in every community across this state and country. To fulfill this mission, the College constantly works to:

- *Advance Knowledge through Research. One of the primary responsibilities of the University of Washington College of Education is to generate new knowledge about teaching, learning, and education. Creative and careful research engenders wisdom to guide and, when necessary, challenge perceptions and practices. The College is committed to ensuring that sound knowledge generated by research informs practice and policy throughout the state and nation, thereby helping to make excellent education a daily reality for every student.*
- *Prepare and Support Educators and Educational Leaders throughout Their Careers. The shortage of effective educators in all roles – teachers, principals, administrators, professors, and specialists – is well known. Increasingly fewer people choose educational careers, and those who do often do not stay. A major goal of the College is to recruit and prepare significantly more educators from diverse groups and create programs and partnerships designed to reduce the current high rate of attrition.*
- *Connect Research, Policy & Practice. The extraordinary challenges confronting public education require that we connect our research and our teaching to public policy in more substantive ways. To that end, we are creating new opportunities for convening researchers, educators, policymakers, and community members to illuminate problems and plan courses of action.*
- *Contribute to the Innovative and Responsible Use of Technology in Education. Advances in technology are presenting new possibilities for education. Our goal is the thoughtful and systematic integration of technology into the College’s programs, courses, and research. An emerging strength of the College is that it simultaneously explores new possibilities for the use of technology in learning and teaching while contributing critical perspectives about the role of technology in education.*
- *Provide for Ongoing Renewal. The vitality and productivity of an institution depend on its capacity for measured change and ongoing renewal. We are committed to regularly reviewing our programs so they remain responsive, relevant, and effective. More important, the College will work to support and revitalize the dedication, ideals, and intellectual capacity of the individuals who make the programs work and the institution thrive.*

(C) Institution (history, mission)

The University of Washington was, in 1878, one of the first public universities to establish an undergraduate college of education dedicated to preparation of secondary teachers and public school administrators. As the role of schools became more complex, the mission of the College broadened to include the education of elementary teachers and a wide variety of other specialists and higher education personnel. By the 1980s the University recast itself as a major research institution and asked the College to reassess its own mission. The College focused on strengthening its graduate programs and enhancing its research productivity. In the 1980s educational renewal emerged on national and state agendas. The College became a strong, research-oriented college with expertise in education research and model development. The development of new knowledge and application of it to school settings fostered additional review and rethinking in the late 1980s. In 1995 the 5th year teacher certification program was replaced with a Master in Teaching program to reflect the increased knowledge teachers need to be effective.

(D) Type(s) and delivery of teacher preparation program(s) offered (e.g. undergraduate, MIT, school partnership)

The University of Washington – Seattle offers three teacher certification routes. The largest program offered through the College of Education is an MIT degree program with certification for students in elementary and secondary education programs. Also offered through the College of Education is an M.Ed. degree in Special Education with concurrent certification in special education (moderate severe profound, elementary level, and emotional and behavioral disabilities or early childhood special education). The School of Music offers an undergraduate certificate program in music education through their Music Education department

(E) Faculty composition (e.g. full-time tenure track, National Board certified teachers, etc.)

The College of Education has 58 tenure-line full-time faculty, all of whom hold doctorate degrees. There are 41 non-tenure line faculty working in teacher preparation who serve either in wholly administrative or supervisory positions. Occasionally a person who is not a full-time tenure-line faculty member may teach in the programs when full-time tenure-line faculty members are not available or do not have appropriate expertise. Every effort is made to fill these positions with either a person with a doctorate in the appropriate field, an experienced master teacher if appropriate, or an advanced doctoral student. These individuals are thoroughly screened and student evaluations are required to inform the college of their success.

(F) Collaborative activities

The University of Washington Teacher Education programs are offered in partnership with the University and multiple Partner Schools in eleven surrounding school districts. In the 2006-2007 year, a total of 13 elementary schools and 23 secondary schools were partners in teacher education efforts. The University is currently refocusing these partner school relationships on a smaller network of 19 schools serving highly diverse student populations. Partner schools in six of the eleven school districts benefited from NSF-funded projects for improving mathematics understanding of teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school level (ECML). Elementary teachers in partner schools in five districts participated in professional development in science education, also through a UW program funded by NSF.

Section IV. Certification.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report is accurate and complete and conforms to the definitions and instructions used in the *Higher Education Act, Title II: Reporting Reference and User Manual*.

_____ (Signature)

Charles A Peck Name of responsible institutional representative
for teacher preparation program

Director of Teacher Education Title

Certification of review of submission:

_____ (Signature)

Patricia A Wasley Name of President/Chief Executive (or designee)

Dean, College of Education Title