

Attachment 1.5.d: Findings of Other Accreditation Associations for the Preparation of Education Professionals

- I. Report of Center for Quality Assurance in Teacher Education
International Recognition of Teacher Education 2010 – p. 1
- II. Report of Follow-up Visit 2013 – p. 49

Center for Quality Assurance in Teacher Education

International Recognition of Teacher Education

Board of International Reviewers:

Carol Vukelich, Chair
Pauletta Bracy
Abdullateef Haidar
Bonnie Konopak
Steve Lilly

Recognition Visit to:

QATAR UNIVERSITY
Doha, Qatar
October 29-November
2, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary for Professional Education Unit.....	4
I. Introduction.....	5
II. Conceptual Framework.....	10
III. Standards.....	21
Standard 1.....	23
Standard 2.....	23
Standard 3.....	28
Standard 4.....	39
Standard 5.....	40
Standard 6.....	43

**SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
Center for Quality Assurance in International Education**

Institution: Qatar University

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

M = Standard Met

NM = Standard Not Met

NA = Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

Introduction

Qatar

Qatar is an Arab emirate located on the northeast coast of the Arabian Peninsula and bordered by Saudi Arabia. Its population doubled from 2004-2008 and now is 1.6 million, with 800,000 living in the capital of Doha. Twenty percent of the population is Qatari nationals. Formerly a British protectorate, Qatar became independent in 1971, and the current ruler, Emir Hamad Bin Khalifa AL-Thani, has led the nation since 1995.

With rapid growth due to an economy based on oil and natural gas, Qatar has recognized education as playing a central role in national development. In 1995, the Qatar Foundation was established to support the leadership's vision as a knowledge-based country. The Foundation currently has over 30 institutes that foster education and research, including the Rand-Qatar Policy Institute. This institute developed *Education for a New Era: Design and Implementation of K-12 Education Reform in Qatar*, which provided the framework for school reform.

In 2002, the Supreme Education Council (SEC) was established to direct the nation's education reform efforts. Two institutes have primary responsibility: (1) the Education Institute oversees and supports Qatar's Independent Schools, and (2) the Evaluation Institute conducts student testing, monitors student learning, and evaluates school performance. In contrast to an earlier, centralized model under the Ministry of Education, Independent Schools are granted autonomy to carry out their educational mission while being held accountable to meet standards. Currently, there are 102 Independent Schools, with 77 other semi-independent schools that are in the process of becoming fully independent.

In 2006, the Qatar Foundation initiated the Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF) that provides funds for a range of research, including education. Competitive grants are awarded to researchers at all levels, from students to professionals in public, private, and academic sectors. Grant funds are also provided for undergraduate research through the Undergraduate Research Experience Program and the Young Scientists Research Experience Program to encourage research and innovation.

In 2007, the Education Institute of the Supreme Education Council developed the first set of standards for school educators, the National Professional Standards for Teachers and Schools Leaders. These standards describe what educators need to know, understand, and be able to do. The two sets of standards share common commitments:

- Promoting student learning
- Creating safe, supportive, and challenging learning environments
- Effectively using resources to promote student learning
- Building effective school-community partnerships
- Working in teams
- Reflecting on professional practice.

In 2009, the Evaluation Institute established educator licensure requirements and procedures for the purposes of licensing teachers and school leaders according to the national standards.

Governed by the Qatar Office for Registration and Licensing for Teachers and School Leaders, the process focuses on a portfolio process whereby candidates submit documents addressing national standards and undergo a school-based attestation process. Currently, the process is being implemented, with on-going monitoring and review to improve its effectiveness.

Qatar University

The College of Education began in 1973 as the first higher education institute in Qatar. The University was founded in 1977 with four colleges and now has seven colleges: Arts & Sciences, Business & Economics, Education, Engineering, Law, Pharmacy, and Sharia and Islamic Studies. A Board of Regents sets policy for the university and monitors its implementation.

In 2008-2009, there were 8,687 students registered, approximately 80 percent female and 66 percent Qataris. In addition, there were 681 faculty and administrators, with 30 percent Qataris. Undergraduate courses are taught on separate campuses for male and female students, while graduate programs are taught in co-educational settings.

In 2003 the University began a reform initiative, assisted by the Rand-Qatar Policy Institute, to evaluate and improve the quality of instructional and educational services. Similar to the national reform efforts, the move was from a traditional, centralized model to a more autonomous system with greater accountability. The first strategic plan extended from 2006-2009, and the second planning process began in 2009. Currently, the University is seeking Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) regional accreditation. In addition, there is a requirement that all units pursue external accreditation where it exists or external review where it does not exist.

As part of strategic planning, the University's vision and mission were articulated, focusing on the belief that "Qatar University is an intellectual and scholarly community characterized by open discussion, free exchange of ideas, respectful debate, and a commitment to rigorous inquiry" (IR, p. 3).

Vision:

Qatar University shall be a model national university in the region, recognized for high-quality education and research and for being a leader of economic and social development.

Mission:

Qatar University is the national institution of higher education in Qatar. It provides high quality undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare competent graduates, destined to shape the future of Qatar. The university community has diverse and committed faculty who teach and conduct research, which address relevant local and regional challenges, advance knowledge, and contribute actively to the needs and aspirations of society.

In addition, key performance areas were established for all programs:

- Prepare competent graduates by providing high quality education
- Conduct quality research that addresses contemporary challenges and advances knowledge

- Identify and meet the needs and aspirations of society
- Provide effective and efficient support and facilities to academic missions and maintain a supportive environment for the university community.

College of Education

The College of Education collaborates with other university colleges, K-12 schools, and education agencies, including the SEC, to prepare educators. The College has two departments, Educational Sciences and Psychological Sciences (two other departments in Art Education and Physical Education are being phased out). Educational Sciences offers a new B.Ed. in Primary Education, post-baccalaureate Diplomas in Primary and Secondary Education, and a M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. Psychological Sciences offers post-baccalaureate Diplomas in Early Childhood and Special Education and a M.Ed. in Special Education.

In 2009-2010, there were 10 candidates enrolled in four B.Ed. tracks: Early Childhood, English, Math/Science, and Arabic/Islamic Studies. In the Diploma program there were 12 candidates in Primary Education, 7 in Special Education, and 7 in Secondary Education: English, Chemistry, Arabic, and Islamic Studies (Math, Biology, Physics, and Social Studies had no enrollees). At the advanced level, there were 27 candidates enrolled in the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership and 5 candidates in the M.Ed. in Special Education.

There are 33 professional education faculty, including 31 full-time in the unit, 1 full-time in the University/part-time in the unit, and 1 part-time adjunct. All have doctorates in their area of specialization.

As the only public comprehensive university in Qatar, the College of Education has played a significant role in nation-wide educational reform. The College supervises an Independent School, both supporting the administrators and teachers and using this experience to improve its programs. New programs have been initiated to support reform changes, such as the Diploma Program in Primary Education and the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. Faculty members provide professional development to school educators through the Center of Education Development and Research (CEDR), as well as host professional conferences in the region, including Special Education and Early Childhood Education. Faculty and administrators provide leadership on national committees by developing standards, frameworks for professional development, and an evaluation system. In addition, they are very familiar with expectations of the new national standards for teachers and school leaders and have aligned their programs with these standards to ensure their candidates' success. As seen in the next section, Conceptual Framework, the heart of the nation's reform is a foundation for the philosophy, purposes, and goals of the unit.

Circumstances Affecting the Visit

Due to the serious illness of the Associate Dean responsible for IRTE preparation, the unit faced considerable challenges in fully developing and implementing the assessment system.

Conceptual Framework

Guided by both national and university reform efforts, the College of Education has moved forward with initiatives to strengthen its programs and improve teaching and leadership in K-12 schools. As part of this process, the unit has collaborated with its stakeholders to develop a conceptual framework for the purposes of creating a shared vision and providing direction for candidate performance, programs, and the unit.

Background

In 2007, the College elected to seek International Recognition in Teacher Education and began the process of articulating its values, beliefs, and theoretical foundations. The College held a series of discussions to talk about important aspects of educator preparation, culminating in a meeting with representatives from the Ministry of Education, Supreme Education Council, candidates, and administrators and teachers from several Independent Schools to share these ideas. A draft of the conceptual framework developed by the College was discussed and approved along with a graphic representation. At the same time, the College's vision and mission statements were revisited in light of the conceptual framework and also approved. Faculty agreed that the conceptual framework was built upon shared ideas prior to 2007 and that the process provided an opportunity to articulate these ideas and to use them to ground their courses, programs, and the unit.

Vision

The College of Education at Qatar University will be a leading institution in the preparation of education professionals through outstanding teaching, scholarship, and leadership in order to enhance the future of coming generations.

Mission

The College of Education is committed to providing excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of education professionals by establishing a foundation in which life-long learning, teaching, research, and community partnerships are fostered. The College fulfills its commitments by providing:

- To its members an educational, motivational, and supportive environment for both learning and teaching in a climate characterized by responsible freedom.
- To society highly qualified education professionals and on-going professional development, by supporting scholarly activities, and by sharing the responsibility of educational reform through effective partnerships.

Conceptual Framework

The unit's conceptual framework is summarized in the following phrase: *Together we shape the future through excellence in teaching, scholarship, and leadership.*

Together includes both collaboration with other stakeholders and commitment to diversity, with the goal of excellence for all K-12 students. Collaboration is defined as a shared responsibility among all interested and invested in the state's growth and education of learners who are the future leaders of Qatar. Commitment to diversity focuses on honoring and valuing the contributions of all stakeholders, particularly the multiple cultural, linguistic, and historical groups that contribute to the strength of the educational environment.

Shaping the future includes faculty, candidates, and graduates who are involved in, and expected to contribute to, influencing policy and practices in K-12. Shaping the future is directly related to excellent teaching, scholarship, and leadership, which are aligned with University and College expectations. Key points for each element are listed below.

Teaching. Candidates must demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected in the learning outcomes and QNPS to facilitate student learning in K-12 classrooms (Darling-Hammond, 2006). In addition, candidates must develop teacher efficacy—believing it possible to influence learner achievement regardless of socioeconomic level, family, and other factors (Zientek, 2007).

Scholarship. Candidates are prepared to think critically, solve problems, make decisions, reflect on sound data, and then model these practices. In addition, they are expected to engage in ongoing reflective practices and to make informed decisions about their teaching and students' learning (Bowden, 2007; Gray, Chang, & Radloff, 2007).

Leadership. All candidates are expected to show leadership through ethical behavior and initiative. In addition, all candidates are expected to help others achieve goals and improve student learning. In particular, school administrator candidates are leaders for school, while teacher candidates are leaders for other teachers and for program development (Conley & Muncey, 1999, Urbanski & Nickolaou, 1997).

To represent the conceptual framework, the graphic design incorporates the color blue (representing the College), a plant (indicating shaping/growth), and the Qatar building architecture to symbolize Qatar/Arabic culture. The design includes the words “Together we shape the future” and “Teaching, Scholarship, Leadership.”

The knowledge base supporting the conceptual framework is primarily at the course and program levels. The programs have contextualized the concepts of the framework, as well as the resulting outcomes and proficiencies (below), according to their own theory and research base. While several references are given for aspects of the three elements, the knowledge base at the unit level is minimal.

Candidate Outcomes and Proficiencies

For each of the three elements in the conceptual framework, the unit has identified eight learning outcomes and related proficiencies.

- Teaching
 - Content: Demonstrate deep understanding of key theories and concepts
 - Pedagogy: Ensure effective planning and use of multiple strategies to maximize student learning
 - Technology: Evaluate and use current technologies for instruction and management
 - Diversity: Respond to every student's uniqueness and foster successful learning experiences to meet individual differences

- Scholarship
 - Scholarly inquiry: Understand tools and methods of inquiry and use data-driven decision-making to maximize teaching and learning
 - Problem solving: Gather, analyze, and plan a sequence of steps to achieve learning objectives; process a variety of factors to identify solutions and make well informed decisions
- Leadership
 - Ethical values: Apply professional ethics in all contexts and have enduring respect for self confidence in teaching as a profession
 - Initiative: Demonstrate qualities of leadership to plan, collaborate, and communicate effectively

Professional Dispositions

There are no unit-wide dispositions identified. The Diploma and B.Ed. programs have adopted the dispositions of the Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers (QNPS) that are listed below, based on a review of the QNPS knowledge base and the alignment with INTASC dispositions and the elements of the conceptual framework. The M.Ed. programs have not formally identified dispositions but informally draw from the outcomes of ethical values and initiative.

- Teaching:
 - Ensures that all students can learn at high levels and achieve success
 - Supports the idea that students with special needs learn in different ways
 - Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful for all students
 - Views language, literacy, and numeracy developments as the responsibility of all teachers
 - Creates supportive learning environments in which students' ideas, beliefs, and opinions are shared and valued
 - Utilizes ICT skills in the planning, teaching, and management of student learning
 - Conducts assessment in an ethical way
 - Has enthusiasm for both teaching and the subject area
 - Provides meaningful connections between the subject content and everyday life
 - Supports independent as well as collaborative learning
- Scholarship:
 - Develops research-supported teaching strategies
 - Engages in reflective practices
 - Uses data to plan and review student's learning experience
 - Utilizes online library as a resource as lesson plans are developed
 - Selects strategies and resources that facilitate the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities
 - Pursues opportunities to grow professionally and participate in life-long learning
- Leadership:
 - Uses effective language in communicative situations and various social functions
 - Shows respect for individual and cultural differences
 - Provides care and support for students
 - Provides a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole

- Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help
- Demonstrates a commitment to the Education for a New Era reforms

Alignment of Conceptual Framework

Teaching, scholarship, and leadership are aligned with institutional, state, and, for some programs, professional standards. First, the three elements and eight outcomes reflect the University's mission and support the four key performance areas (see Introduction).

Second, the College has aligned its outcomes with the Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders (QNPS), including 12 standards for teachers and 7 standards for school leaders. In addition, each program has developed a matrix aligning the QNPS standards with its curriculum. The Evaluation Institute of the SEC has developed a system for teacher and school leader licensure, and the QNPS standards will be used to evaluate licensure in a portfolio-based system. As a result, both teaching and school leadership candidates should be well prepared to qualify for licensure as in their respective fields.

Third, some programs have aligned their curriculum with international standards. For example, the B.Ed. programs are aligned with INTASC, the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership is aligned with ELCC, and the M.Ed. program in Special Education is aligned with CEC.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

The Bachelor Degree in Primary Education is a new program with ten candidates who began the program in spring 2010 and another ten candidates who began the program fall 2010. Due to the program's newness, only minimal candidate data are available.

While the unit identified the exit survey as a feature of its candidate assessment system, the items on the survey are unit operation items and, as such, are unrelated to candidate performances. The exit survey is being revised to include items related to the unit's outcomes; the revised version will be used for the first time spring 2011. Consequently, data from this instrument will not be addressed in this standard. In addition, the Diversity Survey data will be addressed in Standard 4, not in this Standard.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Bachelor in Education in Primary Education. At this time, the only measure of the candidates' content knowledge is their grades in three EDUC courses. To date, cohort 1's content course GPA is 3.12. No candidate scored below the acceptable level, a grade of C, in these courses.

Diploma Programs. The unit has specified admission criteria candidates must meet (e.g., a minimum GPA of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale for admission, TOEFL scores of at least 450 [except in the Arabic track], participation in an interview, preparation of a writing sample—for select applicants). In addition, candidates applying for the Secondary Diploma Programs must pass a content exam developed by unit faculty in the appropriate subject. Admitted candidate data reveal that the unit systematically applied its benchmark.

Midway through the program and during their internship, candidates submit exhibits in an e-portfolio. The intent of the midway portfolio submission is for feedback to the candidate and for the unit to obtain a baseline rating. The data presented below are reflective of candidate performance midway through their program. The unit intends to share these data with the candidates so that they might earn higher scores at the final portfolio submission as they exit their program. Given the very small number of candidates in each program, poor performance on the part of a single candidate or few candidates can have a significant impact on the reported data. Such is the case with the Cohort 2 data presented below. Three candidates were terminated from the Diploma program because of their poor performance. Aggregated content knowledge data for the Diploma candidates are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Initial and Advanced Program Candidates' Content Knowledge

Programs	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	12%	23%	27%	23%	15%
Diploma – Cohort 3	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
M.Ed. in Special Education	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%

Diploma candidates' content knowledge also is assessed during the candidates' internship semester. Four items on the Classroom Performance Assessment (CPA) instrument assess the interns' subject area knowledge. University supervisors, the mentors, and the interns submit ratings on these four items. Fall 2009 final assessment data indicate supervisor mean ratings ranging from 1.69-1.94, mentor mean ratings ranging from 1.73-2.00, and intern mean ratings ranging from 1.75-2.0 on these four items. (The CPA scale is a 2-point scale, with 1= partly meets the standard and 2 = meets the standard).

Master of Education in Special Education. Candidates admitted to the Master of Education in Special Education must demonstrate a Bachelor's degree grade point average of at least 2.5 on a 4.0 scale, a TOEFL score of 520 or better, and participate in an interview. The first two criteria are Qatar University requirements. The admission data indicate that admitted students meet all criteria.

The unit also uses course grades in program courses as a measure of candidates' content knowledge. The following data indicate the level of content knowledge performance: Semester 1, Cohort 1 overall mean 2.52; Semester 2, Cohort 1, 3.60; Semester 3, Cohort 3, 3.60.

Candidates submit exhibits in their e-portfolio for the first time at the end of the second semester. The exhibits are scored using the same rubric as is used for assessing the Diploma candidates' exhibits. Data from this submission for these candidates are presented in Table 1.1 above.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates.

Diploma Program. Diploma candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed in two ways, through exhibits presented in their e-portfolios and performance during their internship as measured by the Classroom Performance Assessment (CPA). Multiple CPA items assess these candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills. On the final evaluation in fall 2009, all raters' (supervisor, mentor and intern) mean ratings on every item was 1.13 or higher on the 2-point scale (see definition of scoring above).

The Diploma candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills also are assessed through the exhibits they submit in their e-folio. Data from the candidates' first submission of their e-folio, end of their second semester in the program, are presented in Table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2 Initial and Advanced Teacher Candidates – Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills

Programs	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	23%	23%	31%	23%	0%
Diploma – Cohort 3	33%	33%	34%	0%	0%
M.Ed. in Special Education	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%

Master of Education in Special Education. This program's candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed in one way, through the exhibits they submit in their e-folio, with the e-folio submitted at the end of the candidates' second semester in the program and at the end of the internship. Data from the first submission by this program's candidates are presented in Table 1.2 above.

All Programs. The unit also administered a newly-developed post graduate survey. Its first administration was with fall 2009 graduates. A section of this instrument includes items linked to pedagogical content knowledge (teaching practices). Alumni and supervisor ratings (2=exceeds expectations; 1=meets expectations) on these items ranged from 1.5-1.8. Data were not disaggregated by program due to the small number of responses.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Diploma Program. Diploma candidates' professional knowledge and skills are assessed in two ways, through exhibits presented in their e-folios and performance during their internship as measured by the Classroom Performance Assessment (CPA). Several items on the CPA address candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Across all items by all raters (university supervisors, mentors, and interns) the typical rating was 1.75 and above. (See above for scoring system.)

Again, candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are assessed through exhibits presented in their e-folio at the two checkpoints. Data from the first submission for this program are presented in Table 1.3-1.6 below.

Table 1.3 Initial and Advanced Teacher Candidates' Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

Programs	Technology				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	8%	4%	46%	31%	11%
Diploma – Cohort 3	0%	17%	33%	50%	0%
M.Ed. in Special Education	20%	40%	20%	20%	0%

Table 1.4 Initial and Advanced Teacher Candidates' Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

Programs	Scholarly Inquiry				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	15%	31%	23%	19%	12%
Diploma – Cohort 3	33%	33%	33%	0%	9%
M.Ed. in Special Education	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%

Table 1.5 Initial and Advanced Teacher Candidates' Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

Programs	Problem Solving				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	19%	27%	19%	27%	8%
Diploma – Cohort 3	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
M.Ed. in Special Education	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%

Table 1.6 Initial and Advanced Teacher Candidates' Professional Knowledge and Skills

Programs	Diversity				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	4%	27%	34%	31%	4%
Diploma – Cohort 3	0%	33%	50%	17%	0%
M.Ed. in Special Education	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%

Master of Education in Special Education. This program's candidates' professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed in one way, through the exhibits presented in the e-folio at the two checkpoints. Data from the first submission by this program's candidates are presented in Tables 1.3-1.6 above.

All Programs. The unit's newly-administered Post Graduate Survey of fall 2009 graduates includes several items linked to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Again, both alumni and supervisor ratings on these items were high, ranging from 1.5 to 1.8. (See scoring definitions above.)

1d. Student Learning

Diploma Program. These candidates' ability to assess and report student learning is assessed on the Classroom Performance Assessment form, with data gathered during their internship experience. Supervisor, mentor, and intern ratings on five items describe the candidates' ability to monitor students during lessons, plan and align valid and reliable assessments, assess and report student learning using methods in line with school policies, provide feedback to students, and review assessments for continued appropriateness. Candidate ratings on these items are high, ranging from 1.75 to 2.00. Candidates are not required to present data to demonstrate their ability to have a positive effect on all students learning.

Master of Education in Special Education. Candidates currently are not required to analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn. The faculty have proposed a revision to an internship assignment to gather these data.

All Programs. Two items on the Post Graduate Survey address student learning (use student data to plan and review learning experiences and students' learning is assessed and reported using methods in line with school policies). Alumni rated both of these items 1.5, while supervisors rated them 1.4 and 1.6 respectively. Of all ratings on the survey instrument, the 1.4 was the lowest rating provided by the alumni's supervisors. Responses were not disaggregated by program due to the small number of responses.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Master of Education in Educational Leadership. The unit provides evidence of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership candidates' knowledge and skills in several ways. The content of the program is based on professional standards (national and ELCC). Therefore, grades provide a reflection of the candidates' content knowledge and skills. Candidates' course grades in Fall 2008, Spring 2009, and Fall 2009 consistently indicate high performance in each of the program's courses; grade point averages range from a low of 3.41 (one course in Instructional Supervision) to a high of 4.0 (Internship). The unit calculated the grades for courses they identified as theoretical courses and reported a grade point average of 3.71. Secondly, the program's assessment plan requires candidates to submit evidence of their performance relative to the unit's conceptual framework outcomes in exhibits presented in an e-portfolio at the end of their second semester in the program and at the completion of their internship. Unit faculty judged candidates' performance on their e-portfolio performances submitted at the end of their second semester using a newly-revised rubric. Data from this analysis are presented below in Table 1.7. Finally, the unit requires candidates to complete a comprehensive exam linked to the program's content. The comprehensive exam is graded on an A-F scale; the data reveal that 20% of the candidates earned an A, 53% earned a B, and 27% earned a C.

Table 1.7 MED in Educational Leadership Candidates' Performance on Items Submitted in e-Folio

Performance Levels				
Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Content Knowledge				
33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
Technology				
50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Pedagogy				
17%	33%	33%	0%	17%
Scholarly Inquiry				
33%	17%	17%	0%	33%
Problem Solving				
33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
Diversity				
17%	33%	33%	0%	17%

Data from the Post Graduate Surveys described above are inclusive of alumni from the MED in Educational Leadership.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

No data were provided to indicate that the Educational Leadership candidates' reflect on their work within the context of student learning or that they establish education environments that support student learning. Program faculty have prepared a description of an assignment and a

rubric to measure the candidates’ effect on colleagues’ learning; no data were presented for this project and it is not clear that all candidates complete this assignment.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

At the initial level, the unit assesses its candidates’ professional dispositions in two ways: through a program-entry interview and through the administration of its Professional Dispositions Indicator three times within each program. Candidates self assess at Checkpoint 1, the candidates’ self-assess and a mentor assesses at Checkpoint 2, and the candidates’ self assess, and a mentor and a supervisor assess at Checkpoint 3 at the end of the internship.

Bachelor in Education. Candidates’ baseline disposition data indicate high scores on the teaching dispositions (60% scores of 16 and above; 40% scores of 11-15), lower scores on the scholarship dispositions (40% scores of 10-12, 30% scores of 7-9, and 30% scores of 4-6), and high scores on the leadership dispositions (80% scores of 10 or above and 20% scores of 7-9).

Diploma Programs. Data were presented for the mid-point and end of the internship. The maximum number of points a candidate might be awarded on the is 44. End-of-internship data for the program candidates ranged from a low of 15 to a high of 43. The typical candidate earned ratings in the high 30s to low 40s. Only one candidate was identified by the supervisor and mentor as consistently exhibiting inappropriate dispositions.

Secondly, during their internships, initial-level candidates self assess their dispositions on the Professional Practices Indicators form; supervisors and mentors also use this form to rate the candidates. The maximum score on this instrument is 58. End-of-internship university supervisor ratings ranged from 33-58, mentors’ ratings ranged from 51-58, and intern ratings ranged from 48-58.

Finally, the unit assesses two dispositions (the unit labels them outcomes), ethical values and initiative, through evidence the candidates provide in their e-folios. Data for all programs’ candidates are presented in Table 1.8 and 1.9 below. As described above, these data are based on the faculties’ assessment of the candidates’ performances at their first submission of their e-folios.

Table 1.8 Faculty Assessment of All Programs’ Candidates’ Ethical Values and Initiative

Programs	Ethical Values				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	16%	23%	19%	42%	0%
Diploma – Cohort 3	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%
M.Ed. in Educational Leadership	50%	17%	0%	33%	0%

M.Ed. in Special Education	20%	0%	40%	40%	0%
Unit Overall	9%	19%	21%	33%	12%

Table 1.9 Faculty Assessment of All Programs' Candidates' Initiative

Programs	Initiative				
	Target	Acceptable	Emerging	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing
Diploma – Cohort 2	8%	0%	19%	31%	42%
Diploma – Cohort 3	17%	33%	17%	33%	0%
M.Ed. in Educational Leadership	17%	33%	33%	0%	17%
M.Ed. in Special Education	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Unit Overall	12%	12%	21%	25%	30%

Finally, the unit defines several items on the Post Graduate Survey as disposition indicators of teaching, scholarship, and leadership. Alumni's ratings ranged between 1.5 to 1.9, while supervisors' ratings ranged between 1.4 to 2.0. Those items earning a 2 (exceeds expectations) by all responding supervisors (n = 11) included (1) recognize that subject matter must be meaningful for all students, and (2) reflect critically on professional practice. With the small number of respondents (alumni = 22, supervisor = 11), data were not disaggregated by program.

Overall Assessment of Standard.

The unit provided sufficient evidence that its teacher candidates demonstrate acceptable content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Further, it has provided sufficient evidence that its educational leadership candidates have an acceptable understanding of the knowledge expected in their field. Finally, the unit provided acceptable evidence that its initial candidates demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn and they reflect appropriate professional dispositions. The evidence provided at the advanced program level is less robust than that provided at the initial level.

Area for Improvement and Rationale.

1. The unit does not have an assessment of its candidates' impact on student learning.

The unit does not require its initial teacher candidates to provide evidence that they can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and

monitor student progress or its advanced teacher candidates to provide evidence that they can analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn.

Finally, the unit does not require school leader candidates to provide evidence that they are able to create positive environments for student learning or that they collect and analyze data related to student learning, and apply strategies for improving student learning within their own jobs and schools.

Recommendation for Standard 1.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2a. Assessment System

The unit has developed and begun to implement elements of a comprehensive assessment system. The concept of unit assessment with a common set of expectations for all programs was new to the College of Education. The process for developing the system included articulating unit-wide outcomes and proficiencies, making decisions on data to be collected that address these expectations, creating or adapting assessment instruments to collect data, and organizing the system by checkpoints to ensure consistency and coherence.

The assessment system reflects the conceptual framework, which is aligned with institutional, state, and professional standards. The framework's three elements of teaching, scholarship, and leadership and the eight outcomes derived from these elements are the foundation for the assessments used to monitor candidate progress in both initial and advanced programs. In addition, dispositions identified by the Diploma and B.Ed. programs are part of the system for initial programs; dispositions have not been formally identified by the M.Ed. programs.

Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at specific checkpoints throughout the program. For the Diploma and B.Ed. programs, evaluations of candidates are conducted at the following points: admission to the university, checkpoint 1—admission to the program, checkpoint 2—application for student teaching or internship, checkpoint 3—completion of student teaching or internship, and checkpoint 4—during the induction year (year after program completion). There are similar checkpoints for the M.Ed. programs: admission to the university, checkpoint 1—end of 2nd semester, checkpoint 2—end of 3rd semester, checkpoint 3—end of 4th semester, and checkpoint 4—post graduation (year after program completion) year.

The assessment system also includes some measures of program quality. To ensure adherence with unit expectations, programs use a specific course syllabi template that aligns unit learning outcomes, Qatar National Standards for Teachers and School Leaders (QNS), course objectives, course learning outcomes, and assessments. To ensure program effectiveness, faculty review aggregated data from specific assessments to monitor trends on unit outcomes, although these reviews are conducted primarily at the initial level and are not systematic. In addition, programs administer exit surveys when candidates complete their programs and post graduation surveys a year after program completion. These surveys are intended to ascertain how well the programs prepared candidates according to the conceptual framework. However, these surveys have not been consistently administered across programs, and the results have not been consistently distributed to faculty or used.

The assessment system includes limited measures of unit operations. Faculty members are evaluated using a comprehensive system of teaching, scholarship, and leadership that reflects the

elements of the conceptual framework. The College recently developed a strategic plan that reflects the conceptual framework, but the process for assessing implementation of the plan was not clear. In addition, the College now submits a unit assessment report as part of SACS accreditation; however, the categories reported are pre-selected by the University and do not always reflect the conceptual framework.

The Education Partners Committee, an advisory group for the College of Education with representatives from K-12 and SEC, meets twice a year and is charged with reviewing all aspects of the unit including the assessment system. This group has been active, providing feedback on individual instruments as well as the system.

The unit has taken some steps to eliminate bias in assessment and to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its procedures. The unit uses multiple assessments to evaluate the eight outcomes at each checkpoint. Instruments are reviewed by faculty and the professional community for accuracy. Faculty members develop and use rubrics to evaluate candidates' progress; however, training in how to use the rubrics is inconsistent across programs. Some instruments, such as the Classroom Performance Assessment, Professional Practices Instrument, and Professional Dispositions Indicator, are assessed by three individuals; however, there is little evidence that the results are consistently triangulated.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

The unit maintains an assessment system that provides information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, and competence of graduates. The unit now has a data manager and data collection procedures and timelines to ensure that the data are collected. Program coordinators are responsible for data collection on applicant qualifications and candidate proficiencies, while the Associate Dean for Student Affairs is responsible for data collection on the exit survey and post graduation survey. This process was recently implemented and as yet has not produced consistent data across programs.

For the Diploma and B.Ed. programs, there are multiple assessments at each checkpoint. Common assessments include: checkpoint 1--GPA, course grades, interview, philosophy statement, PDI, and diversity survey; checkpoint 2--GPA, e-folio, and PDI; checkpoint 3--GPA, e-folio, CPA, PPI, PDI, diversity survey, and exit survey; and checkpoint 4--post graduation survey. For the M.Ed. programs, assessments include: checkpoint 1--GPA, diversity survey, and e-folio; checkpoint 2--GPA, internship request, and comprehensive exam (for Educational Leadership); checkpoint 3--GPA, e-folio, diversity survey, and exit survey; and checkpoint 4--post graduation survey. Assessments used in each program were not always aligned with the conceptual framework; upon recommendation of the IRTE team, the unit is now working to ensure all instruments reflect the eight outcomes.

The assessment system was recently implemented, and the unit does not yet regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data to improve candidate performance. The unit has some assessments that evaluate program effectiveness and unit operations; however, these assessments are not well integrated into the assessment system, and the data are not yet regularly and systematically collected and processed.

The unit offers its programs on the main campus of Qatar University and does not operate alternate route, off-campus, or distance learning programs.

The unit has an established process to manage formal candidate complaints. The candidate first contacts the person with responsibility for the nature of the problem, for example, a faculty member on academic issues, a counselor on personal issues, or the registrar for registration issues. If the problem is not resolved at that level, the candidate is referred to the Associate Dean for Student Affairs who also interacts with the department head and/or dean depending on the situation. If the problem is not resolved at that level, the candidate is referred to the Vice President for Student Affairs and University Student Affairs Committee. The Associate Dean for Student Affairs maintains records of the complaints and documents their resolution.

The unit uses various information technologies to maintain assessments, including Banner at the admissions level, Blackboard at the course level and TaskStream at the unit level. TaskStream was selected after a review of other data management systems because it included tools to customize candidate portfolios and was able to generate reports. However, the process of acquiring and operationalizing TaskStream was a challenge for the unit, thereby limiting the amount of data collected at the time of the visit. With the appointment of the data manager, the unit expects to be fully operational soon.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

The unit uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, although this process has not been systematic or consistent across programs. The initial programs use both course and field experience data to determine individual candidate progress as well as trends across candidates. Faculty reported that they meet at the end of each semester and review any curricular deficiencies and any field placement problems. Faculty in advanced programs reported using, or planning to use, specific assessments to look for trend data. For example, faculty in the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership conducts an item analysis of the comprehensive exam to determine areas of weaknesses in the curriculum. Faculty in the M.Ed. in Special Education plan to use exit and post graduation data, either by survey or focus groups, for feedback on program effectiveness. However, these program reviews are not formally integrated in the assessment system.

Faculty reported changes made to programs as a result of data analysis. For example, in the initial programs faculty determined that their syllabi required a common format since individual instructors were not always covering the same information. In addition, school placements are reviewed at the end of clinical practice, with evaluations from the candidate, college supervisor, and mentor teachers; these evaluations have helped clarify the types of experiences necessary to support individual candidates. In the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership program, faculty determined that, after an item analysis of the comprehensive exam, candidates were not strong on finance, and the faculty collaborated with a professor from the College of Business on strengthening the content. In the M.Ed. in Special Education, the program is being implemented and did not have specific examples of program modifications.

Each faculty advisor has access to his/her candidates' grades and other evaluation tools throughout the checkpoints. At the end of the semester, program coordinators meet with their program faculty to review assessment results of the learning outcomes and a summary of candidate performance on different assessments. In addition, program coordinators are expected to share summaries of their reviews with their department head and with the deans.

Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates to help them improve their performance. During their coursework, they receive feedback from their instructors on their assignments and exams. During their clinical practice, both mentor teachers and college supervisors share ratings on the CPA, PPI, and DPI with candidates. In addition, they are given opportunities to rate themselves using the same instruments. Candidates reported that they receive information as to their progress and are assisted in correcting any deficiency areas; in addition, they felt that their college instructors and mentor teachers were interested in and supportive of their achievements.

Overall Assessment of the Standard.

The unit has developed elements of an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and is aligned with institutional, state, and professional standards. Assessments for candidate performance are monitored across four checkpoints to ensure that they meet unit outcomes. Programs also collect data on program effectiveness, such as through exit and post graduation surveys, although this practice is not consistent across programs. There are limited data collected on unit operations; the faculty appraisal system is strong, but other assessments still need to be fully implemented. The professional community, including the Education Partners Committee, provides guidance and feedback on all aspects of the unit and programs. The unit has taken some steps to ensure its assessments are fair, accurate, and consistent but still needs additional attention to rubrics and inter-rater reliability. Because the system was recently implemented, data collection on candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations has not been regular or systematic. In addition, while the unit uses some data for program improvement, it is not consistent across programs.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales.

1. The unit does not have a fully developed assessment system in place to support the collection, analysis and reporting of candidate, program, and unit operations data.

Assessment of candidate performance includes multiple sources of evidence different checkpoints, but the coherence of data collected is negatively impacted by the lack of a comprehensive system. Evaluation of programs and unit operations to ascertain effectiveness is not well defined or systematic, and is not well integrated into the assessment system.

2. The instruments used to assess advanced candidate proficiencies and dispositions need development.

At the advanced level, the unit relies heavily on course grades as indicators of the candidates' proficiencies. A meaningful way to assess candidates' proficiencies during their internships, a component of their program requiring significant hours of work, has

not yet been developed. In addition, the two advanced programs have not prepared a set of dispositions central to their candidates' development as professional leaders and have not designed the means to assess candidates' dispositions, beyond the e-portfolio exhibits selected to document ethical values and initiative.

3. The unit has taken limited steps to eliminate bias and establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its assessments.

Although the unit uses multiple instruments and solicits feedback from its professional community, its use of rubrics for assessments does not always include training of scorers and an inter-rater reliability process.

4. The unit does not use data for program improvement on a regular and systematic basis.

Because the analysis and reporting of data have not been consistent across programs and the assessment system is not fully implemented, the programs have not had the information to comprehensively study their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications.

Recommendation for Standard 2.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Met

Standard 3: *Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*

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

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

At the initial level, the unit has developed strong field and clinical experiences to help candidates apply theories and concepts acquired in coursework (theory) to schools and special education centers (practice). To achieve this, the unit has developed a strong relationship with 28 schools around Doha. In the development of the field and clinical programs, schools were not involved in this process. In the Qatari context, this is understandable. Reform in teacher education at the University of Qatar is much ahead of such efforts in the field of education. The unit is planning to involve the field in the future once the new system of field experiences and clinical practices is set in place and all involved parties get acquainted with it. Currently, the unit is providing periodic workshops to acquaint its field partners with this new system.

Early field experiences and clinical practices differ from one program to another. Early field experiences are organized by course instructors. Programs identified several courses in each program for candidates to become acquainted with schools and to apply selected concepts and acquire specific teaching skills. Candidates found the field experiences very helpful.

Clinical practices/internships are similar at the initial level, but differ from those at the advanced level (Master of Education in Special Education and Master of Education in Educational Leadership), and the two advanced programs' practices differ from each other. Each program coordinator arranges with each school that is selected for the internship placement. Each teacher education program coordinator visits the selected schools and provides the principal with three forms: a contract form, the list of qualification standards for the selection of mentor teachers form and the mentor teacher application form. These forms are the first step in the placement process. Once schools and mentor teachers are selected, a workshop is held to acquaint the mentor teachers with the contents of the appropriate Internship Handbook. The unit representative and school administrator communicate regularly during the semester regarding the placement. Meetings to discuss the progress of the intern are held regularly throughout the semester. The discussions are then relayed to the program coordinator – and the college supervisor, if needed.

The Educational Leadership program placements are organized differently since most candidates are in-service staff members who do their internship in the schools where they work. The directors of the Supreme Education Council's Leadership Training suggest interns shadow exemplary leaders. In consultation with the candidate, the Coordinator suggests potential matches for the internship. It is the responsibility of the candidate to contact the administration of the school or education center, meet and talk with the administrator to see if there is a good match, and then request the placement using the Internship Placement Form. After the Program Coordinator approves the placement, the candidate sets up a meeting that the candidate, the

approved mentor, and the candidate’s adviser attend to ensure that all participants are aware of the roles and responsibilities of all parties.

Placement of Master of Education in Special Education candidates is easier since there are only four major centers in Doha where a candidate is placed. A mentor is selected based on consultation between the program coordinator and the head of the appropriate division at the center. Candidates' opinions are sought at the end of each semester to assess their placement and the whole internship program.

Table 3.1 provides an overview of the partners in the unit’s field experiences and describes the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit’s field experiences.

Table 3.1
Field Experience Partners and Their Roles

Partner	Design	Delivery	Evaluation
Education Partners Committee	Feedback on documents during twice-yearly meetings*		Summary of data analysis sent to partners for reflection and feedback
Mentor teachers	Input collected following each semester of student teaching/internship	In-school mentors for candidates	Post-internship gathering to review process and documents
University supervisors	Committee members representing all programs Sub-groups responsible for draft documents (e.g., handbooks and evaluation forms)	Assigned faculty members monitor candidates’ progress Collaborate with mentor teachers Confer multiple times with candidate and mentor teacher	Meet bi-weekly during student teaching/internship semester to report on status of candidates Meet at the end of the student teaching/internship semester to review all processes and products with intention to modify any part of the program deemed necessary for the improvement of the candidates’ experiences
Other unit faculty	Review drafts of documents and suggest modifications during monthly Shaping-the-Future meetings		Review documents at full-college meetings (Shaping the Future)

* unable to confirm during visit

3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice:

Both field experiences and clinical practices reflect the unit’s conceptual framework and Qatar Professional Standards and were designed to help candidates develop the content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, the pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and the professional dispositions delineated in standards. They allow candidates to participate as teachers or other professional educators, as well as learners in the school setting.

The college developed four handbooks, one for each program: Bachelor of Education Student Teaching Handbook, Diploma Internship Handbook, Master of Education in Educational Leadership Internship Handbook and Master of Education in Special Education Handbook. The first two are very thorough and reflect the current best practices in internship programs. They include the main components of any internship handbook: college learning outcomes, course matrix, timeline, requirements, expectations, clear explained assignments, policies and procedures, roles and responsibilities, and the needed forms. The advanced internship handbooks are not written at that level of clarity and comprehensiveness, especially regarding the assignments.

At the initial level, the unit developed a calendar for internship assignments required in each program; candidates' are confident that they benefit from their internship experiences. The experiences help candidates demonstrate proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework and Qatar Professional Standards. Table 3.2 summarizes field experiences and clinical practice by program.

Table 3.2
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

Program	Field Experiences (during coursework; before student teaching/internship)	Student Teaching/Internship	Total Hours
B. Ed Primary (initial)	112 hours <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Observes instructional and learning strategies · Observes teacher as collaborator · Identifies individual differences among students · Assists students under the guidance of the classroom teacher 	340 hours Internship: 10-week minimum with mentor in the classroom (300 hours) + Orientation (20 hours) + Seminar (20 Hours)	452
Diploma (initial)	(59 hours) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Observes instructional and learning strategies · Observes teacher as collaborator · Identifies individual differences among students · Assists students under the 	Internship: 10-week minimum with mentor in the classroom (300 hours) + Orientation (20 hours) + Seminar (20 Hours) (340 hours)	399 hours

Program	Field Experiences (during coursework; before student teaching/internship)	Student Teaching/Internship	Total Hours
	guidance of the classroom teacher		
M. Ed./ SPED (advanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Observes SPED students & teachers · Identifies instructional and learning strategies · Observes SPED teacher and general ed. teacher · Observes IEP team meetings 	<p>Interns are placed at a center for students w/special needs or at a school organized to accommodate students w/special needs</p> <p>Description of experiences found in the SPED Field Visit document</p>	400 hours
M.Ed./EL (advanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · EDEL 608, Issues in Educational Leadership – 25 hours observing in schools, making a potential professional development plan for a teacher · EDEL 609, Action Research – Make a PD plan, work with a teacher to carry it out, and evaluate progress; design, conduct, and report an action research project 	The intern creates an Internship Plan that will allow the candidate to demonstrate all standards, conducts and reports on the plan; program coordinator works to accommodate candidates' specific situations	400 hours

The unit does not have clinical faculty designated as such; however, unit faculty serve the roles that are traditionally served by clinical faculty. Supervisors are available following each observation to sit with the candidate and discuss the lesson just presented. In preparation for the midpoint and final evaluations, supervisors meet with candidates to further discuss any relevant issues and give ongoing feedback to web-based reflections.

Unit supervisors are required to visit and observe their candidates in the Diploma programs at least five (5) times during the semester and to document their observations. Supervisors also meet weekly with candidates to discuss their progress and collect new information. At the end of a candidate's clinical experience, the candidate rates the college supervisor and mentor teachers in surveys. The data from these surveys will inform the program coordinators of the degree of support provided to candidates by unit supervisors. The surveys were developed during Spring 2010 and will be used with the Fall 2010 interns.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership and Master of Education in Special Education faculty members visit candidates on-site one or two times per semester, hold weekly online discussions, and meet monthly in on-campus seminars. Course evaluations and exit surveys indicate that candidates are positive about the support they receive.

Assessment of candidates' internship experiences include many forms, including developing and teaching a unit plan, teaching lessons, observation, application of Classroom Performance Assessment, application of s, reflective journals, parent contract report, and E-folio. Unit supervisors gather data on candidates using multiple tools, including lesson plans, lesson reflections, conferences, mid-point assessments and final evaluations to evaluate candidate skills, knowledge, and professional dispositions in relation to Qatar Professional Standards and unit's conceptual framework. Unit supervisors provide regular and continuing support for student teachers and interns in schools through such processes as observation, conferencing, group discussion, and email.

Data summary presented by the unit for Fall 2006, Spring 2007 and Fall 2007 regarding candidates' performance in student teaching show that candidates master the performance outcomes outlined by the unit for this experience.

Candidates at the Master of Education level participate in field experiences that require them to apply course work in classroom and school settings, and reflect on their practice in the context of theories on teaching and learning. Examples include observing special education students and teachers or school principals, identifying instructional and learning strategies, observing special education teachers and general education teachers, observing IEP team meetings, and conducting action research.

Technology is one of the proficiencies included in the conceptual framework. Candidates have specific assignments in their courses that require the instructional use of technology, and candidates are responsible for posting an example and reflection to their E-folio. However, the unit is still not satisfied.

The unit developed a Diversity Questionnaire to assess candidates' ability to help all students learn. Using this Questionnaire, candidates reflect on how they support the learning of all students. The Masters of Education students also complete the Diversity Questionnaire at Checkpoints 1 and 3. Essentially, the Diversity Questionnaire asks the respondents to what extent they agreed or disagreed with whether candidates in the program met each of the diversity statements. However, to date, there is no analysis of the Diversity Questionnaire data.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Candidates do meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice. The unit clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of all parties in the assessment of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions during student teaching.

The field experiences and student teaching/internship are developmental in nature. For example, in the Diploma program, candidates transition from observing, to assisting, to co-planning and co-teaching, to planning and teaching, to assuming full responsibility of teaching, to scaling back responsibilities and finally to conferences. Related to all tasks, the candidates get support from mentors and unit supervisors, either in person or electronically.

Assessment is also conducted in stages and in various formats. For example, in the Diploma programs, all lessons require a planned assessment (Lesson Template) and a reflection that includes what the candidate learned from the lesson, including the assessment. In addition, the candidate, the mentor, and the supervisor rate the ability of the candidate at multiple times. The ratings are discussed with the candidate.

Three instruments are administered to all Diploma candidates during the second and third checkpoints (three times over the course of their programs) to assess candidates' performance during student teaching: the Classroom Performance Assessment (CPA), s (PDI), and Professional Practice Indicators (PPI). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to diversity are evaluated by the Diversity Questionnaire twice over the course of their programs. The multiple administrations allow the unit to measure growth and development of their candidates over time. Masters students are not assessed on the CPA, PDI, or PPI, but they do complete the Diversity Questionnaire and, in the case of the educational leadership candidates, do self-assessments on the national standards (correlated to NCATE/ELCC).

At the end of each semester of Student Teaching/Internship, a committee reviews candidates' experiences and the handbooks to ascertain that the experience continues to maximize the candidates' development. The Post-Graduation Survey is also administered after the QU graduate has been in the field for a year to collect their perspectives on how well they were prepared.

Student teaching/internship represents candidates' crowning experience of their education. Program proficiencies are derived directly from the conceptual framework. They are specified in learning outcomes and aligned with national standards. For each program, a matrix was prepared to map college learning outcomes and national professional standards to specific assignments that assess candidates' mastery of each standard. Then syllabi were checked to identify the courses where the assignments were encountered to ensure that the assignments were appropriate to assess the targeted knowledge, skills, and/or disposition and would be assessed in the course. Although, to date, not much data were produced from TaskStream, the system has the potential to provide the unit with the needed information on the quality of the graduates.

It is left to the candidates to select and post representative work (from the course-embedded assignments) on their E-Folio (on TaskStream™) to demonstrate mastery of the unit's learning outcomes and to reflect on how they represent mastery. Faculty members meet with candidates regarding their selections during the last semester to give them feedback, and a final assessment of the selected artifacts uploaded into the candidates' E-folio is made at the end of the candidates' student teaching or internship experience.

There is no evidence of the candidates' impact on student learning during field experiences and clinical practice. A plan is to be developed to do so.

In Qatari schools, boys are separated from girls at all grade levels except kindergarten, and women do not teach in boys' schools above the primary level. Men do not teach in girls' schools at any level. For that reason, many college programs cannot offer gender-diversified experiences

to all students. However, as much as possible, candidates are placed in diverse situations that reflect Qatar's diverse student population.

Qatar's schools are diverse in ethnicity, having approximately 15% of their student body from countries all over the Gulf, North African, and Asian regions. The Supreme Education Council has adopted a policy concerning inclusion. With the exception of gender diversity, the education system is diverse. Consequently, candidates have the opportunity to interact with diverse students. Qatari schools are all inclusive schools, with 2-5% students with disabilities and 4-10% of students exhibiting learning problems. The special education candidates who do their internships in special education centers, such as Shafallah and Al Noor, experience less ethnic diversity during this final stage of their programs as the centers have Qatari First admission policies.

Overall Assessment of Standard.

The unit works closely with schools to implement and assess strong field experiences and clinical practice programs, and has plans to work with the schools in the design of its field experiences. The initial programs are better than the advanced programs, in terms of field experiences and clinical practices design and implementation.

The process is developmental and systematic. Candidates complete field experiences to become acquainted with schools and classrooms and to test theoretical knowledge in actual settings. They complete a specified number of hours before doing their clinical practice/ internship. Candidates must complete specified assignments during their final field experiences. The data indicate that collectively they experience success in the completion of the assessments assigned to this experience.

In general, the unit meets the required elements of the standard and, consequently, the standard as a whole. Its strength in this standard is its strong relationship with schools and strong design of the clinical program, especially at the initial level.

Area for Improvement and Rationale.

None.

Standard Strengths.

The unit demonstrated two notable and unique aspects of field experiences and student teaching/internship. The first is its ability to partner with about 28 schools and special education center to offer strong a strong culminating clinical experience for its candidates. The second is its ability to design a strong field experiences and student teaching/internship system for its candidates, especially at the initial level.

Recommendation for Standard 3.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs , implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

One of the eight outcomes delineated in the Conceptual Framework addresses the unit's commitment to diversity: *Respond to every student's uniqueness and foster successful learning experiences by meeting individual differences.* The unit identifies dimensions of diversity as nationality, gender, exceptionalities including learning and physical disabilities, and language. Socio-economic background is not considered because the schools in which candidates are placed for field experiences do not keep such information on their students.

A review of the initial and advanced programs' content reveals that diversity permeates the curriculum either through infusion in coursework or courses devoted exclusively to diversity. All programs, except the MED in Educational Leadership, include at least one course in diversity. Examples of assignments addressing diversity include lesson plans, curriculum units, classroom observations, diagnostics research, ESL theory paper, designing an IEP, intervention plan, cultural climate analysis, school action plan, and family and community plan.

To assess candidates' diversity knowledge and experiences, assessments are conducted in courses and at checkpoints in the assessment system. The variety of assessments includes grades, surveys, final projects, e-folio artifacts, and action research projects.

Format of course syllabi includes delineation of the conceptual framework learning outcomes. Per the course, all pertinent outcomes are identified. A review of syllabi cited for inclusion of diversity confirmed that the content is covered as indicated in course objectives, learning experiences, and assignments.

The Lesson Plan Guide includes a template which provides opportunity for candidates to note any modification of the plan made to accommodate students. Directions are to "suggest what you will do to differentiate or modify the lesson for students with diverse needs."

Evaluation of the curricular and internship experiences in diversity is thorough. The unit has developed instruments to assess candidate performance, professional practice, and professional dispositions. Diversity related elements in each of the surveys are presented below:

The Classroom Performance Assessment (CPA) used by the college supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the intern at mid-point and final examination periods includes the following items:

2.4 Uses a variety of skills and resources to modify lessons

4.2 Conducts inclusive, equitable, and ethical interactions and communication with

students

8.2 Encourages students to interact respectfully with others including those with diverse backgrounds.

The Professional Dispositions Indicator (PDI) used by the college supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the intern at mid-point and final examination periods includes the following items:

T.1 Ensures that all students can learn at high levels and achieve success

T.2 Supports the idea that students with special needs learn in different ways

T.3 Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful to all students.

The Professional Practices Indicator (PPI) used by the college supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the intern at mid-point and final examination periods:

11.1 Builds relationships with families and the broader community to enhance student learning.

In addition, the Post Graduate Survey administered to graduates who completed their programs in fall 2009 and their supervisors also includes diversity items. The results revealed that both groups (alumni and supervisor) had positive impressions of the graduates' dispositions and skills regarding diversity. The following items were specific to diversity:

Ensure that all students can learn at a high level and achieve success.

Support students with special learning needs to learn in different ways.

Recognize that subject matter must be meaningful for all students.

Create supportive learning environments in which students' ideas, beliefs, and opinions are shared and valued.

Show respect for individual and cultural differences.

Build relationships with families and the boarder community to enhance student learning.

Interaction and communication are conducted in an open, inclusive, equitable, and ethical way.

The mean for items related to diversity ranged from 1.4 to 2.0 (0=below expectations to 2=exceeds expectations) by both alumni and their supervisors. Generally, supervisors gave candidates higher ratings than they gave themselves.

In preparation for the team visit, the Diversity Standard Committee (formed to write the institutional response to Standard 4), developed a Diversity Survey (DS) which is to be administered at different checkpoints during the candidates' program. Its purpose is to determine how well the candidates' experiences "match the curricular, pedagogical, and assessment practices in the context of diversity." The plan is to produce a version for faculty. It is unclear how this comparative analysis will be used for programmatic improvement. In a recent use of the survey, candidates across all programs expressed concern about four variables: sensitivity to gender differences; interaction with school, unit, and other faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups; field experiences; and sensitivity to cultural differences. No specific information was provided regarding how the data will be used.

The Diversity Standard Committee also conducted a survey on diversity in internships with twenty-five diploma students during the internship seminar to obtain a diversity profile of their field and clinical experiences. The committee expects to continue this survey each semester.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Faculty in the unit are diverse. A stated goal of the university's recruitment process is "to achieve an excellent and balanced workforce with representation and participation from diverse communities." While no quota in faculty recruitment exists, the President of the university is committed to maintaining diversity among faculty.

Of the total faculty in the unit, 54% are Qatari and 46% are non-Qatari including faculty from the United States, Egypt, Algeria, Canada, Lebanon, Jordan, and Tunisia. Sixty-seven percent are female and 33% are male.

Diploma candidates and recent graduates praised the rich exchange of experiences with faculty during their learning. Likewise, faculty spoke of new knowledge gained from their interactions with candidates from diverse backgrounds. An assessment conducted by the Diversity Standard Committee about clinical experiences revealed diversity among mentor teachers (e.g., Sudanese, Indian, Pakistani, Syrian, Jordanian, Egyptian, Jordanian and Qatari).

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Candidates in all programs have ample opportunity with work with diverse candidates. During fall 2008, 102 females and 24 males were enrolled in the diploma programs; in the master's programs, 42 females and 5 males were enrolled. For the spring 2010 term, the bachelor's program had 10 female candidates enrolled. Representation across all programs included candidates from Qatar, Canada, United States, Egypt, Jordan, Sudan, Iran, Iraqi, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Palestine, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Mauritania, Algeria, Nigeria, Yemen, India, Bosnia, Oman, Lebanon, and Australia.

Recognizing the gender demographics, the unit has set a goal to enhance diversity through the recruitment of more males. The Diversity Standard Committee undertook a survey, "Male Students' Attitudes toward the Profession", to explore reasons for the lack of male presence in the profession. Focus groups of undergraduate students and Blackboard technology were used to create the instrument. One hundred and seventy-two undergraduate students from varied majors participated in the study. Data have been analyzed and findings will be used to develop recruitment strategies.

In addition, the Exit Survey administered at graduation, seeks information on candidates' satisfaction with the level of respect for expression and the quality of interactions with diverse peers. Graduates are also asked about how often they had developed a project, case study, or simulation with classmates and worked with other candidates on class assignments.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The Supreme Education Council (SEC) of Qatar adopted inclusion in all schools in Qatar. To achieve this goal, the SEC identified a number of criteria to be met by schools. It also adopted the Response to Intervention (RTI) model to support students with learning difficulties. Schools are asked to make necessary accommodations to meet the needs of special needs students in different areas, such as, the use of assistive technology, specialized equipments, alternate formats and adaptations to the physical environment as well as modifications in curriculum, teaching methods and assessment tools. Statistics show that about 5% of all students have physical impairments which is considered to be one of the highest percentages in the world. Also about 3-5% of the students have learning difficulties. At the present, diagnosis is not available in independent schools, but schools may self-identify students as having exceptionalities.

The Qatari education system is based on segregation of boys and girls at all grade levels except kindergarten. Also female teachers do not teach in boys schools after the sixth grade. Male teachers do not teach in girls' schools at any grade. For that reason, many of college programs cannot offer gender-diversified experiences to all our students. However, as much as possible, candidates are placed in diverse situations that reflect Qatar's diverse student population. From the survey on internships referenced earlier, respondents reported working with both male and female students from mostly Qatar, and other nations; as well as students with learning and physical disabilities.

In general, SEC regulations provide candidates with schools that embrace diversity and provide candidates with the opportunity to interact with diverse students. Each of the programs requires a minimum of 300 hours in a classroom under the mentorship of the classroom teacher (6 hours per day, 5 days per week for 10 weeks). Each candidate is also required to attend Internship Seminar in two sections: an orientation of 20 hours before the classroom placement and 20 hours over the 10 weeks of the classroom experience.

Overall Assessment of the Standard.

The unit sufficiently addresses diversity throughout the curriculum and has evaluated its curriculum and candidates' experiences for presence of diversity. Further, it works to ensure that its candidates have opportunities to interact with diverse peers, faculty, and students in field/internship placements.

Areas for Improvement.

None

Recommendation for Standard 1.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5a. Qualified Faculty

Faculty in the unit are well qualified with terminal degrees in their fields, and they have the required expertise for the courses they teach. Approximately one third of the faculty have achieved the full professor rank. Experienced teachers are qualified for their roles in the internship programs. The unit asserts a priority to hire highly qualified faculty. Faculty members are appointed by the Dean and approved by the Vice President and Chief Academic officer after confirmation by the President.

The unit follows university conditions for appointment which include:

- An advanced degree from an accredited university or institution of higher learning recognized by the State and Qatar University
- Competency in teaching
- Ability to engage in scholarly activity
- Good collegiality and interpersonal skills.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

For promotion to any rank, faculty must demonstrate achievement in teaching and instructional development.

When the University Reform Project began in 2003-2004, a goal of the newly established Office of Faculty and Instructional Development (OFID) was to “provide faculty with meaningful opportunities for continuous professional development.” Workshops are offered regularly on topics of special interest to faculty. In addition, faculty have adequate opportunity to enhance their teaching through College-supported conference attendance.

Faculty employ a range of instructional strategies in their teaching. These include lecture, class discussions, small group discussions, brainstorming, student presentations, graphic organizers, guest speakers, discovery learning, guided discovery, hands-on activities, student research, role playing, cooperative group activity, role playing, Socratic dialogue, Blackboard discussion forums, and field trips.

Technology is widely used in the delivery of instruction at varying levels of comfort; the majority of faculty appear to be at the mid- to advanced-levels. The most prevalent usage is Blackboard, followed by PowerPoint™, e-mail communication with candidates and electronic office hours.

Technology is integrated into all programs through relevant assignments in several courses. These requirements include software evaluation, microteaching, tech-enhanced lesson plans, evaluating digital resources, issues of technology with children, and data recording and analysis.

Assessments are likewise varied to include examinations, portfolios, projects, reflective writing, discussion boards, and papers.

Best practices in modeling diversity are driven by the diversity outcomes delineated in the conceptual framework and modeled by a diverse faculty who infuse diversity throughout their teaching.

Candidates evaluate teaching performance through the university Faculty Performance System each semester. Faculty in the unit consistently are rated higher than the university norm.

The College Quality Assurance Committee conducted an assessment of teaching practices and the peer observation system. Data from the system are used to assist faculty in improving their teaching. One hundred percent of the participants provided positive feedback about the system. They also scored high in percentages of various strategies used in the classroom.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practice in Scholarship

A major thrust of the reform initiative of 2003 was to shift the university from a teaching institution to a comprehensive institution, one that focused on faculty teaching and research. Emphasis is now placed on research and faculty are held accountable through the university Faculty Performance System. Each year, the faculty select research priorities for the academic year. Faculty are expected to address the priorities in their scholarly work and research. Research may be embedded in professional development activities or consultancies. All faculty are encouraged to engage in collaborative research and scholarly activity. There are several examples of joint publications by unit faculty. The unit also encourages faculty to reflect upon their work and incorporate their findings into their teaching where appropriate.

Funding for research is available from several sources. Faculty may apply for university research grants, start-up grants, student grants, research facility grants, and summer research grants. Founded in 2006, the Qatar National Research Fund/National Priorities Research Fund is another source of funding. It administers funding for original, competitively-selected research, and fosters collaboration. Finally, the Undergraduate Research Experience Fund seeks to “stimulate a broad array of research opportunities”. The unit boasts an impressive record of successful grantsmanship by securing eight internal grants for 2009-2010.

Several research collaborations by faculty, teachers, and school leaders have occurred through the Center for Development and Research (CEDR), a center in the unit. As a result of these collaborations, the center is recognized as an established leader in professional development for educators and research to support the educational reform in Qatar.

Faculty productivity as reflected in articles, books, and chapters has remained fairly constant over the last three years. Review of a list of 23 faculty publications for 2008-2009, indicated that

some faculty are more productive than others, with one faculty member producing eight articles in single and joint authorship. With the new research agenda for the university and unit, faculty scholarship is expected to increase with greater involvement by all faculty.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practice in Service

Faculty are highly involved in committee service in their departments, and at the unit and university levels. They also cite service in the community, schools, and professional organizations. Over the past three years, this engagement has steadily increased to a total of 243 involvements in the 2009-2010 year.

The hallmark for service in the unit is the Center for Development and Research. K-12 teacher attendance at workshops for the current academic year has surpassed the 1000 mark and involved 34 faculty as facilitators.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The Qatar University Faculty Handbook clearly delineates policies and procedures for faculty evaluation, both annual evaluation for improvement and merit salary consideration and periodic evaluation for promotion consideration. There is a Faculty Performance Review and Development System Framework which guides faculty members, department heads and deans in the annual report and evaluation process. Annually each faculty member prepares a report, including at least one course portfolio, and submits the material to the Department Head. The Department Head reviews the materials, verifies the documents submitted, meets with the faculty member to provide feedback, and reaches agreement with the faculty member on a work plan for the following year. These materials are submitted to the Dean who verifies results, considers any responses by the faculty member, and prepares the final faculty evaluation report, which is submitted to the University Office of Evaluation. The Dean and Department Head meet individually with faculty members whose performance is less than expected or unsatisfactory to discuss performance issues and complete an individual professional development plan. The majority of salary increase funds is distributed annually on a merit basis, and merit raises are keyed to results of the annual report and review process.

The promotion process is also well delineated in the Faculty Handbook. Promotion consideration begins with the faculty member assembling a professional dossier presenting evidence for promotion in the areas of teaching, research and service. The materials are reviewed by a departmental committee and the Department Head before submission to the college level for further review. At the college level, the Promotion Committee reviews the dossier and makes a recommendation to the Dean, who reviews all departmental and college level reviews and makes her decision. If the Dean's decision is positive, the application moves to the campus level. If the Dean's decision is negative, the application is not sent forward to the campus level for review. A negative decision by the Dean can be appealed by the faculty member, resulting in campus-level review of the application.

At the University level, the Promotion Committee typically accepts the department- and college-level decisions that the candidate's teaching and service record merit promotion. The university

level review focuses on the candidate's research accomplishments. For promotion to Associate Professor, it is expected that the candidate will have published at least four original papers in reputable, refereed professional journals. There is a comparable expectation for promotion to the rank of Professor. When the College submits promotion materials for campus-level review, they include a list of 10 external reviewers who are qualified to comment on the quality and importance of the scholarly contributions of the candidate. The University Promotion Committee chooses three reviewers from the list and submits the candidate's scholarly papers to these reviewers for analysis. Based on these evaluations, as well as the input provided at the prior levels of review, the University Promotion Committee makes a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who recommends to the President for a final decision. Faculty candidates are informed of recommendations at each level of review, and can appeal decisions or file responses to decisions at all levels of the process. Faculty members who receive promotion to a higher professorial rank receive a salary increment based on the promotion.

Faculty members who have not merited promotion after ten years in rank meet with the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs to discuss the reasons for lack of progress. Options for action range from development of an action plan to improve performance to termination.

If a faculty member's performance is judged, through the annual review process, to fail to meet expectations for two consecutive years or two out of three years, or if the faculty member fails to submit evaluation documents without acceptable justification, the Department Head shall request the Dean to form a special review committee. This starts a process through which a faculty member may, after appropriate consideration at multiple levels of review, be recommended for termination due to Chronic Low Performance.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Faculty Professional Development

Faculty members in the unit have available to them multiple and varied opportunities for continuous professional development, and they regularly avail themselves of these opportunities. Each faculty member has a detailed faculty development plan for the current academic year, specifying objectives, action plan, outcomes and completion dates in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These plans are developed and signed by the faculty member, approved by the Department Head, and reviewed jointly by the faculty member and Department Head at the end of each semester. College faculty expressed strong support for this system and the formative and summative feedback it provides.

The University has established an Office of Faculty and Instructional Development (OFID) that offers a wide range of workshops throughout the academic year on topics related to technology, teaching methods, and assessment of student learning. Many unit faculty members engage as participants in these workshops, and many of the workshops are taught by faculty from the unit. In addition to these internal professional development opportunities, college faculty regularly participate in workshops and conferences related to the national school reform movement in Qatar, as well as national and international conferences in their areas of specialization. Every faculty member is provided the opportunity to attend one international conference per year funded by the college, and further travel support for international conferences is often available based on individual faculty members' requests. Summary data indicate that during the 2009-10

academic year, college faculty members attended 140 workshops, 85 conferences, and 64 technology use workshops. These numbers are evidence of strong faculty involvement in professional development to advance their teaching, research and service activities.

Qatar University has a sabbatical leave program that is thoroughly delineated in the Faculty Handbook. Regular faculty members on rolling or indefinite duration contracts are eligible for sabbatical leave if they have been in full-time service to the University for at least 8 of the previous 10 semesters. Administrators may be granted a sabbatical leave after completing one full term of administrative service. Faculty members may be awarded up to three sabbatical leaves during their employment at Qatar University. Sabbatical leaves are for either one or two semesters, and are granted through an application and review process.

In the 2007-08 academic year, the College of Education initiated a peer observation program in which faculty members visit colleagues' classes and provide instructional feedback using a defined observation and comment protocol. The Peer Observation System is administered by the Quality Assurance Committee in the College of Education, which has developed a comprehensive Peer Observation System Guide/Manual to guide observers and assure consistency in the observation and feedback process. The Quality Assurance Committee determines a schedule of observations each academic year, and every faculty member in the unit is observed during any two-year period. The purposes of the Peer Observation System are to:

- a) Support active teaching processes to enhance the quality of teaching and learning
- b) Raise awareness about issues that faculty members face in teaching
- c) Encourage faculty members to engage in dialogue and exchange of ideas
- d) Motivate faculty members to engage in self reflection
- e) Make changes in the teaching-learning process based on evidence.

The Peer Observation System is not a faculty evaluation tool, and observation reports are confidentially maintained by the Quality Assurance Committee. Any release of the observation reports is at the discretion of the faculty member, and several faculty elect to include the reports in their annual review and/or promotion dossiers.

In developing the Peer Observation System, the Quality Assurance Committee examined faculty evaluation models from 10 universities around the world, and the completed protocol was reviewed by faculty at American University in Beirut. The process as currently implemented goes well beyond common practices in other universities in both the specificity and the scope of the program. Faculty members serving on the Quality Assurance Committee have submitted a paper on the Peer Observation System to UNESCO for review and possible publication.

Overall Assessment of the Standard.

The unit faculty are well qualified and engaged in both continuous professional development and systematic support of the education reform movement in Qatar. Both the unit and the University have well-defined systems for faculty evaluation, development, and promotion. The faculty are well equipped to accomplish the College mission and vision and to make a sustained contribution to the development of high quality education programs for all students in Qatar schools.

Strength of the Standard.

The Peer Observation System developed and operated by the College of Education Quality Assurance Committee represents exemplary practice in the area of faculty development and support. The program is worthy of emulation in universities throughout the world.

Areas for Improvement.

None

Recommendation for Standard 5.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

The College of Education is one of seven academic colleges in Qatar University. It was established in 1973 as the only academic program in the first institution of higher education in Qatar. Currently the College of Education is the only higher education unit in Qatar devoted to preparation of teachers and school leaders.

The Dean of the College of Education is the head of the professional education unit at Qatar University, and the roles and responsibilities of the dean and other academic officers in the college are delineated in the university's Faculty Handbook. The college currently has two Associate Deans, handling academic affairs and student affairs. There are four departments, two of which (Art Education and Physical Education) are being eliminated. The two remaining departments, Educational Sciences and Psychological Sciences, are administered by Department Heads and offer all professional education programs in the college and the university. Each program in the college has a Program Coordinator who reports to the appropriate Department Head and has specific planning and oversight responsibility for the designated academic program.

The College of Education has a faculty committee structure designed to provide faculty input and leadership on major decisions and programs in the college. Interviews with faculty working as members of the Curriculum Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, and Promotion Committee reveal that they have substantive, well-defined roles in the governance and operation of the college.

The college has established two centers, the Center for Development and Research (CEDR) and the Early Childhood Center. CEDR has four purposes:

- a) offering professional development workshops for K-12 educators
- b) coordinating research symposia at the College of Education
- c) participating in research projects with external agencies
- d) involving faculty in school-based research.

The Early Childhood Center has three purposes

- a) training early childhood educators and professionals to meet international standards
- b) initiating research projects on pedagogy in early childhood education
- c) promoting best practices in teaching and learning in early childhood education, using new technologies.

Additionally, the college has proposed establishment of a National Center for Educator Development to be housed in the College of Education. This center would provide high quality educational experiences for current and prospective teachers in Qatar's Independent Schools, and research and evaluation projects on personnel preparation as a part of the Qatar education reform

movement. This proposal has the support of the Qatar Minister of Education and is currently being considered for approval by the Board of Trustees of Qatar University.

The unit has strong and productive relationships with the Supreme Education Council that is responsible for school reform in Qatar, and with the College of Arts and Sciences at the University. In 2008 the unit formed the Education Partners Committee that included leadership personnel from the Supreme Education Council and from schools in Qatar. This committee meets twice per year, reviews unit programs, and provides recommendations for program improvement. They also provide assistance and feedback in planning for new instructional, research and service programs in the college. It is clear from both interviews with committee members and review of committee minutes that this group of external advisers offers important advice and support on college initiatives.

College of Arts and Sciences faculty and administrators were active participants in development of the new Bachelor of Education program in Primary Education. In addition, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences indicated that a faculty member in A&S has been designated as the liaison to the College of Education for curricular planning and coordination, and this faculty member receives a one-course release each academic year to perform these duties. There are regular meeting between A&S faculty members and College of Education program coordinators for integrated planning.

The College of Education has well-developed admission and advising materials that are made available to students and prospective students in a timely manner. The University Catalog, as well as application and advising materials, are available primarily on-line. The college has an annual student recruitment day and booths at local book fairs and cultural events. Student enrollment is a continuous challenge for the College of Education because of cultural issues that tend to make other majors more attractive to many students. The College of Education is aggressive in attacking this issue, and has recently reached an agreement with the Minister of Education to provide monthly stipends for candidates enrolled in teacher education programs. The stipends are at a level that will attract candidates' attention, and everyone is hopeful that with the initiation of the B.Ed. program and the candidate stipends, enrollment in teacher education programs will grow over the next several years.

The primary role of the Associate Dean for Student Affairs is to insure that all candidates have access to advising and counseling. All candidates are assigned advisers at the time of program admission, and it is the college's intent that this adviser will serve in this role throughout the candidate's program. Advising responsibilities are outlined in program handbooks. The Student Support Committee recognizes outstanding candidate achievements and assesses candidates' satisfaction with advising services.

6b. Unit Budget

Qatar University has a well-defined budget planning process that starts with departmental budget requests that are reviewed at the college level and combined into a single college budget request to the university. After university review and modifications, the university budget request is

submitted to the Qatar Ministry of Finance for review and approval. Upon Ministry approval of a University budget, allocations are made to colleges for their operations.

There are four budget categories. The personnel and building budgets are centralized and are not under the management of college deans. The funds for operations and technology are allocated to the colleges and managed at the college level. The allocation for the College of Education for the current year was discounted only 7% from the college's original request.

In 2009-10, according to figures presented in the Qatar University Fact Book, the College of Education enrolled 4.6% of the students in the university, and received 5.1% of the operations funds allocated to academic colleges in the university. The College of Education is receiving its fair share of university resources, and is funded adequately to achieve its mission.

6c. Personnel

Faculty workload at Qatar University is measured in Instructor Credit Hours (ICH). By university policy, the annual teaching workload for a full-time faculty member is 21 ICH, distributed over two semesters. Department Heads are expected to avoid teaching loads of more than 15 ICH in any given semester. ICH credit is provided for administrative and program coordinator duties, as well as other specified college or departmental tasks. If a faculty member teaches more than 21 units in an academic year, s/he is entitled to additional compensation for the overload.

College of Education teaching loads for the 2009-10 academic year were generally in conformity with university policy. Twenty-nine faculty teaching loads were documented, only four of which exceeded 21 units. In each of these four cases, Department Heads described the circumstances leading to the overload, and the consideration provided the faculty member for the additional teaching responsibilities. Considerations varied according to faculty needs and interests, and included such actions as additional travel allocation and a reduced teaching load this academic year. Overall, the university teaching load principles are honored in unit faculty assignments to teaching.

The Qatar University Faculty Handbook describes supervision of student teachers as having a .33 "teaching load factor." This means that student teaching supervisors receive .33 of the student course credit for supervision. Since practicum is a 6-credit-hour course for students, faculty members receive 2 ICH during semesters in which they are doing practicum supervision. The Department Heads make every effort to assign no more than three candidates to any supervisor for a given semester, meaning that 3 student teachers/interns would equal 2 ICH for the faculty supervisor. This would equal approximately 32 candidates per academic year per full-time equivalent faculty, or 16 per semester. For Fall Semester 2010, 10 unit faculty members are assigned to practicum supervision. Of these 10, three are supervising two candidates, 5 are supervising three candidates, and 2 are supervising four candidates. There is a clear inequity in these assignments, though they fit within the expectations of the standard.

The unit does not currently have clinical faculty. Graduate assistants are, when teaching, assigned to assist with technology training, primarily related to student e-folios. Teaching assistants also engage in collaborative research with faculty.

As delineated in Standard 5, Element f, the unit provides substantial resources and opportunities for faculty professional development. The level of faculty professional development exceeds that which is typical for institutions of higher education.

6d. Unit Facilities

The unit has 14 classrooms, including a large (250 capacity) lecture hall with full multi-media capabilities. Most are SMART classrooms with self-contained media capabilities. In addition, the college has a video laboratory and an extensive media center. Because the college offers classes both during the day and in the evening, classroom capacity is expanded.

Each faculty member has a private or shared office with desktop computer, printer, and a telephone system with Voice-over-Internet protocol. Both classroom and office space are sufficient to meet current needs of College of Education faculty and students.

6e. Unit Resources Including Technology

Resource allocation across the two departments in the unit is equitable and sufficient to meet their instructional and administrative needs. The reduction of departmental units in the college from four to two offers opportunities for more efficient allocation and use of resources. Unit resources have been designated for supporting the assessment system.

Faculty and candidates have access to substantial technology resources and support systems, including the Blackboard Course Management System. Virtually all courses have a technology component through Blackboard, with instructors requiring at the very least retrieval of announcements and handouts. Many courses require extensive use of technology. All candidates are required to complete e-folios through TaskStream, and all faculty are required to post an on-line course portfolio at least once per academic year. The university, through QUnet, provides interconnectivity and network services for computers throughout campus, and wireless Internet access is available on campus.

The College of Education has four computer classroom labs with differing configurations of instructor options. Each lab is equipped with computers at every student seat.

The University Library has two separate facilities, one on the women's campus and the other on the men's campus. Circulation services in the Library are automated with the MINISIS Integrated Library System, arabicized by the Arab League's Department of Information. A state-of-the-art four-story University Library is currently under construction and scheduled to open late 2010. The Libraries contain traditional collections in English and Arabic, as well as extensive electronic database options, including eBrary, ERIC, ISI Web of Knowledge, and Lexis Nexus.

In addition to the University Libraries, the unit maintains a Resource Room and Media Center for use by candidates. The Center has over 1,100 books, 126 videos, 14 CDs and 100 DVDs, all focused specifically on education. The Center also provides resources for preparing classroom materials, including copying, binding, lamination, scanning, Internet and computer access, video copiers, and a die cut machine with dies suitable for classroom materials preparation. There are also manipulatives available for science and mathematics teaching that can be checked out by candidates. The Center provides a textbook loan service for candidates. Center staff conduct workshops for candidates and practicing teachers.

Each year, faculty have the opportunity to request new acquisitions in both the University Libraries and the unit’s Resource Room and Media Center. The request processes and timelines are similar for the two operations. Each spring, programs are asked to submit prioritized requests for books, media, and other resources. In the University Libraries, each unit has a percentage of the acquisitions budget; in almost all cases the allocation is sufficient to cover all requests. If a unit makes requests that exceed the allocated budget, purchases are made in relation to the prioritized list.

In order to make textbooks more affordable for students, the unit purchases textbooks and makes them available to students at half-price.

Overall Assessment of the Standard.

The College of Education is the designated unit in the university responsible for professional education for teachers and school leaders, and for university support of the reform program for primary and secondary schools in Qatar. The unit has sufficient resources to fulfill its mission, and an organizational structure that meets operational and leadership needs. Governance and administrative structures in the college support leadership in program development, teaching improvement, stimulation of research opportunities, and service activities designed to strengthen education for all students in Qatar schools.

Area for Improvement and Rationale.

1. The student teaching/practicum supervision formula for faculty ICH credit is based on credit per section rather than credit per candidate.

The problem with a formula based on credit per section rather than credit per candidate is that it guarantees neither equity across faculty nor conformance with the expectations of the standard. A faculty member assigned two candidates to supervise receives the same 2 ICH as a faculty member assigned four candidates.

Recommendation for Standard 6.

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Report to Dean Hissa Mohammed S. M. Sadiq, Dr. Nancy
Allen, and the Administration and Faculty of Qatar University's
College of Education

Preparing for NCATE Accreditation

Visit of March, 2014

Karen Karp
Professor
College of Education
University of Louisville

Nick Michelli
Presidential Professor
The Graduate Center
City University of New York

Introduction and Status

Our visit to Qatar University took place between March 19 and March 25, including travel time. Prior to our visit, we analyzed the conceptual framework and made suggestions for changes, reviewed the documents available (which were limited at the time), and reviewed our October report in order to follow up on suggestions made there. In addition we prepared documents and a PowerPoint on the Boyer Model to respond to interests expressed by the University.

Regarding the Conceptual Framework, we have provided our original comments and ask that you review them once more. Some were editorial, and some were quite substantive. Given how important we think the CF is we suggest that you tell us which comments you did not take and why, so we can be sure it is the best it can be. You need not respond on items that are clearly editorial.

We met with Dean Hissa and Dr. Allen frequently during our visit as well as with faculty of the College of Education, and especially with individuals responsible for specific NCATE standards and SPA reports. Our schedule for this visit, our October 2013 report, the Conceptual Framework with our comments, and the NCATE guide for preparing tables are appendices. We suggest that it is important to review these documents to place the comments from March, 2014 in context. Some items are more fully explained there. In addition, we attach to the email the PowerPoint we prepared and the, in addition, the Glassick article on assessment using Boyer's work.

The NCATE Standards the Conceptual Framework and Qatar University

The Conceptual Framework

The Conceptual Framework should be the shared vision of the unit at the University regarding the preparation of educators and should be evident in every program of study. The Conceptual Framework should be the basis for program planning—course objectives, assessments evaluating students, data base development, and determining students’ fitness to begin work as an educator. The current framework works well for all programs and the changes described to us that were made since the October visit to update the research base and fine tune the message are movements in the right direction. But, continue to be certain that there is clear evidence of the active role of Pre-K-12 partners and faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences in its development and their understanding of the Conceptual Framework. In addition, every Board of Examiner team we have worked on has asked initial and advanced candidates questions to determine if the learning expected in the CF is in fact achieved and asked Arts and Science faculty and school faculty about their role in its development and their understanding of it in practice. This is often an area that needs some correction and enhancement, and currently there is ample time for that.

We do not know if all of our recommendations made in the fall were incorporated into the Conceptual Framework. The copy we now have is identical to the one we reviewed. To be certain, we are attaching our original comments on the CF as an appendix to this report. Clearly, you do not have to take our advice, but it would be helpful to know why or why not the comments werer accepted and the reasoning behind the decisions.

SPA Reports

The draft of a SPA report for the Educational Leadership program was provided in advance of the visit and was reviewed providing numerous comments and suggestions to all documents. Dr. Karp met with Dr. Romanowski, program coordinator, to review and discuss the notes. Dr. Allen also reviewed the comments and there was agreement that the draft would respond to the concerns and questions.

During the visit we also met to discuss the more complex SPA situations where programs and SPAs did not seem to precisely align. For example, we met and examined the situation with the Special Education program. If the SPA is not deemed in close enough association to the outcomes and standards, standards for the program will need to be created and validated. We suggested that using the SPA standards as much as possible will alleviate additional work on this task but that this standard/SPA-like response will be the focus of the Reviewers for Standard 1 and 2 as there will be no outside review panel. In our conversations about the SPA decision it was brought to our attention that others suggested they “wouldn’t pass” the SPA due to the lack of hours in the field experience or the duration of the program (less than 2 years). This is not accurate. The SPAs only base their decision on the stated standards, and neither of those two variables are considered during the special education SPA review. The field experience hours will be a consideration of the NCATE Standard 3 review – but the duration of an excellent program (from admission to completion) is not an issue.

The draft of a SPA report for the Primary Program was provided for review, and the document is attached to this report. Any questions can be directed to us and we will support the growth and development of the report.

In general here are some things to consider with the reports started:

- Make sure rubrics have one “component” per cell so multiple things are not being assessed in a single item.
- Keep rubric headings consistent – definitely across programs and preferably across the entire unit. You will be asked to collapse data across the whole unit and if the rubric don’t have the same number and meaning of headings that will be almost impossible.
- Use the language of the SPA standards in your rubrics – and your report – wherever possible
- Avoid the use of the N/A rating in any assessments – unless you have a detailed plan for how you will follow up on each N/A to make sure the candidate adequately meets that standard or rubric component.
- Ensure that assignments are actually carried out with children in schools – as a performance assessment. Just creating a plan is not the same as carrying it out and

making on the spot adjustments, etc. SPAs are looking for performance-based assessments.

- Include faculty expertise on the faculty charts– making sure that it is obvious to the readers how these individuals are experts.
- Other comments are written directly on the documents with tracked changes.

All SPA reports and verified SPA-like reports are very important for meeting Standard 1 especially and they play a role in Standard 2, as we discuss below.

Data Tables and Supporting Assertions

The expected tables for reported data are clearly stated on the NCATE/CAEP website. Additional data not included in the Institutional Report can be linked to the online evidence section as an exhibit. You should consider at each step of the process what evidence will be placed online for each assertion you make in the Institutional Report. Remember, that putting a document under one standard does not mean it should not be repeated under another standard in the exhibit area if it is relevant to meeting that standard.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge Skills And Professional Dispositions

Standard 1 expects that:

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and

dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

As you know, this is a critical standard and is made more critical by every program that does not go through and pass an external review. It is difficult to be successful in achieving NCATE accreditation without meeting Standards 1 and 2, although as we said, in our last report, it is possible however to meet one standard and not the other as the standards stand alone. If this happens, the most common situation is meeting Standard 1 based on evidence submitted and collected during the visit but failing Standard 2 for lack of systematic collection of data.

Standard 1 always depends in part on the SPA reports completed and the response from SPA organizations (or in the case of some U.S. institutions state-administered program reviews). You made a decision to not submit SPA reports by the March 15, 2014 deadline, making it essential that they be submitted by the September 15, 2014 deadline. Given the limited window during which NCATE rather than CAEP accreditation is possible, the importance of successful SPA submission cannot be overstated. You cannot proceed with an NCATE review without the relevant SPA reports.

The visiting team will look at the SPA reports and the response of the SPAs as part of the assessment of this standard. This includes the embedded performance assessments required for SPA reports, which we believe are already in place (or are being put into practice) and the corresponding data being collected.

Beyond that, the ability to generate reports through Taskstream must be refined further and used for the required data tables and other exhibits.

Much of what we said in our October report still pertains to Qatar University's work on Standard 1, and should be reviewed again. We attach that report as an appendix to this report.

Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

Standard 2 expects that:

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

Remember that standard 2 is the reciprocal of Standard 1 in the sense that it describes the **system** in place that is used for the evaluation of both initial and advanced candidates, programs and the unit. NCATE looks to see that the institution not only evaluates individual programs but also looks at the unit as a whole with aggregated data to get a sense of its health, success and progress towards continuous improvement.

The decision to hire an assessment expert will be helpful to demonstrate your commitment, but probably not in time to meaningfully affect data for this report.

We identify the following continuing questions and comments, which were in our last report and reviewed in our exit interview. They should continuously be kept in mind and your responses further developed:

1. How are the data collected?
2. From where are the data collected?
3. How often are the data summarized and analyzed with changes documented (both at the program and unit levels)?
4. Who has responsibility to summarize and analyze the data?

5. In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed?
6. Who reviews the data (especially stakeholders such as school and community partners, faculty in Arts and Sciences, and candidates) and how are the data shared with these partners?
7. What forms of information technology are used to maintain the system?
8. How easy is it to generate data reports to answer specific questions and who has responsibility for producing such reports?
9. Use the protocol developed by Trish regarding measuring candidate impact on students.
10. Develop visuals for data reporting
11. Develop COMMON dispositions for all initial programs and all advanced programs, with specialized additions when needed .

Most importantly: the assessment process must be a SYSTEM with evidence that assessments are designed to gather data about planned program outcomes through meaningful performance assessments, and the results from those assessments are used to improve programs and the functioning of the unit, as well as to assess the assessment process itself. Although it will not be fully in place before CAEP becomes the only review option, NCATE values evidence of PreK-12 student learning as a result of internships by your candidates. This standard can require the development of portfolios for candidates which includes samples of student work demonstrating mastery of objectives. There will also need to be evidence on the impact on student learning for the other school professionals and in all advanced programs.

Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

Standard 3 expects that:

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

The essence of our recommendations for Standard 3, the items most often coming to the attention of visiting teams, include:

1. Collaborative planning with partner schools. We mentioned involvement in the development of the CF. Beyond that, how else are the school partners involved in program assessment and revision? When and how do you share assessment results with them? What documentation do you have of your meetings with the K-12 Advisory Council?
2. Strong involvement of partner schools in all activities. The clinical faculty in partner schools should feel that they are a part of the unit and their ideas are valued and respected. In some cases clinical faculty engage in research with university faculty and jointly present at conferences or in preparing publications. In other cases they attend professional development that unit faculty are receiving (such as your conference or other outside speakers, etc.). Demonstrate the nature of this two-way partnership.
3. Shared knowledge of the Unit's goals. Just to emphasize what we have already stated, partners must know and understand the CF
4. Shared vision of what excellence looks like. Training for mentors such as the clinical faculty or cooperating teachers in schools, is often overlooked. We recommend a systematic approach to providing professional development to prepare them to serve in the role. In this context you can reinforce the CF and even engage in joint assessment of a evaluating a teaching episode to enhance reliability. The same principle applies to the college based faculty who supervise internships – there must be inter-rater reliability.

5. Diverse opportunities for candidates to implement classroom learning. Demographics on partner schools should be considered in placements. Placement in diverse settings in internships helps meet both Standard 3 and Standard 4.
6. Consistent guidelines that are commonly understood by candidates, mentor teachers, supervisors and faculty. Be sure field experience and student teaching/internship handbooks are updated and used, and that any assessment forms reflect the CF, the standards and the dispositions required of corresponding programs.
7. Purposeful oversight of placements at all phases of the program (beginning, middle and culminating). Often programs allow the K-12 schools autonomy in placing candidates and there are times they are not placed in situations with outstanding master teachers or mentors. This should be a joint process in which you, over time, ask for particular clinical faculty or ask that candidates not be placed with some faculty (based on decisions made from evaluation data). It isn't easy, but it is very important even beyond accreditation. One of Nick's mentors, John Goodlad, goes so far as to say that a college should admit no more candidates than for whom it is certain that there are excellent placements and clinical faculty available for each. We can talk about this more if you would like to brainstorm..

Standard 4: Diversity Questions

Standard 4 expects that:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

We believe your faculty have an understanding of this important and sometimes difficult standard. It is not unusual for the uninformed to look at a group of initial or advanced candidates and assume there is no diversity based on some variable that is visual, and of course this is exacerbated by the fact that the women at Qatar University all wear Abayas. In our experience the assumption of a lack of diversity is often wrong and misguided. As we said in our exit interview:

1. Consider various types of diversity in candidates, faculty, field settings (economic status, rural/urban, cultural/tribal differences, presence of a parent from another culture, etc.).
2. Show where in courses candidates are taught how to work with diverse K-12 students and how that is assessed through performance based assessments.
3. Certainly “culturally responsive teaching” tied to constructivism which is a cornerstone of your CF should be demonstrable in multiple ways.
4. The presence of students with disabilities, sometimes used as a factor of diversity, may be difficult to tease out because of cultural traditions within the society.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications Performance And Development

Standard 5 expects that:

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

For this standard, there are several things we discussed with you, and which are indeed important. These are:

1. Use plenty of hard data—evidence of excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship.
2. For scholarship you have to decide the extent to which you will use the Boyer model.
3. All faculty must have current CVs in English and Arabic on website by end of the semester
4. Be clear about how faculty are reviewed and reappointed with transparency – there should be no faculty who would say – “I am unsure why I received this rating. “
5. Some colleges examine distribution in rank in comparison with other colleges within the university between men and women to demonstrate equity.

Standard 6: Unit Governance And Resources

Standard 6 expects that:

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

One important aspect of Standard 6 is assurance for the team that in fact leadership authority, budget, facilities and resources are adequate to deliver a high-quality program to the preparation of educators. This does not replace the need for collaboration.

This standard, like the others, should rely on data collected through Standard 2. Specifically, our suggestions, some of which are repeated from our last visit, are these:

1. Focus on fairness and transparency

2. Should have and evidence that you follow policies for...everything, including personnel actions and curricular actions. Such documentation will go a long way to justify that you are addressing the fairness and transparency issue.
3. Demonstrate adequacy of resources including funding for technical support in your assessment system, in personnel and equipment for teaching and supporting candidates.
4. Demonstrate equity of your resources as compared with other colleges. We know that some program areas are more expensive than others, often the sciences and arts require equipment other programs do not require, so equity does not mean equal resources. If you have access to the budgets of each college, a comparison of funding by FTE student is often a useful metric.
5. How is curriculum developed *and approved* within the program? Who oversees its final approval? We know that curriculum is approved finally above the deans' level. What you want to demonstrate is that when a curriculum proposal passes your level, it is likely to be approved beyond. In some places, proposals for education are systematically denied by other units. For example, education might need a mathematics course that Arts and Sciences will say they cannot offer due to a lack of resources or will not offer at a time convenient for education candidates.
6. Are there college level standing curriculum committees, and committees at other levels – such as program level? What is their role in governance? Who is on them? We would expect to see the inclusion of the K-12 advisory and arts and science advisory groups here and even candidates where appropriate (such as on a technology committee, etc.)
7. Some program curricula, often the content knowledge component of secondary programs, are prepared outside traditional education departments—in the arts and sciences. Evidence that standards for selection and knowledge of what teachers need to know should be presented, and there should be approval of any aspect of a teacher education program by a unit committee before it goes further. Just to reiterate because it is important, —how is curriculum designed and approved ACROSS school (Education or Arts and Sciences) lines? Is the role of the College of Education, even if only for input, clear? Influential?
8. Many institutions deal with the authority question through something often called a Teacher Education Coordinating Council which includes College of Education faculty,

College of Arts and Science faculty, K-12 representatives and even initial or advanced candidates. This group reviews any changes in a program leading to work in schools and if it doesn't have the authority to deny that the change go further, it should be expected to give input to the next level.

9. Remember that the standard does include workload policy that should be comparable to other colleges.
10. Finally, demonstrate that what you report about assessment of the unit in Standard 2, including the adequacy of field placement services and counseling, is reflected in Standard 6.

Conclusion

There is clear evidence of progress and we all know what the deadlines are. We want to review drafts of standard reports and SPA reports as soon as they are ready. We recommend that you allow time for our input.

Appendices

- A. Schedule for March Visit
- B. Conceptual Framework with Karp and Michelli Comments
- C. October 2013 Karp and Michelli Report
- D. Boyer PowerPoint Attached to email
- E. Glassick Article Attached to email as PDF
- F. NCATE Guidelines for Preparing Tables for Institutional Report
- G. Comments on the Primary program review. **Sent in a separate email**

Schedule March Visit

DATE	TIME	NAME
Thurs. 20th	8:30-9:30	Steering Committee – Dr. Hissa’s Office
	9:30-10:00	Issues with Secondary Program – (Dr. Ali and Dr. Fatma Al-Motawah) Room 136
	10:00	Standard 5 (Dr. Ali and Dr. Asma) – Room 136
	11:00	Lunch – on campus
	12:00	Standard 1 (Dr. Clay) – Room 136
	1:00	Standard 6 (Dr. Hissa, Dr. Fatma, Ms. Reem) – Dean’s Office
	2:00	Standard 2 (Dr. Yahya) – Room 136
Sun. 23th	8:00	Issues with Special Education Programs (Dr. Clay, Dr. Asma, Dr. Fatma Al-Motawah) – Room 136
	9:00	Presentation -- Update-Questions and Answers (all faculty and staff invited) – Room 223
	10:00	Standard 4 (Dr. Ahmed) – Room 136
	11:00	Boyer’s Definitions of Scholarship – Dean’s Office
	12:00	
	1:00	New Programs (Dr. Michael, Dr. Clay, Dr. Yahya, Dr. Atmane) – Room 136
Mon. 23th	9:00	Qatar Primary School for Girls
	11:00	Mosaab Secondary School for Boys
	1:00	Standard 3
	2:00	Exit Conference (Dean Hissa, Dr. Clay, Dr. Yahya, Dr. Nancy)

Conceptual Framework of the College of Education, Qatar University



Introduction

Qatar University, the national university of the State of Qatar, is rooted in its heritage, cultural values, and traditions while offering world-class education and research. Proud of its Arabic identity and role as a part of the educational and intellectual scene in the Arab world, it is also thoroughly engaged with international developments academically. Strongly attuned to the realities of the society it serves, the university is fully committed to Qatar's ambitions to achieve a knowledge-based economy.

The College of Education was the first higher education institution in the State of Qatar and the founding unit of Qatar University. It remains the single entity for the preparation of educators in the country. The college embraces its unique position of honor as well as the exceptional responsibility this entails. The [vision](#) of the college reflects awareness of this role by asserting that:

The College of Education will be a leading institution in the preparation of education professionals through outstanding teaching, scholarship, and leadership in order to shape the future of Qatar.

Its mission states:

The College of Education is committed to providing excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of education professionals by establishing a foundation in which life-long learning, teaching, research, and community partnerships are fostered. The college fulfills its commitment by providing:

- *Its members an educational, motivational, and supportive environment for both learning and teaching in a climate which blends and balances modernity and the preservation of Arabic and Islamic identity.*
- *Society with highly qualified education professionals and on-going professional development, by supporting scholarly activities, and by sharing the responsibility of the modernization of the country through effective partnerships.*

To realize its vision and fulfill its mission, the college is committed to these values:

- Honoring the history, culture, and values of Qatar and its people

- Providing challenging academic programs benchmarked to international standards of content knowledge, pedagogy and dispositions
- Contributing to the solution of social and educational problems
- Respecting diversity locally and globally
- Promoting collaborative communities of practice
- Using the most current technologies to advance education
- Contributing to theory and practice in education through scholarship
- Fostering life-long learning
- Requiring the highest standards of professional ethics

The relationship between the college’s mission, vision, and institutional values and the unit’s conceptual framework is a reciprocal one as all of these components rely on as well as shape one another.

The key document of the conceptual framework was developed as part of the college’s preparation to achieve International Recognition in Teacher Education (IRTE) in 2010. Using a multi-stage, iterative, collaborative process, the unit’s education partners and other stakeholders from the community along with faculty and staff of the college identified their beliefs about teaching and learning which formed the basis of the framework’s initial draft. Alignment with the college’s vision and mission was achieved. Stakeholders and faculty identified key references thought to be seminal works related to the identified priorities. Faculty were asked to read core references and suggest additional ones. Subsequent revisions of the framework were prepared and shared with external stakeholders and those within the college until a final version was approved for the IRTE. The conceptual framework, however, represents a living document for the college, a document that is systematically reviewed and revised.

The Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework can be summarized in the statement:

Together we shape the future through excellence in teaching, scholarship, and leadership.

The visual symbol of the conceptual framework incorporates the Qatar University building architecture to symbolize Qatari and Arabic culture, a plant to indicate growth and shaping, and an arrow to show our ongoing movement toward excellence today and in the future. The design’s blue color is the one used for the College of Education in all publications for Qatar University.

The three pillars of the conceptual framework—teaching, scholarship, and leadership—are supported by eight unit learning outcomes that are common across all programs in the college. Briefly, as more complete descriptions of the outcomes follow in subsequent sections, these are:

Outcome 1: Content

Demonstrate understanding of the key theories and concepts of the subject matter.

Outcome 2: Pedagogy

Plan effective instruction to maximize learning for all students.

Outcome 3: Technology

Use current and emerging technologies in instructionally powerful ways.

Outcome 4: Diversity

Foster successful learning experiences for all students by addressing individual differences.

Outcome 5: Problem Solving

Arrive at data-informed decisions by systematically examining a variety of factors, data and resources.

Outcome 6: Scholarly Inquiry

Actively engage in scholarship by learning from and contributing to the knowledge base in education.

Outcome 7: Ethical Values

Apply professional ethics in all educational contexts.

Outcome 8: Initiative

Lead positive change in education.

The outcomes have been aligned with the Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders which are the basis for educational licensure and advancement in the country. (See Appendix 1.)

The conceptual framework guides the college in all its efforts. It is the touchstone against which decisions are tested. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. All courses contribute toward candidate mastery of the concepts, knowledge, and skills articulated by the conceptual framework.

Here, then, is a discussion of the meaning of the components of the conceptual framework, examples of how the framework guides the college's efforts, and a summary its intellectual foundations.

“Together”

It is fitting that the statement of the conceptual framework begins with the word, *together*, as interdependence is such a key value of Arab and Qatari culture. In order to succeed in often harsh circumstances, the individuals of a family, tribe, and community need to work together. This value shapes the thinking and actions of the college in several ways.

The college realizes its responsibility to prepare individuals with the knowledge and skills to help the country succeed in the global community. Woven throughout its programs are the values

and goals reflected in the Qatar National Vision 2030. The programs of the unit significantly contribute to achieving three of the four national goals articulated in this vision:

Economic Development

Development of a competitive and diversified economy capable of meeting the needs of, and securing a high standard of living for all [Qatar's] people, both for the present and for the future.

Human Development

Development of all [Qatar's] people to enable them to sustain a prosperous society.

Social Development

Development of a just and caring society based on high moral standards and capable of playing a significant role in global partnerships for development. (General Secretariat for Development Planning, 2010).

Achieving the goals of Qatar's vision is the responsibility of the whole community, not just the college but, as His Highness, Sheikh Tamim Bin Hamad recently stated, education is the train of development for the country. Building capacity and sustainability in education through the preparation of competent educators and school leaders is a critical factor in supporting this growing nation. That is the role the college plays, how it works together with all who are interested and invested in the state's growth and the education of learners in the K-12 environment who will be Qatar's future leaders.

Such a collaborative synergy creates a shared vision, a critical characteristic of effective educational systems (McCombs & Miller, 2007; Boyd, 1992; Nanus, 1992; Seeley, 1992). Faculty in the college model for candidates the important lesson that developing a shared vision among stakeholders can contribute to increased student learning (Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, & Bryk, 2001; Hallinger & Heck, 1996). This commitment to involving stakeholders also reflects the educational principle that knowledge is socially constructed (Vygotsky, 1978; Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Glassersfeld, 1995; Palincsar, 1998). And it creates for the college a community of practice with its essential elements as described by Wenger (2007): (1) an identity defined by a shared interest, (2) a network through which members share information, and (3) practitioner participants, who have knowledge, skills, and resources to contribute to the common goal.

“We shape the future”

The conceptual framework emerges from the college's belief that the purposes of education are twofold. One is to help students learn about, engage, and critique cultural and social values, traditions, morality, and religion. The other is to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to develop their intellectual and social potentials, as this development is beneficial for society. Such thinking has been central to education throughout its history (Hodgkinson, 2006; Freeman, 2005; Kendall, Murray, & Linden, 2004; Postman, 1996; Goodlad, 1984). Through the preparation of educators and school leaders skilled to achieve both purposes, education becomes the future of Qatar, and the college of education shapes that future.

The college shapes the future through its teaching by bringing some of the best ideas and practices in education from around the world—e.g., those that form the intellectual foundation of this conceptual framework—to examine education in Qatar. Through courses and activities, the programs' candidates understand the current context of education in the country, and begin to think how they can contribute to its improvement when they assume positions of responsibility upon graduation.¹

The college's National Center for Educator Development is also an important means through which it has an impact on the future of education and educational reform in the country. The Center's collaborations with the Supreme Education Council of Qatar, Independent Schools, and international partners provide a number of intensive ways to improve educational practices in schools and address critical issues, such as the need to create supportive bridges between secondary schools and universities so that students can be successful in the higher education they need to access for the good of the country. Also, the Center's extensive program of professional development workshops provide the kinds of learning opportunities that research shows educators need to continue to improve throughout their careers (Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009).

"Through excellence in teaching"

Four of the college's eight Unit Learning Outcomes relate specifically to excellence in teaching:

Outcome 1: Content

Demonstrate understanding of the key theories and concepts of the subject matter.

Outcome 2: Pedagogy

Plan effective instruction to maximize student learning.

Outcome 3: Technology

Use current and emerging technologies in instructionally powerful ways.

Outcome 4: Diversity

Foster successful learning experiences for all students by addressing individual differences.

They rely on clear conceptions of how people learn and what is important for teachers and educational leaders to know.

The Nature of Learning

¹ For example, EDUC 310 Foundations of Education in Qatar and School Reform is a course that all potential candidates must take before they can apply to either of the B.Ed. programs. EDUC 500 Qatari Schools and Society is an initial course for the Diploma Programs. EDEL 603 Educational Policy in Qatar plays an important role in the curriculum for future school leaders in the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. And in SPED 601 Issues, Policy and Practice in Special Education, candidates in the M.Ed. in Special Education examine Qatar's efforts to educate students with Additional Educational Support Needs via the lens of changing interpretations of educational equity (McGlaughlin, 2010).

These principles related to learning underlie the college's conceptual framework and its efforts:

- Humans construct knowledge based on prior knowledge
- Active engagement with concepts and skills is the most effective way of learning
- What is learned must be transferable to other contexts in the real world
- Reflection improves learning and informs practice
- Learning needs to continue throughout one's life

Humans construct knowledge and understanding based on what they already know (Cobb, 1994, Piaget, 1978; Vygotsky, 1978). Their previous beliefs, skills, and knowledge affect what they attend to and how they interpret, understand, and retain new information (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). The implications of this principle are that effective instruction must focus on the student and the ways in which the student is making sense of the information rather than on simply presenting information; instruction must be *student-centered* (Kember, 2009; Carlile & Jordan, 2005; Harden & Crosby, 2000; Rogers, 1999). Faculty members as teachers and models, and candidates as future teachers, are encouraged to move away from the paradigm of the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge and toward a student-centered model of instruction.

One facet of student-centered learning is the active involvement of students in the learning process. Active learning has been shown to be comparable to lectures in helping students learn facts and information, but superior in developing thinking skills (Bonwell & Eison, 1991), and so educators realize the importance of active student engagement in their educational experiences (Paxman, Nield, & Hall, 2011; McKeachie, & Svinicki, 2006; Armstrong, 1983).

Research suggests that not only does active learning improve motivation and learning, but it may also foster transfer, i.e., the ability of students to apply school-acquired knowledge and skills in different contexts (Elmore, Peterson, & McCarthey, 1996). As stated by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000):

The new science of learning is beginning to provide knowledge to improve significantly people's abilities to become active learners who seek to understand complex subject matter and are better prepared to transfer what they have learned to new problems and settings. Making this happen is a major challenge (e.g., Elmore et al., 1996), but it is not impossible. (p. 13)

The college embraces that challenge.

Reflection and metacognition are also key characteristics of effective learners, and through meaningful reflection, teachers inform their practice (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Milner, 2003; Loughran, 2002; Clift, Houston, & Pugach, 1990). Reflective teaching and learning are infused throughout its programs.

The unit recognizes the rate of change in today's world, and thus developing life-long learners among its faculty, graduates, and their future students is a central commitment. As noted by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000), it is impossible today to convey to students at any level the complete set of knowledge they need to survive in and contribute to society. Education must

rather seek to provide basic knowledge plus the ability to continue to ask and answer meaningful questions and to pose and solve authentic, real-world problems. The goal of the unit is to graduate candidates who are self-sustaining, lifelong learners; who are creators, rather than just consumers, of knowledge; and who can mentor their students in becoming so as well.

Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Besides knowledge about how people learn, excellence in teaching also begins with a clear conception of what is important for educators to know:

- Knowledge about students
- In-depth content knowledge in their fields
- Pedagogical content knowledge and skills
- Dispositions that contribute to effective teaching and learning
- Knowledge and skills about the instructional uses of technology

Knowledge about students.

The unit believes that the focus of education must always remain on the students, so it is essential that our candidates understand how children grow and develop, acquire and use language, and differ in learning styles, prior knowledge and experiences, cultural worldviews, and individual needs. This knowledge about and understanding of students is thus, not only taught in specific courses about human development, but is also woven throughout all courses so that candidates may understand why, as well as how, to foster environments and learning experiences to maximize the learning of all students. For this, the college not only draws from foundational theories in education (Dewey, 1887; Piaget, 1967; Vygotsky, 1978), but also from recent and emerging studies in education (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000).

This component of the conceptual framework also addresses the diverse nature of Qatar's society and student population, in which multiple cultural, linguistic, and historical groups contribute to shape and strengthen the educational environment. The faculty teaches and models attitudes and actions that support diversity and social justice (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Hale, 2001; Foster, 1997; Fordham, 1996; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Faculty are encouraged to infuse courses with strategies for educating diverse populations of candidates through active, student-centered learning (Kember, 2009; Lead, Stephenson, & Troy, 2003; Harden & Crosby, 2000) and multiple modes of instruction (Waldrip, Prain, & Carolan, 2010). The use of such approaches not only increases the effectiveness of our programs, but also affirms "the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers reflect" (Nieto, 2002, p. 29). The unit is committed to developing in our candidates a "set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" (Bennett, 2009, p. 97).

Programs also explicitly address the educational needs of all students, including students with disabilities or, as they are called in Qatar, students with Additional Education Support Needs (Supreme Education Council, 2010). The unit's policies on special education, and especially its emphasis on inclusive education, are consistent not only with the laws of Qatar, but also with two foundational documents used internationally to inform special education programs—*The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action* (UNESCO, 1994) and the *Convention on the*

Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations, 2006). All candidates, whether in special education or general education concentrations, are expected to have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to ensure that every student has opportunities to learn in effective, appropriate, and supportive environments.

Content knowledge

In a presidential speech to the American Educational Research Association, Lee Shulman (1986) described the content knowledge needed by a teacher:

We expect that the subject matter content understanding of the teacher be at least equal to that of his or her lay colleague, the mere subject matter major. The teacher need not only understand that something is so; the teacher must further understand why it is so, on what grounds its warrant can be asserted, and under what circumstances our belief in its justification can be weakened or even denied.
(p. 9)

Although the extent of content knowledge needed for successful teachers is still disputed in research (Allen, 2003, Wilson & Floden, 2003), the unit seeks to hold its candidates to high standards in content knowledge so that they may not only know the information and concepts of their disciplines, but also understand them at deep and meaningful levels.

Pedagogical content knowledge and skills

As numerous research studies have stated (Shulman, 1986b; Grossman, 1990; Sesnan, 2000), pedagogical content knowledge and skills that support learning in the discipline enable the teacher to facilitate student achievement, and so are essential for the successful classroom. Adhering to the learning principles of active engagement and the importance of transfer to the real world, the college requires that such knowledge and skills are demonstrated in authentic contexts through a series of field and clinical experiences in each program.

An appreciation of the importance of actual classroom experience dates at least from the time of John Dewey (1933), who asserted that the primary purpose of teacher education is to provide experiences for teacher candidates in actual classroom settings. In their field experiences, candidates examine their own beliefs about teaching and learning (Kagan, 1992) and may experience significant changes in beliefs, attitudes, and effectiveness (Kennedy, 2006, as cited in Tuli & File, 2009). Research indicates that it is critical that pre-service teachers face the reality of the demands and complexity of teaching early, so that they can make informed decisions as to whether teaching is the best career for them (Gold & Bachelor, 1988; Johnson, 2004; Arnett & Freeburg, 2008). In addition, pre-service teachers have expressed that university courses, without field-based experiences, are unable to duplicate the real-life experiences of teachers in the K-12 environment (Arnett & Freeburg, 2008), and that the field experience is the most valuable component of their teacher education experience (Arnett & Freeburg, 2008; Hill & Brodin, 2004; Haigh & Tuck, 1999). For these reasons, field experiences are integrated throughout every program, increasing in time spent in the field as well as responsibilities, holding that such experience is an opportunity to learn, rather than just an opportunity to demonstrate what has been learned (Zeichner, 1996).

Dispositions for teaching

Researchers have demonstrated for decades that certain attitudes, beliefs, values, and personality traits have an impact on the effectiveness of a teacher (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2002; Demmon-Berger, 1986; Combs, 1974), although determining which characteristics should be the focus is less clear (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2002). In developing our conceptual framework and tools for assessment, the unit focused on those characteristics that would contribute to an individual's likelihood to select and use strategies that would result in effective learning for all students, would lead to productive team work with colleagues and other stakeholders, and would be perceived by the community as demonstrating professionalism. To identify those dispositions, we referred to the accepted lists for our community and our programs.

The dispositions for the programs in the unit were based upon the dispositions identified in the Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders (Education Institute, 2007) for all initial and advanced programs; the Masters in Special Education also added dispositions from the Ethical Principles of The Council for Exceptional Children (2010). (See Appendix 2.) Throughout the programs, faculty members teach and model these dispositions, and expect their demonstration in course assignments and field experiences. Supervisors and school-based mentors formally assess the candidates multiple times throughout their programs; candidates also self-assess and give evidence of these dispositions to increase awareness;

Instructional uses of technology

The use of technology for teaching and learning is consistent with proven effective pedagogical strategies such as student-centered learning, multi-model instruction, real-world contexts, open-ended learning environments, and distributed learning (Bell & Winn, 2000; Brown, 2000, Land & Hannafin, 2000). The use of technology has been shown to encourage cognition (Sternberg & Preiss, 2005) and can contribute to student achievement – if it is chosen well and used thoughtfully (Cheung & Slavin, 2011; Agodini, Dynarski, Honey, & Levin, 2003; Schacter, 1999). As Jonassen stated, computer-based tools “function as intellectual partners with the learner in order to engage and facilitate critical thinking and higher-order learning” (1996, p. 9). In line with professional and national standards (e.g., International Society for Technology in Education, 2002; Education Institute, 2005), candidates are taught effective and diverse ways to use technology in their own classrooms.

“Through excellence in...scholarship”

The unit envisions its faculty and candidates as lifelong learners, problem-solvers, and producers of knowledge. Further, we expect our graduates to be able to mentor their K-12 students in these same skills. Two Unit Learning Outcomes directly relate to this component of our conceptual framework:

Outcome 5: Problem Solving

Arrive at data-informed decisions by systematically examining a variety of factors, data, and resources.

Outcome 6: Scholarly Inquiry

Actively engage in scholarship by learning from and contributing to the knowledge base in education.

The unit's vision of scholarship articulates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions it seeks for candidates and graduates to be consumers and generators of research who are able to translate research into practice. Alone and in collaboration with others, they should be able to identify, collect, and scrutinize evidence; validate knowledge against stringent standards of quality; and critique their performance through reflective teaching practices (Schön, 2005).

This begins with the expectation that the college's faculty are scholars and practitioners who model, as well as teach, the processes and ethics of research and reflection. The efforts of faculty members in the college reflect the full range of p scholarship as described by Boyer (1990), and are often applied to the problems facing education in Qatar and the Arab world:

- The scholarship of discovery that includes original research that advances knowledge.
- The scholarship of integration that involves synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time.
- The scholarship of application (also later called the scholarship of engagement) that goes beyond the service duties of a faculty to those within or outside the University and involves the rigor and application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
- The scholarship of teaching and learning that employs the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

The college seeks to graduate educators who, as action researchers, possess the ability to evaluate their own teaching skills and engage in the inquiry process, to offer explanations for what they are doing, and to generate living educational theories (Schön, 1983; Mcniff & Whitehead, 2009). Not only does this occur as would be expected at the graduate level, where a number of courses and assignments prepare candidates to understand and rely upon the research that they will need as future leaders, but it is increasingly occurring at the baccalaureate level.² This is another important way that the college shapes the future.

“Through excellence in...leadership”

The unit expects all its candidates, whether serving in positions of administration or as classroom teachers, to be leaders. Two Unit Learning Outcomes specifically address this goal which is especially important to the success of education in Qatar:

Learning Outcome 7: Ethical Values

² One of the objectives in the 2013-2016 Strategic Plan for Qatar University is to facilitate student research, and the college has embraced that challenge for its undergraduate candidates. Faculty have been very successful in securing funding internally—Qatar University's Student Grants—and externally—via the competitive Undergraduate Research Experience Program of the Qatar National Research Fund—to support student participation in research projects. And dissemination of those efforts is occurring both nationally within events in Qatar and at international conferences abroad.

Apply professional ethics in all educational contexts.

Learning Outcome 8: Initiative

Lead positive change in education.

Ethical Values

Educational leaders face numerous pressures, conflicting goals, and diverse ideas of the desired ends of education (Sheild & Sayani, 2005). These pressures are not only limited to those traditionally defined as leaders, i.e., those in formal positions of authority. Instead, leadership "...like energy, is not finite, not restricted by formal authority and power; it permeates a healthy school culture and is undertaken by whoever sees a need or an opportunity" (Lambert, 1995, p.33). School leaders assume a wide variety of roles that support school and student success (Harrison & Killion, 2007).

Leaders, whether in administrative or teaching positions, are constantly faced with dilemmas that demand more than a technical response, that require them to grapple with ethical issues (Dantley, 2005). Thus, one of the most important aspects of leadership is demonstrating the qualities of ethical behavior. This requires leaders to engage in critical reflection that compels them to involve themselves personally in their own understanding of ethics and how they can deal with ethical dilemmas. All programs provide opportunities for self-reflection on ethical behavior in schooling (Dantley, 2005). The unit expects all candidates to embrace and practice such universal values as honesty and truthfulness, integrity, reliability, respect, fairness, caring, pursuit of excellence, and professionalism.

Initiative

Effective educational leaders are catalysts for "commitment to and vigorous pursuit of a clear and compelling vision, stimulating higher performance standards" (Collins, 2007, p. 31). This requires motivated leaders who assess, act, and develop opportunities and strategies that can resolve problems or improve situations.

Furthermore, leadership requires a vision that provides meaning and purpose for schools. For educational leaders, vision is "a hunger to see improvement" (Pejza, 1985, p. 10) and "the force which molds meaning" (Manasse, 1986, p. 150). Educational leaders must translate the vision into reality and clearly articulate that vision to others. This requires communication skills and the involvement of all stakeholders. Mazzarella and Grundy (1989) state that school leaders interact well with others, and they know how to communicate. School leaders know that building and sustaining good relationships within and beyond the school is central to the school leader's role (Bryk & Schneider, 2002), and that working together with stakeholders at various levels is essential for school success.

Summary

Thus, the last component of the unit's conceptual framework connects back to its first, reflecting the College of Education's continual efforts to realize its vision, fulfill its mission, and honor its responsibility to the State of Qatar.

Together, we shape the future through excellence in teaching, scholarship, and leadership.

References

- Agodini, R., Dynarski, M, Honey, M., & Levin, D. (2003). *The effectiveness of educational technology: Issues and recommendations for the national study*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences.
- Al-Thani, H. (2006). Disability in the Arab region: Current situation and prospects. *Journal for Disability and Educational Development*, 3, 4-9.
- Arnett, S.E., & Freeburg, B.W. (2008). Family and consumer sciences pre-service teachers: Impact of an early **field experience**. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 20(1), 48-55.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues & perspectives (4th ed.)*. New York: Wiley.
- Bell, P., & Winn, W. (2000). Distributed cognition, by nature and by design. In D. H. Jonassen & S.M. Land (Eds.) *Theoretical foundations of learning environments* (pp. 123-145). Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bennett, J. M. (2009a). Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.) *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 95-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the Sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Bonwell, C.; Eison, J. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom AEHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). *How people learn*. National Academy Press: Washington, DC.
- Brown, D. G. 2000. The jury is in! In *Teaching with Technology*, (David G. Brown, Ed.) Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2002), *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Carlile, O., & Jordan, A. (2005). It works in practice but will it work in theory? The theoretical underpinnings of pedagogy. In S. Moore, G. O'Neill, and B. McMullin (Eds.), *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching*. Dublin: AISHE.
- Cheung, A., & Slavin, R.E. (2011). *The Effectiveness of Education Technology for Enhancing Reading Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research and Reform in Education.

- Clift, R., Houston, W., & Pugach, M. (1990). *Encouraging reflective practice in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Collins, J. (2007). Level 5 leadership. In *The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 27-50.
- Combs, A.W. (1974). Humanistic goals of education. *Educational accountability: A humanistic perspective*. San Francisco: Shields.
- Cook, B. G., Tankersley, M., & Landrum, T. J. (2009). Determining evidence-based practices in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 75(3), 365-383.
- Council for Exceptional Children (2010). *Ethical principles for special education professionals*. Available from the Internet at <http://www.cec.sped.org/content/navigationmenu/professionaldevelopment/professionalstandards/ethicspracticestandards/default.htm>
- Dantley, M. E. (2005). Moral leadership: Shifting the management paradigm. In F. W. English (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory, Research and Practice*. Thousand Oak, CA: SAGE Publications, p. 35-46.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 57(3).
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Demmon-Berger, D. (1986). *Effective teaching: Observations from research*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274087).
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. Retrieved on January 3, 2012, from <http://www.rjgeib.com/biography/credo/dewey.html>
- Dewey, J. (1933) *How we think. A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process* (Revised ed.), Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Education Institute (2005). *State of Qatar curriculum standards*. Doha, Qatar: Supreme Education Council.
- Education Institute (2007). *National professional standards for teachers and school leaders*. Doha, Qatar: Supreme Education Council.
- Elbeheri, G., Everatt, J., Reid, G., & al Mannai, H. (2006). Dyslexia assessment in Arabic. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 6, 143-152.
- Elmore, R.F., Peterson, P.L., and McCarthy, S.M. (1996). *Restructuring in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and school organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching*. New York: New Press.
- Freeman, R. (2005). Competing models for public education. Which model is best? Retrieved September 10, 2006, from <http://www.commondreams.org/views05/0226-25.htm>

- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Stecker, P. M. (2010). The “blurring” of special education in a new continuum of general education placements and services. *Exceptional Children*, 76, 301-323.
- Gay, G. & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice* 42(3), 181-187.
- Gellevij, M.; Meij van der, H.; Jong, T. & Pieters, J. (2002) *Multimodal versus unimodal instructions in a complex learning context. Journal of Experimental Education*, 70 (3). pp. 215-243.
- General Secretariat for Development Planning (2010). Qatar national vision 2030. Retrieved January 3, 2012, from http://www.gsdp.gov.qa/portal/page/portal/GSDP_Vision_Root/GSDP_EN/What%20We%20Do/QNV_2030
- Glaserfeld, E. (1995), *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*, London: RoutledgeFalmer;
- Gold, Y., & Bachelor, P. (1988). Signs of burnout are evident for practice teachers during the teacher training period. *Education*, 108(4), 546-555.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *What are schools for?*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*, New York: Teacher College Press: Columbia University.
- Habor, P. & Getz, C. (2011). Developing intercultural competence in future student affairs professionals through a graduate student global study course to Doha, Qatar. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 14(4). 463-486.
- Haigh, M., & Tuck, B. (1999). *Assessing teacher performance in practicum*. Auckland College of Education, New Zealand.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R.H. (1996). Reassessing the principal’s role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research 1980-1995). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Harden, R. M. and J. Crosby (2000). AMEE Guide No 20: The good teacher is more than a lecturer-the twelve roles of the teacher. *Medical Teacher* 22(4), 334-347.
- Harden, R. M. and J. Crosby (2000). AMEE Guide No 20: The good teacher is more than a lecturer-the twelve roles of the teacher. *Medical Teacher* 22(4), 334-347.
- Harrison, C. & Killion, J. (2007). Teachers as Leaders: Ten Roles for Teacher Leaders. *Educational leadership*, 65(1), pp. 74-77.
- Hill, G. & Brodin, K.L. (2004). Physical education teachers’ perceptions about the adequacy of university course work in preparation for teaching. *Physical Educator*, 61(2), 74-78.
- Hodgkinson, H. (2006). *The whole child in a fractured world*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (2002). *National educational technology standards for teachers: Preparing teachers to use technology*. Eugene, OR: ISTE.

- Ishler, P. & Kay, R. (1981). *A survey of institutional practice*. In C. Webb, N. Gehrek, P. Ishler, & A. Mendozze (Eds.), *Exploratory field experiences in teacher education* (pp. 15-22). Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Johnson, S. M. (2004). *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jonassen, D.L. (1996). *Computers in the classroom: Mindtools for critical thinking*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- Kagan, S. L. (1999). A5: Redefining 21st-century early care and education. Seventh presidential essay. *Young Children*, 54(6), 2-3.
- Kember, David. (2009). Promoting student-centered forms of learning across an entire university. "Higher Education, 58"(1), pp. 1-13.
- Kendall D., Murray, J. & Linden, R. (2004). *Sociology in our times*. (3rd Ed.) Scarborough, ON: Nelson Education Ltd.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, L. (1995). Towards a theory of constructivist leadership. In L. Lambert et al. (Eds.), *The constructivist leader*, 28-51. Chicago, IL: Teachers College Press.
- Land, S. M. & Hannafin, M. J. (2000). Student-centered learning environments. In D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (Eds.) *Theoretical foundations of learning environments* (pp. 1-24). Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lea, S. J., D. Stephenson, and J. Troy (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student centered learning: Beyond educational bulimia. *Studies in Higher Education* 28(3), 321-334.
- Lesser, E. L. & Storck, J. (2001) Communities of practice and organizational performance. *IBM Systems Journal* 40(4), <http://www.research.ibm.com/journal/sj/404/lesser.html>. Accessed December 30, 2002.
- Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 33-43.
- Manasse, A.L. (1986). Vision and leadership: Paying attention to intention. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(1), 150-173.
- Mazzarella, J.A. & Grundy, T. (1989). Portrait of a leader. In S.C. Smith & P.K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for Excellence Second Edition*. (pp. 9-27). Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC: OERI contract OERI -R-86-0003.
- McCombs, B. L., & Miller, L. (2007). *Learner-centered classroom practices and assessments: Maximizing student motivation, learning, and achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- McGlaughlin, M. J. (2010). Evolving interpretations of educational equity and students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 76, 265-278.

- McKeachie, W.J., & Svinicki, M. (2006). *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McNiff, J. and Whitehead, J., (2009). *Doing and writing action research*. London, Sage.
- Milner, R. (2003). Teacher reflection and race in cultural contexts: History, meanings, and methods in teaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 173-180.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Newmann, F. M., Smith, B. A., Allensworth, E., & Bryk, A. S. (2001). *School instructional program coherence: Benefits and challenges*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Palincsar, A.S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345-375.
- Paxman, J., Nield, K., & Hall, A. (????) Nutrition, confidence, and control: Unraveling active learning for nutrition undergraduates. *Journal of Food Science Education*, 10(4) 45-53.
- Pejza, J.P. (1985). The Catholic school principal: A different kind of leader. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association, St. Louis, MO.
- Piaget, J. (1967). *The child's conception of the world*. (J. & A. Tomlinson, Trans.). London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Postman, N. (1996). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). The politics of education. In *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Schacter, J. (1999). *The impact of education technology on student achievement: What the most current research has to say*. Santa Monica, CA: Milken Family Foundation.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1995). Knowing-in-action: the new scholarship requires a new epistemology, *Change*, November–December: 27–32.
- Seeley, D.S. (1992, April). Visionary leaders for reforming public schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Sesnan, B. (2000). *How to teach English*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Sheild, C. M. & Sayani, A. (2005). Leading in the midst of diversity: The challenge of our times. In F. W. English (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory, Research and Practice*. Thousand Oak, CA: SAGE Publications, p. 380-402.
- Shulman, L. (1986a). Those who understand. Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2) 4-14.

- Shulman, L. (1986b). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Research*, 15(2). 4-14.
- Silberman, C. (1971). *Crisis in the classroom*. New York: Random House.
- Smith, M. K. (2003, 2009) 'Communities of practice', *the encyclopedia of informal education*, www.infed.org/biblio/communities_of_practice.htm.
- Southwest Education Development Laboratory (1997). *Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? Issues about Change*, 6(1). Austin, TX: SEDL.
- Sternberg, R.J. & Preiss, D.D. (2005). *Intelligence and technology: The impact of tools on the nature and development of human abilities*. Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Supreme Education Council. The Education Institute. (2010 March). *Additional educational support needs: A pack of policies, guidance documents and support materials for schools*. Doha, Qatar: Author.
- Tuli, F., & File, G. (2009) Practicum experience in teacher education. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science*, 5(1), 107-116.
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Paris: Author.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Waldrip, B., Prain, V. & Carolan, J. (????) *Using multi-modal representations to improve learning in junior secondary science*. *Research in Science Education*, 40(1) 65-80.
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX. National Staff Development Council.
- Wenger, E. (2007) Communities of practice. A brief introduction. *Communities of practice*. Accessed January 14, 2009, from <http://www.ewenger.com/theory/>.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wilson, S., & Floden, R. (2001). *Creating effective teachers: Concise answers for hard questions*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Eric Document 476366.
- Zeichner, K. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, and M.L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of Reform in Preservice Teacher Education*. (pp. 133-175). NY: Teachers College Press.

Appendix FOR CF: Alignment of Unit Learning Outcomes and the Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders

Qatar University College of Education Learning Outcomes	Qatar National Professional Standards for Teachers
TEACHING	
<i>Outcome 1: Content</i> Demonstrate understanding of the key theories and concepts of the subject matter.	3. Foster language literacy and numeracy development. 9. Apply teaching subject area knowledge to support student learning.
<i>Outcome 2: Pedagogy</i> Plan effective instruction to maximize student learning.	1. Structure innovative and flexible learning experiences for individuals and groups of students. 2. Use teaching strategies and resources to engage students in effective learning. 7. Assess and report on student learning. 8. Apply knowledge of students and how they learn to support student learning and development.
<i>Outcome 3: Technology</i> Use current and emerging technologies in instructionally powerful ways.	5. Construct learning experiences that connect with the world beyond school. 6. Apply Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in managing student learning,
<i>Outcome 4: Diversity</i> Foster successful learning experiences for all students by addressing individual differences.	4. Create safe, supportive, and challenging learning environments.
SCHOLARSHIP	
<i>Outcome 5: Problem Solving</i> Arrive at data-informed decisions by systematically examining a variety of factors and resources.	12. Reflect on, evaluate and improve professional practice.
<i>Outcome 6: Scholarly Inquiry</i> Actively engage in scholarship by learning from and contributing to the knowledge base in education.	12. Reflect on, evaluate and improve professional practice.
LEADERSHIP	
<i>Outcome 7: Ethical Values</i> Apply professional ethics in all educational contexts.	12. Reflect on, evaluate and improve professional practice.

Outcome 8: Initiative

Lead positive change in education.

10. Work as a member of professional teams.

11. Build partnerships with families and the community.

Alignment of Unit Learning Outcomes and the Qatar National Professional for School Leaders

Qatar University College of Education Learning Outcomes	Qatar National Professional Standards for School Leaders
TEACHING	
<p><i>Outcome 1: Content</i> Apply key theories and concepts of the subject matter.</p>	1. Lead and manage learning and teaching in the school community.
<p><i>Outcome 2: Pedagogy</i> Use effective planning and instruction to maximize student learning.</p>	2. Develop, communicate, and report on strategic vision and aims of the school and community.
<p><i>Outcome 3: Technology</i> Use current and emerging technologies in instructionally powerful ways.</p>	6. Develop and manage resources.
<p><i>Outcome 4: Diversity</i> Foster successful learning experiences for all students by addressing individual differences.</p>	4. Lead and develop people and teams.
SCHOLARSHIP	
<p><i>Outcome 5: Problem Solving</i> Systematically examine a variety of factors and resources to arrive at data-informed decisions.</p>	6. Develop and manage resources.
<p><i>Outcome 6: Scholarly Inquiry</i> Actively engage in scholarship by learning from and contributing to the knowledge base in education.</p>	7. Reflect on, evaluate, and improve leadership and management.
LEADERSHIP	
<p><i>Outcome 7: Ethical Values</i> Apply professional ethics in educational contexts.</p>	5. Develop and manage school-community relations. 7. Reflect on, evaluate, and improve leadership and management.
<p><i>Outcome 8: Initiative</i> Demonstrate the qualities of effective leadership in interpersonal and public contexts.</p>	3. Lead and manage change.

Appendix 2: Program Dispositions

Dispositions for Bachelor of Education and Post Baccalaureate Candidates

1. Ensures that all students can learn at high levels and achieve success.
2. Supports the idea that students with special needs learn in different ways.
3. Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful for all students.
4. Views language, literacy, and numeracy development as the responsibility of **all** teachers.
5. Creates supportive learning environments in which students' ideas, beliefs, and opinions are shared and valued.
6. Utilizes ICT skills in the planning, teaching, and management of student learning.
7. Conducts assessment in an ethical way.
8. Has enthusiasm for both teaching and the subject area.
9. Provides meaningful connections between the subject content and everyday life.
10. Supports independent as well as collaborative learning.
11. Develops research-supported teaching strategies.
12. Engages in reflective practices.
13. Uses data to plan and review student's learning experiences.
14. Utilizes online libraries as resources while lesson plans are developed.
15. Selects strategies and resources that facilitate the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities.
16. Pursues opportunities to grow professionally and participate in life-long learning
17. Uses effective language in communicative situations and various social functions.
18. Shows respect for individual and cultural differences.
19. Provides care and support for students.
20. Provides a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole.
21. Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help.
22. Demonstrates a commitment to the Education for a New Era reforms.

Dispositions for Master of Education in Educational Leadership Candidates

Teaching

Content

Candidates have high standards for content knowledge in discipline areas.

Pedagogy

Candidates believe that all students can learn and have the ability to be successful in their academic endeavors.

Diversity

Candidates demonstrate **respect for diversity**.

Technology

Candidates recognize the importance of using diverse educational resources, including technology.

Scholarship

Scholarly Inquiry

Candidates engage in critical reflection of theory and professional practice.

Problem Solving

Candidates use critical thinking to solve problems.

Leadership

Ethical Values

Candidates demonstrate **professional conduct** that models ethical behavior and integrity.

Initiative

Candidates initiate and lead others in achieving goals, vision and mission.

Dispositions for Master of Education in Special Education Candidates

1. Maintaining challenging expectations for individuals with disabilities to develop the highest possible learning outcomes and quality of life potential in ways that respect their dignity, culture, language, and background.
2. Maintaining a high level of professional competence and integrity and exercising professional judgment to benefit individuals with disabilities and their families.
3. Promoting meaningful and inclusive participation of individuals with disabilities in their schools and communities.
4. Practicing collegially with others who are providing services to individuals with disabilities.
5. Developing relationships with families based on mutual respect and actively involving families and individuals with disabilities in educational decision making.
6. Using evidence, instructional data, research, and professional knowledge to inform practice.
7. Protecting and supporting the physical and psychological safety of individuals with disabilities.
8. Neither engaging in nor tolerating any practice that harms individuals with disabilities.
9. Practicing within the professional ethics and standards of the profession; upholding laws, regulations, and policies that influence professional practice; and advocating improvements in laws, regulations, and policies.
10. Supporting the Education for a New Era reforms in Qatar.
11. Advocating for professional conditions and resources that will improve learning outcomes of individuals with disabilities.
12. Participating in the growth and dissemination of professional knowledge and skills.
13. Reflecting on, evaluating, and improving their professional practice as an ongoing process.

Report to Dean Hissa Mohammed S M Sadiq, Dr. Allen and the
Administration and Faculty of Qatar University

Preparing for NCATE Accreditation

Visit of October 1-8, 2013

Karen Karp
Professor
College of Education
University of Louisville

Nick Michelli
Presidential Professor
The Graduate Center
City University of New York

Introduction and Status:

We visited Qatar University from October 1 to October 8 including travel time. Prior to our visit we examined all the documents submitted for IRTE review, which focused primarily on the Conceptual Framework and Standards 1 and 2.

During our visit we met many times with Dean Hiss, with Dr. Allen and in addition, with faculty of the College of Education. At the outset of the visit we discussed the issue of choosing to pursue CAEP or NCATE. Our recommendation is to pursue NCATE, which is available until the Spring, 2015 for visits. After our discussion we contacted NCATE for their view. They concur with our recommendation. For the first CAEP visits all standards must be met. The focus of CAEP is almost exclusively on outcomes data and few institutions are at the point where those data will be available.

Further we discovered that the other institution actively preparing for accreditation, Sultan Qaboos in Oman has decided that NCATE is the best option for the same reasons we put forth. The status of the work in Saudi Arabia is unclear.

We came to the conclusion by consensus that NCATE would be the route for Qatar University.

Subsequently we submitted a copy of the letter of intent to pursue accreditation as required by NCATE. Although the University met the preconditions for accreditation because of the IRTE approval, a letter of intent is still an important part of the process.

The letter was sent and received. Subsequently dates for the visit were sent in, and Qatar is on the NCATE calendar for a team visit. At the same time a template for the visit should be available on AIMS. Please note that only administrators and faculty at Qatar can view the template for now. Check to be sure it is there—we can't.

During this visit it was very useful to meet with and get to know the chairs and some team members of committees preparing Standard reports for the IR as well as those who will work on

SPA. At this point we ask that you send us a list of who is on each committee or do so as soon as it is confirmed.

In the next sections we will review our thoughts about the standards and Spas, raise some questions, and invite your input

Standard One: Candidate Knowledge Skills And Professional Dispositions

Standard One expects that:

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

Standard One is a standard that establishes that candidates graduating from the University are indeed prepared to begin teaching. Success on this standard depends heavily on the data collected and analyzed with the developed data collection system that is reported on in standard two. It is possible however to meet one standard and not the other as the standards stand alone.

Despite the progress made in preparing for IRTE, there is significantly more work to be done in meeting the. Standard One is among the most difficult and comprehensive to meet and attention must be given to it. It is also important that the development of the report in relation to this standard as well as Standard 2 is supported by the University through the provision of data and the development of the technology to collect and aggregate data. The fundamental question an NCATE team looks to answer are, “How does an institution demonstrate that its candidates indeed have the skills and knowledge and professional dispositions needed to be successful?” In most instances, there is a state examination of content knowledge that is used to demonstrate that in fact the necessary knowledge is present.

In the absence of a state-supported examination, it is common to possible to use follow-ups of students and other employers as a means of demonstrating that in fact the necessary knowledge skills and dispositions are present and within NCATE guidelines, it is possible to use GPAS and the value of these can be strengthened if they can be compared to cohorts in other programs. In addition, success in the SPA reviews is relevant to this standard. The Spas determine if the program is ready for recognition and implicitly if students have the requested knowledge, skills,

and dispositions. Developing embedded assessments for the SPAs can provide data for Standard 1. The University should gather data on agreed upon key assessments, including course imbedded tests and assessments during field experiences.

In addition, the use of portfolios can be used to support this standard.

The university has decided to use Taskstream as the mechanism for aggregating and reporting data. We have not yet seen the kinds of reports that you can develop from Taskstream data.

The absence of a common required standardized tests for certification makes meeting this standard more of a challenge than usual, but we know it has been done and will be done here. Accumulating data for each of the years before the visit is very important to have an adequate accumulation of data from which to draw conclusions.

We look forward to a report on this standard prior to our next visit.

Standard Two: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

Standard Two expects that:

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

Standard two is the reciprocal of Standard One in the sense that it describes the system in place that is used for the evaluation of both students, programs and the unit. NCATE looks to see that the institution does not only evaluate individual programs but also looks at the unit as a whole with aggregated data to get a sense of its health, success and progress towards continuous improvement .

Our sense is that a great deal of progress was made to meet the IRTE review. It is also clear that the system needs continued development. Effectively using the kinds of data reported for

Standard One and being certain that these data are collected systematically and reported appropriately would will allow the institution to meet the standard.

We make these suggestions:

- Gain input from all the other standards teams. Make sure the team working on Standard 2 knows and understands their data needs.
- You might consider establish a requirement for a test of standard Arabic that assures that students speak modern standard Arabic and are able to teach students to read and write.
- Work with technology specialists to make revisions in the data collection process and to assure that the system is in fact working effectively.
- Document the decisions for change that are made from the examination of assessments. We hope that report from other standards teams will help inform this.
- Essentially, we raise the following questions: How are the data collected? From where are the data collected? How often are the data summarized and analyzed? Who has responsibility to summarize and analyze the data? In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? What forms of information technology are used to maintain the system? How easy is it to generate data report to answer specific questions and who has responsibility for producing such reports?
- The essential job for this committee that must be done in the course of the rest of this year is to be certain that what is present to collect data for the assessment of candidates and the unit is **in fact a system**. Further there must be evidence that the data gathered are used to make decisions about candidates and to make decisions about programs. Finally it is important that the Unit demonstrate that changes made have resulted from analysis of the data collected through this system. You have made progress on each of these, and the statement of what must be done is really as a reminder and for the record.

WE cannot emphasize too strongly how important Standards One and Two are. This is not to say that the other standards are not important. They are, but it is impossible to be successful without meeting the standards that we have discussed so far.

Standard Three: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

Standard Three expects that:

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

Standard Three calls for the Unit to demonstrate that field experiences in clinical practice are well-thought-out , in-place and **planned both by the University and the school partners**. This must also be the case for clinical experiences provided for other school professionals, such as school leadership and special education. It is also important that evidence be present that these field experiences allow the institution to demonstrate that students have the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions necessary to help students learn.

Make certain that your partner schools are deeply involved in this practice. You need them, and they need to see having your students as of value. You might start with another review of the conceptual framework with them.

Another important consideration is to examine the required documents used by the university supervisors and the K-12 supervisors with students. They should be the same form. You should continue to press for process to provide professional development for the mentors—and probably your own supervisors. As we said, watching a video of teaching and having a group complete

the assessment form and then discuss their findings is one of the best ways to get validity and inter-rater reliability which is important to demonstrate.

We recommend that you prepare a list of the partner schools where most of your students are placed for clinical experiences and consider for each how well they understand the conceptual framework and are committed to the process.

Is there a process in place whereby the partner schools are assessed for the quality of the experience provided your students? Is there avoidance that when this cannot be demonstrated placement in these schools is terminated?

Can you demonstrate that that your candidates are well prepared to use technology and have an opportunity to do so during their field experiences? This should be included in an exhibit.

Are there practicum handbooks for students and faculty? Make certain we have them.

This is not a terribly difficult standard to meet, but it is, in our view, essential for a solid program.

Standard Four: Diversity Questions

Standard Four expects that:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Standard Four is often seen as a challenge for institutions that appear to be rather homogeneous. However the standard does not limit an institution to defining diversity in terms of race, culture,

or language. As we said, we know you can be successful in identifying the kinds of diversity that might be found among students at the University and among students at the schools in which the preservice teachers work. Another aspect of the standard is the diversity of faculty.

Beginning with the diversity of faculty, it will not be difficult to demonstrate that the University has in fact a diverse faculty. You should include the amenities available to attract faculty, which often include the provision of housing, medical coverage, tuition support, opportunities for collaboration as well as networking.

Among the sorts of diversity that have been used in similar institutions to yours for diversity of students as well as among the students in the schools in which field experiences occur. Among the elements they identified is the physical location of the schools, that is, whether they are urban areas or rural areas. There could a discussion of the economic standing of students.. Diversity that may in fact, be from different cultural/tribal backgrounds may be difficult to gather but is necessarily discussed as a way in which diversity is present and expressed. The effect of intermarriage with other cultures is a factor of diversity and on occasion one family member, usually the mother, comes from another culture.

We believe it will not be difficult to demonstrate the presence of diversity so long as this committee engages its work gathering hard data to demonstrate the claims that are made, showing both the nature of the field experiences in coursework designed to have students work with diverse school students, as well as the presence of the overall sensitivity of the faculty and the institution to cultural diversity.

The presence of disabilities as a factor in diversity may be difficult to tease out because of cultural traditions within a society.

Standard Five: Faculty Qualifications Performance And Development

Standard Five expects that:

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

Standard Five has three major parts: qualifications, performance, and development. Each requires related but different data to make the case that faculty meet the standard. By giving examples of best practice in teaching, research and scholarship from among Qatar's faculty you can make a good case that that part of the standard is met. This is one area where hard copies of faculty papers and books should be provided for the team if they are not provided electronically, as will be the case with most other. CV's must be collected in a standard format and may be aggregated if the data lend themselves to aggregation.

It is here that collaboration among faculty in education, in schools and in Arts and Sciences can be noted and a case made.

Note that while the knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates are reported in Standard One, the connection between candidate performance and faculty teaching is to be demonstrated in Standard V. Some of the data being collected under the system set up in Standard Two, especially follow up with graduates and employers, will be useful here. Those data may be used in more than one section with the exhibit cross-referenced.

While aspects of the assessment of the Unit are reported in Standard Six, the evaluation of faculty by the Unit is reported under Standard V. You should be able to report when and how faculty are assessed and given feedback for improvement

While not in fact a specific data point in this standard but one which teams sometimes look for as evidence of how highly regarded faculty in the Unit are within the university, is the distribution of faculty rank in the your program. If in looking at the data provided, it appears that the program is heavily weighted toward the lower ranks, then comparison of rank distribution by percentages across other programs within the University would be a good way to anticipate any concerns.

Standard Six: Unit Governance And Resources

Standard Six expects that:

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

Standard six assures the accrediting body that in fact leadership authority, budget, facilities and resources are adequate to deliver a high-quality program to the preparation of educators. This includes high-quality information technology resources. The roles of the Dean, the faculty, the Provost and other members of the upper administration should be laid out and relationships among them made clear. What evidence is there that the dean can influence her supervisors to gain support for the program.

How is curriculum developed and approved within the program. Who oversees its final approval. Are there College level standing curriculum committees, committees at other levels? It seems obvious that the departments that house programs develop curricula, but the review and approval of such curricula at higher levels is not spelled out clearly.

The role of advisement and counseling is an important element that needs explanation. Who provides student services including counseling? How is it assessed?

The Standard requires a clear statement of how professional community members – including k-12 schools and arts and science faculty, participate in program development, delivery and evaluation. This is similar to the point made earlier regarding how field experiences are planned and structured. It is not clear to us how college interacts with its partners and has interacted with them in developing the conceptual framework and programs

The budget for the institution and for the College of Education will, we expect, be found to be adequate. Comparisons among College budgets within the University should be made and presented on a per-pupil basis along with an explanation of additional costs (equipment in the sciences for example). Such comparisons would serve to ensure equitable and appropriate funding among the different Colleges.

One important element of the standard that needs to be addressed and will certainly draw the attention of the NCATE team is the workload policy. This is the only area where NCATE provides a specific number in a Standard. The standard is that faculty, when teaching graduate courses, teach no more a nine credit load in any given semester.

The standard also focuses on resources to support the Unit. Financial support for professional development activities is impressive and should be defined even more clearly. Regarding facilities those used by College are impressive and as we understand it, may be replaced with even stronger facilities. You will be able to highlight the facilities as evidence of the support from the administration.

Not surprisingly, support for the assessment system is significant to NCATE. We have discussed this in the context of other standards, but it must be addressed separately in the review of Standard Six to demonstrate that there are resources present. In our experiences, managing assessment cannot be a task added on to the role of an existing administrator. Identifying someone solely responsible for the development of assessment data is important.

We did not visit the library, but will in subsequent visits.

Overall assuming that the authority of the college to make decisions regarding governance of, and resources for, its education programs can be demonstrated, I believe this standard is likely to be met.

**GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE
TABLES IN THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (CI) INSTITUTIONAL REPORT
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education**

General

NCATE expects a professional education unit to have 2-3 years of data available for review by the Board of Examiners (BOE) team at the time of the visit. The goal is that units continue to systematically and regularly collect, compile, aggregate, disaggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance. However, data reported in the institutional report (IR) should be for a recent 12-month period. The team will be able to determine during the on-site review that the unit has been collecting data regularly and systematically for the past 2-3 years and using that data as appropriate. The following general guidelines should be used to complete the required tables in the IR:

- Data in tables should reflect data from the most recent academic year, calendar year, or other institutional reporting period equivalent to one year.
- Data should be reported for a 12-month period. The data period should be indicated in the table title or the narrative for the standard to which the table is attached.
- Tables are not counted in the characters available for writing the narrative for the standard.
- The unit has the option of attaching additional tables in the online IR to provide **key evidence** for a standard.

Appendix A: Diversity of Professional Education Faculty

This table provides basic diversity data about the professional education faculty. The data requested are limited to the data that an institution would normally collect and report to federal agencies (i.e., race/ethnicity and gender), using U.S. Census categories. The unit should discuss diversity beyond these two categories in its IR narrative for this standard.

- If all professional education faculty members teach at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, the second and third columns of the table may be collapsed into one column. Please indicate that you have collapsed the two in the narrative when you discuss the data.
- If the total number of professional education faculty does not equal the number in Table 1, the unit should explain the difference in the narrative.
- Professional education faculty includes full-time and part-time faculty, including adjuncts and graduate assistants who teach courses or supervise clinical practice.
- Each cell should include the *n* or number of faculty and the percentage in parentheses after the number.

The following example of Appendix A provides several completed cells for your reference.

Appendix A

Diversity of Professional Education Faculty
Standard 4, Element b

	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial & Advanced Programs n (%)	All Faculty in the Institution n (%)	School-based Faculty (Optional) n (%)
Hispanic/Latino of any race	6 (6.4 %)	4 (7.8%)	0 (0%)	77 (3.4%)	37 (8.8%)
For individuals who are non-Hispanic/ Latino only:					
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (0.6 %)	3 (0.7%)
Asian	5 (5.3%)	4 (7.8%)	0 (0%)	123 (5.4%)	11 (2.6%)
Black or African American	8 (8.5%)				
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0 (0%)				
White	71 (75.6%)				
Two or more races	3 (3.2%)				
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	0 (0%)				
TOTAL	94				
Male	52 (55.3%)				
Female	42 (44.7 %)				
TOTAL	94				

Appendix B: Diversity of Candidates in Professional Education

Appendix B provides basic diversity data about candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs. Again, the data requested are limited to the data that an institution would normally collect and report to federal agencies, using the U.S. Census categories. These include race/ethnicity and gender. Other diversity such as socioeconomic status as determined by financial aid should be discussed in the IR narrative for this standard.

- Each cell should include the *n* or number of candidates and the percentage in parentheses after the number.
- The percentage of the population in the institution’s service area should be reported in the fifth column to provide the team the diversity context in the area from which the institution draws its students. The service area may be state, specific counties in a state, a

religious denomination, etc. If a fairly large number of students come from an area or city outside of the institution’s service area, the diversity of that area should be discussed in the narrative for this standard.

The following example of Appendix B provides several completed cells for your reference.

Appendix B

Diversity of Candidates in Professional Education
Standard 4, Element c

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)	All Students in the Institution n (%)	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution %
Hispanic/Latino of any race	23 (1.6%)	3 (0.8%)	195(2.2%)	1.4%
For individuals who are non-Hispanic/ Latino only				
American Indian or Alaska Native	2 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	14 (0.2%)	0.5%
Asian	12 (0.8%)			
Black or African American	10 (0.7%)			
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0 (0%)			
White	1309 (91.5%)			
Two or more races	0 (0%)			
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	75 (5.2%)			
TOTAL	1431			
Male	1056 (73.8%)			
Female	315 (26.2%)			
TOTAL	1431			

Appendix C: Diversity of P-12 Students in Clinical Practice Sites for Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Preparation Programs

This table provides data on the diversity of the P-12 students in the schools in which candidates do their clinical practice (i.e., student teaching or internship). The diversity categories that should be reported include race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, and English language learners in these schools. Data on these diversity categories are usually available on the websites of schools and school districts.

- In the first column, list each school in which candidates have done student teaching or an internship in the past year.
- Report in each cell the percentage of students in each ethnic or racial group listed in the tables' heading row. Report in the furthest three right columns school by school the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, the percentage of students who are English language learners, and the percentage of students with disabilities.
- Schools used for field experiences may be reported as well to make the case that candidates are working in schools with diverse populations.

The following example of Appendix C provides several completed rows for your reference.

Appendix C

Diversity of P-12 Students in Clinical Practice Sites for
Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Preparation Programs*
Standard 4, Element d

Name of School*	Hispanic/ Latino of any race	For individuals who are non-Hispanic/ Latino only						Race/ Ethnicity Unknown	Students Receiving Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	English Language Learners	Students with Disabilities
		American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races				
Jackson Elementary	2.2%	0%	2.2%	1.1%	0%	94.5%	0%	0%	10%	1.2%	5.2%
Marshall Elementary	2.0%	0%	1.7%	0.8%	0%	95.5%	0%	0%	12%	1.5%	7.1%
Francis Scott Key Middle Sch.	11.2%	0.2%	1.7%	5.7%	0%	81.2%	0%	0%	25%	10.0%	9.3%
Caesar Chavez Elementary	58.7%	0%	3.7%	32.8%	0%	4.9%	0%	0%	84%	43.8%	13.2%
Middletown High School	11.0%	0.7%	1.3%	5.2%	0%	81.8%	0%	0%	16%	8.4%	6.2%

* Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.

Appendix D: Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences

This table should provide a summary of the qualifications of each professional education faculty member that address their teaching and other assignments. If the unit submitted its programs for national review by NCATE, this information has already been compiled program by program. NCATE has pulled these program summaries of qualifications into a document that can be updated with the most current faculty data. Faculty in programs that were not submitted for national review must be added to the overall summary.

Information about professional education faculty can be added and edited in NCATE’s Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS). When the institution record is opened in AIMS, select “Manage Faculty Information” from the left-hand menu to see a list of faculty already in the system. You may edit an existing record or add a new faculty member. The following information about a faculty member should be entered:

- The first row requires the name of the faculty member.
- In the second row, “Highest Degree, Field, & University,” a response would be: PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
- Examples of responses for the third row, “Assignment: Indicate the Role of the Faculty Member,” are: faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, or administrator.
- “Faculty Rank” (row 4) could be: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor, etc.
- The checkbox in the fifth row should be checked if the faculty member is in a tenure track.
- The sixth row, “Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service,” requires entries of up to three major contributions in the past three years.
 - *Scholarship* is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school professionals. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one’s work for professional review and evaluation.
 - *Service* includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution’s and unit’s mission.
 - Three major contributions for the sixth row could include: officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, an evaluation of a local school program, etc.
- The seventh row should include a brief description of the faculty member’s recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS), indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). Current P-12 licensure or certification(s), if any, should also be listed.

Faculty Member Name	Michele M. Clarke
Highest Degree, Field, & University	Ed.D., Early Childhood Education, University of Maryland at College Park
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty	-Teaches 3 early childhood education courses

member	-Supervises student teachers
Faculty Rank	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	✓ (Yes)
Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service. List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Published textbook, Early Childhood Methods: Supporting Student Learning, with Merrill/Pearson in 2008. 2. Published article, "Integrating Multicultural Content into Preschool Curriculum," in NAME's journal, Multicultural Perspectives. 3. Elected Vice President of NAEYC's state affiliate in Maryland.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools	<p>-Has supervised student teachers in P-5/6 schools in the Baltimore area from 2002-Present.</p> <p>-Taught 4-year olds, kindergarteners, and second graders in Prince George's County, Maryland schools from 1994-2000.</p> <p>-Holds current Maryland Professional Licenses in preschool education, elementary education, and special education.</p>

The following example reflects the table as it is included in Appendix D. This table may be copied into an Excel spreadsheet to provide the information requested above.

Appendix D

Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences* Standard 5, Element a

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member	Faculty Rank	Tenure Track	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Association, & Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years	Teaching or Other Professional Experience in P-12 Schools

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into this table in the Online Institutional Report (IR).