

BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

N C A T E

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

ACCREDITATION VISIT TO:

Indiana University Southeast

New Albany, Indiana

December 3-7, 2005

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Linda Bradford
Beverly Kitzmiller
Jane McGraw
Michael Stefanic

State Team Members:

Earlene Holland
Mervin Koehlinger
Michael Slavkin

State Consultant:

Terri Banks

Type of Visit

First _____
Continuing X
Combination _____
Probation _____
Focused _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	4
II. Conceptual Framework	7
III. Findings for Each Standard	
Standard 1	11
Standard 2	25
Standard 3	30
Standard 4	39
Standard 5	47
Standard 6	56
IV. Sources of Evidence	62
V. Corrections to the Institutional Report	68

**SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
NCATE 2000 Standards**

Institution: Indiana University Southeast

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	M	M
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M
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

INTRODUCTION

A. The Institution

Established in 1941, Indiana University Southeast (IUS) is one of the eight campuses that are part of the Indiana University system. Indiana University grew from the State Seminary, which was established by an act of the General Assembly in 1820. The Bloomington campus is the oldest and largest in the system, and is also the primary residential campus. IU, one of the oldest state universities in the Midwest, has more than 100,000 students on its eight campuses.

IUS, a commuter campus, is located in New Albany, Indiana and is part of the Louisville, Kentucky metropolitan area. According to the 2003 U.S. census data, the ethnic and racial composition of Indiana is 6.1 percent minority and 93.9 percent white, while the three county area served in Kentucky is 21.6 percent minority and 78.4 percent white. The Indiana Commission on Higher Education has defined the IUS service area as the counties of Clark, Crawford, Floyd, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson, Orange, Scott, and Washington. A tuition reciprocity agreement is available to students residing in the Kentucky counties of Jefferson, Oldham, and Bullitt.

IUS, a comprehensive medium-sized university, began awarding degrees in 1968. It offers nine associate's, 38 bachelor's, and six master's degree programs in its campus-based schools that include Arts and Letters, Business, Continuing Studies, Education, Natural Sciences, Nursing, and Social Sciences. The enrollment in 2004 was 6,238, consisting of 62.1 percent undergraduate females, 63.6 percent graduate females, 37.9 percent undergraduate males, and 36.4 percent graduate males, 6.1 percent minority undergraduates and .8 percent minority graduates. The undergraduate median age is 22 and the median age for graduates is 31. The institution has more than 180 full-time faculty members, 85 percent of whom hold doctoral degrees or the equivalent in their fields.

B. The Unit

The School of Education (SOE) has been designated as the professional education unit, and the unit's dean is the official head of the unit. (The terms "unit" and "School of Education" will be used interchangeably throughout this report.)

The breakdown of university and unit student enrollment for spring 2005 is as follows:

Table I.1 University and Unit Enrollment Data for Spring 2005

UNIVERSITY	ENROLLMENT	MALE	FEMALE	CAUCASIAN	MINORITY	UNKNOWN	FOREIGN
Undergraduate (Full Time)	2981	1114	1867	2733	148	84	18
Undergraduate (Part Time)	2110	792	1318	1874	154	71	11
Graduate (Full Time)	44	21	23	34	6	1	3
Graduate	873	294	579	800	54	14	5

(Part Time)							
UNIT	ENROLLMENT	MALE	FEMALE	CAUCASIAN	MINORITY	UNKNOWN	FOREIGN
Undergraduate (Full Time)	336	80	256	318	3	14	1
Undergraduate (Part Time)	77	24	53	74	3	0	0
Graduate (Full Time)	24	10	14	18	4	1	1
Graduate (Part Time)	646	157	489	594	39	13	0

The unit offers the Bachelor of Science in Education (BSEd) degree leading to initial teaching licenses in elementary, secondary, and special education. At the advanced level, a Master of Science in Education (MSED) degree in elementary, secondary education, and school counseling is offered. Advanced elementary and secondary MSED candidates may add teaching licenses in gifted and talented, kindergarten, middle school, computer education, reading, and educational leadership. Two post-baccalaureate initial licensing programs are also offered: a state-mandated Transition to Teaching (T2T) program for elementary and secondary licensing and a post-baccalaureate initial license for special education (SEPB).

Table I.2 Summary of School of Education Programs, Spring 2005

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level	Number Of Hours	No. of Candidates	Agency or Association Reviewing Program	Program Review Submitted	Current Status
Elem BSED	BS	Initial	130	182	State	Yes	Approved
Sec BSED	BS	Initial	130	348	State	Yes	Approved
Sec BSED Language Arts/Theatre	BS MS*	Initial	39	107	State	Yes	Approved
Sec BSED Mathematics	BS MS*	Initial	36	59	State	Yes	Approved
Sec BSED Science (LS, PS, E/S, Chem., Phy)	BS MS*	Initial	36-39	54	State	Yes	Approved
Sec BSED SS (Econ, GP, GC, HP, Psy, Soc)	BS MS*	Initial	63-66	109	State	Yes	Approved
Exceptional Needs/Mild Intervention BSED	BS MS*	Initial Advanced	130	10	State	Yes	Approved
Elem MSED	MS	Advanced	36	249	State	Yes	Approved
School Counselor MSED	MS	Advanced	48	52	State	Yes	Approved
Sec MSED	MS	Advanced	36	115	State	Yes	Approved
Building Level Administrator	MS*	Advanced	24	62	State	Yes	Approved

*An initial license is a pre- or co-requisite for this license.

Since the last NCATE onsite visit in 1999, the unit has made a number of significant changes involving program design to align with licensing and professional standards and requirements, as well as in personnel, enrollment, and facilities modifications. Some of these changes include:

- changed leadership, interim dean in 2001 to appointment in 2002;
- upgraded facilities—education computer lab, new science education classroom, multicultural-focused education curriculum lab, Graduate Center in Jeffersonville for greater accessibility for Louisville education candidates;
- hired 11 full-time faculty to replace adjunct faculty, including a technology faculty member and adding four minorities;
- hired a full-time database staff position;
- increased student enrollment from 956 students in 1999 to 1,083 students in fall 2005;
- increased SOE diversity enrollment from three percent in 1999 to five percent in 2004;
- adopted the teacher as researcher model for the elementary and secondary MSSED;
- developed state-mandated alternative teaching license program (T2T)
- redesigned H340 Education and American Culture to include urban field experiences;
- implemented new diversity course requirement for elementary education majors;
- included licensing in gifted and talented education and computer education;
- developed formative and summative assessment reviews for each program; and
- adopted unit goals, dispositions statement, and conceptual framework.

C. The Visit

This NCATE review was a continuing visit for initial and advanced teacher education programs. Education programs are approved by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), Division of Professional Standards (DPS), formerly the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB), and NCATE.

There were four NCATE Board of Examiners members, three State team members, and a state consultant from the IDOE. Indiana requires teacher preparation programs at all public colleges and universities to meet NCATE standards and accepts NCATE decisions regarding accreditation. The BOE team operated as a combined team, made a single recommendation for each standard, and wrote a single report.

All unit programs have mapped/aligned their programs and candidate proficiencies with specialty professional association standards as appropriate. All findings in this report reflect only on-campus programs. The unit does not offer distance-learning courses.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides directions for programs, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Introduction

The unit has revised its original conceptual framework significantly since 1999. The SOE logo, "Educators Engaged in Growth," was designed to denote both commitment and reflective action of the conceptual framework (CF).

B. Shared Vision

Mission. The CF supports the institution's mission in becoming the "*best regional university in the nation.*" Revised in 2001, the SOE mission is "*to develop high quality, caring professionals who stimulate continuous renewal of schools within a multicultural society.*" Comprised of four themes (high quality educators, caring professionals, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society), the CF establishes "*the expectation for unit faculty and candidates to engage in life-long professional growth aimed at bringing about renewal in schools.*"

C. Coherence

The CF provides the foundation for the unit's assessment system and programs at both the initial and advanced levels. The unit assessment system provides for regular review of program courses and requirements by a variety of constituencies to ensure that there continues to be coherence among curriculum, experiences, and assessments.

D. Professional Commitments and Dispositions

Philosophy, purposes, professional commitments, and dispositions. The SOE identifies six goals to prepare high quality educators who:

1. value and respond appropriately to diversity and to the needs of all students, and promote educational success and positive personal change in themselves and others;
2. use effective methods, including contemporary educational technology, and appropriate data, to achieve diverse educational goals aligned with professional standards and make decisions based on data and information;
3. create safe and effective learning environments aligned with the concerns, needs, and resources of individual students, their families, the school, and the community;
4. demonstrate mastery of subject content, appropriate professional practices, and the processes of critical thinking, creative thinking, and problem solving;

5. engage in continuous self-improvement and professional growth, support the professional development of others, and display professional behaviors and dispositions for effective practice; and
6. communicate effectively with students, their families, other professionals, and the community, and project a coherent vision of education as a personal and professional activity.

The dispositions which are assessed behaviorally at various points in each program are:

- respect the legal and ethical norms and values of education;
- interact effectively and collaborate with others and foster similar behaviors among students;
- commit to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals;
- exhibit personal management behaviors valued by the professional education community;
- commit to inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education;
- exhibit enthusiasm and respect for education as a practice and a profession;
- commit to data based decision-making and fair practices; and
- commit to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement.

E and F. Commitment to Diversity and Technology

The SOEs dispositions and standards clearly indicate a commitment to diversity and the belief that candidates' experiences in these areas are integral components of all programs. The institution and unit clearly demonstrate a strong commitment to technology. As with diversity, all candidates have numerous opportunities to demonstrate technology skills in their coursework and field experiences. Interviews with school personnel indicate that candidates are cognizant of diversity issues and demonstrate strong technology skills.

G. Candidate Proficiencies Aligned to Professional and State Standards

(a) Knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies. With research constantly changing, the conceptual framework's research/knowledge base also has been significantly revised to reflect current research and best practices in education. The initial BSED programs adopted INTASC and Indiana Developmental and Content Standards (IDCS) and the elementary incorporated the Danielson model into its framework. At the advanced level, the M.S. in Elementary and Secondary Education program adopted the NBPTS outcomes. The unit cites current research to support the conceptual framework--Darling-Hammond (1999), Banks (2001), Eagleton (2000), Garcia (2002), Gorski (2001), Halpern (2000), among others.

(b) Performance expectations and how they are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. The *Educators Engaged in Growth* conceptual framework is based on professional, state, and institutional standards. The CF reflects knowledge bases and best practices as outlined by learned societies and the content and developmental standards adopted by the Division of Professional Standards (DPS), Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), as well as

program content standards developed by specialized professional organizations and National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and American School Counseling Association (ASCA), Mapping of standards to coursework and formative assessments for each program were available onsite illustrating the alignment of program standards to goals, CF themes, courses, course assignments, and assessments.

(c) The system by which candidate proficiencies are regularly assessed. The IUS SOE's Unit Assessment System (UAS) is fully operational and staffed by a part-time (through course release) SOE unit assessment coordinator and a full-time data base coordinator. The assessment coordinator directs and monitors the UAS and chairs the assessment quality team. The UAS "is a process to collect, organize, maintain, analyze, and utilize candidate enrollments, demographic, and performance data for individual assessment and improvement, as well as to monitor program within the unit programs." The system is monitored by the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation (PAUE) quality team.

(d) Continuous evaluation of CF. The revised framework has evolved since 1999 through a series of meetings with program advisory groups composed of unit faculty (tenure-track, lecturers, and part-time), unit professional staff, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, program candidates, and program alumni. The CF was adopted in 2001 and most recent modifications were approved in April 2004. The CF is delineated in the SOE's *Long-Range Strategic Plan*, *Five-Year Unit Assessment Plan*, and the *Diversity Plan*. Designed as a continuous developmental document, the CF components are reviewed annually by the (PAUE) team as the unit continues to be "engaged in growth."

Changes made to the CF include, but are not limited to:

- dispositions adopted, April 2000
- belief statements approved, August 2000
- goals and belief statements are aligned with INTASC, IPSB and approved, October 2000
- refined mission statement approved, January 2001
- program teams developed knowledge base, spring 2001
- coordinators identified four themes taken from the mission statement to organize the CF, June 2001
- final draft of CF approved, September 2001
- PAUE reviewed CF to ensure that INTASC and IPSB standards are embedded, December 2001
- Modifications to CF approved, April 2002
- PAUE reviewed CF and requested modification. No modifications made, spring 2003
- The knowledge base sources, diversity theme are updated, spring 2004
- Changes incorporated into CF, April 2004
- Executive summary of CF reviewed to ensure that it continues to reflect the CF components, spring 2004

All candidates, unit and content faculty, and school personnel interviewed during the visit were cognizant of the four major themes, dispositions, performance outcomes and assessments, and the shared vision, "educators engaged in growth."

There is ample evidence that the IUS School of Education's conceptual framework is shared and reviewed by stakeholder groups to ensure coherence and reflection in curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices, diversity, technology, and measures used for candidate assessment. Data reviewed affirm that the CF is reflected in data sources and that aggregated program data are evaluated by the program advisory groups to determine overall program success and decision-making effecting program modifications for continuous improvements. In summary, the findings of this site visit affirm that the unit's CF *"guides and focuses faculty and candidates through candidate performance, assessment, field experiences, diversity, faculty performance and continued development, and unit governance."* (IR, page 12)

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

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.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

The unit strives to prepare candidates as *educators engaged in growth* who can positively impact student learning. The conceptual framework incorporates content knowledge in the first component, *high quality educator*. This component addresses the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the candidate's discipline.

Initial Programs

Prior to admission to the School of Education (SOE), candidates gain in-depth knowledge from general education requirements, content specializations, and professional education. Once a candidate is admitted, the unit assesses content knowledge formatively in coursework, at several summative decision points (SDPs), and through PRAXIS II testing. The unit also reviews employer, candidate, and alumni surveys of candidate content knowledge.

Applicants seeking admission to SOE at SDP I are required to demonstrate basic content knowledge through PRAXIS I national testing of reading, writing, and mathematics. The aggregate pass rate of basic skills on PRAXIS I is 93 percent or higher and on PRAXIS II is 92 percent or higher for the past five years. Unconditional admission to Transition to Teaching (T2T) or to special education post-baccalaureate (SEPB) requires a passing score on PRAXIS I. Secondary T2T candidates must pass PRAXIS I and II prior to admission. Elementary T2T and SEPB candidates must pass PRAXIS II for state licensure.

Admission to the elementary and special education programs requires a minimum GPA of 2.50 in all college-level course work, which must include *W131 English Composition*, *H340 Education and American Culture*, *S121 Public Speaking*, *T101 Math*, and one course from both social studies and science content areas. Admission to the secondary education program requires a minimum GPA of 2.75 with a minimum grade of C in communication, mathematics, professional education, and each licensing area.

Content knowledge is summatively assessed during student teaching and through candidate portfolios. Data collected from supervising teachers indicate that each special education candidate evaluated from spring 2003 through spring 2004 rated at least basic on "*demonstrates skill mastery of subjects being taught.*"

The unit also monitors data provided by the Indiana Beginning Teacher Assessment Program. Table 1.3 indicates that more than 98 percent of IUS initial licensed first-year Indiana teachers have successfully completed the internship program since the last NCATE visit.

Table 1.3: Indiana BTAP Pass Rates

Year	Number	Passed	Number Reported as Not Passed	No Status Reported on Internship
2000-2001	84	97%	2 (mathematics, elementary education)	19
2001-2002	68	100%	0	6
2002-2003	57	100%	0	4
2003-2004	95	98%	1 (biology & chemistry; 1 (physics, chemistry, & physical science)	12
2004-2005	93	99%	1 (biology)	*23

*Pass rates for new teachers licensed under Rules 2002 are not reported until the second year of teaching.
Source: Indiana Department of Education

Results from supervising teacher surveys indicate that over 88 percent agree that IUS prepared the teacher with “*the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the various disciplines*” and over 91 percent agree that IUS prepared the teacher for “*planning based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and standards.*” Results from employer surveys indicate that over 87 percent reported that first-year teachers “*know and teach their subject,*” and over 88 percent reported that first-year teachers “*plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.*” Results from alumni surveys indicate the 98 percent agree that IUS “*offers high-quality academic programs*” and 85 percent agree that “*the courses in my major contribute to my current work success.*”

Advanced Programs

Elementary and secondary candidates must hold or be eligible for an initial teaching license and must be able to document an overall undergraduate GPA of 2.5 and a 3.0 in any graduate coursework completed. Content knowledge is assessed formatively through projects in core courses. Candidates are assessed on specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students and on abilities to create, organize, and link subjects to other disciplines. Candidates are required to complete six credit hours of cognate coursework in their license area and 18 hours of coursework to strengthen content knowledge in areas such as math, science, social studies, and literacy.

GPA is monitored as a candidate progresses through the program. A summative assessment is made at transition points SDP II (3.0 GPA required in each core course) and SDP IV (3.0 overall GPA required). *High quality* content knowledge is summatively assessed at SDP III through the teacher as researcher inquiry project that requires the candidate to conduct action research to demonstrate knowledge of how to convey a subject to students.

Program effectiveness is also evaluated through alumni and employer surveys. The 2005 survey of building-level administrators indicated that 100 percent of administrators agree that SOE prepares elementary and secondary candidates to “*know and teach their subject.*” Additionally,

94 percent of respondents agree that the program prepares candidates to “*plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.*” The survey of recent graduates conducted in spring 2004 reveals that 83 percent of alumni agree that “*IUS offers high-quality academic programs.*”

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators verify that both candidates and graduates are adequately prepared with content specific knowledge for their subject area.

B. Content Knowledge of Other School Personnel

Other school personnel candidates demonstrate understanding of *high quality* central concepts through key courses with formative assessments as well as summative GPA and portfolio requirements. The program for other school personnel prepares candidates for roles in *school renewal*. Candidates must have a 3.0 GPA to enter and 3.25 at exit.

The counseling program assesses content knowledge at various points within the program. No state or national testing is required or utilized in the assessment system for the counseling program. Course assessments are used in the counseling program to assess content knowledge of degree candidates. Table 1.4 summarizes types of assessments used.

Table 1.4: Content Knowledge Assessment in Counseling

Decision Point	Course	Type of Assessment
SDP I to SDP II (16 candidates selected based on grades and standards)	Child development issues (P515) Social issues in education (H520) Beginning counseling skills (G500) Role of school counselor (G500)	Case Study Reaction to issue paper Personal assessment of skills
SDP II to SDP III	Individual counseling techniques (G504) Applying techniques to case studies (G523) Group counseling skills (G532) Multicultural issues in counseling (G575) Techniques with diverse populations (G575) Techniques in school context (G524)	Oral exam of skills Tape of techniques Tape of group session Media analysis Individual case study Activity and supervision logs
SDP III to SDP IV	Classroom guidance skills (G585) Career counseling skills (G507) Assessment skills in counseling (G505) Program organization skills (G542) Advocacy and leadership skills (G542) Advanced counseling program skills (G562) Application of program skills (G550) Application of advanced counseling skills (G550)	Guidance presentation Career notebook Close the gap proposal Activity and supervision logs Individual and group counseling tapes Program portfolio Case Studies: ESL, diversity, legal issue, special education

Content knowledge is summatively assessed at SDP IV. In spring 2004 and spring 2005, 100 percent of candidates were assessed as “proficient.”

Educational leadership candidates are formatively assessed on content standards in courses. Many use case studies to assess the knowledge of the change process and the application of leadership skills on each school leadership standard.

The summative assessment of the eight program standards for educational leadership occurs in SDP III at the end of all coursework. The assessment is based on the evaluation of work samples

from courses, the practicum, and other evidence identified by candidates and completed by practicum supervisors. In 2004-2005, 100 percent of the educational leadership candidates were rated at least “basic” in all eight leadership areas. Practicum mentors rated candidates an average score of 4.2 on a five-point scale on the “*degree of preparation of your protégé for the practicum.*”

For licensure, all candidates must pass the national School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), and Kentucky candidates must also pass the Kentucky Principal Test. For five consecutive years, 100 percent of Kentucky program completers passed the SLLA examination and Kentucky Specialist Test. Program completers seeking licensure in Indiana were not required to take the SLLA exam until 2002; to date 100 percent have passed. Based on disaggregated SLLA exam results to review IUS test taker strengths and weaknesses, the program and advisory group recommended holding an additional SLLA preparation seminar.

Surveys also inform the unit on program content knowledge for other school personnel. The 2005 counseling employer survey indicates employers assess graduates on “*learning systems organizations*” at 2.8, “*effective use of group counseling skills*” at 2.7, “*career development*” at 2.9, and “*collaboration and consultation skills*” at 2.75 on a 3.0 scale. The recent graduate alumni survey in spring 2004 indicates that 94 percent of counseling and 100 percent of educational leadership graduates agree that “*IU Southeast offers high-quality academic programs.*” The alumni survey also indicates that 100 percent of counseling graduates agree that “*the courses in my major contribute to my current work success.*” Educational leadership alumni indicate 90 percent agree that the program prepared them to be an “*organizational leader*” and “*systemic leader.*” Educational leadership practicum candidates consistently report themselves proficient at instructional leadership and problem analysis.

The counseling program is constructed based on CACREP standards. It is not CACREP accredited as a program must have three full time faculty to be CACPREP accredited.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators verify that candidates and graduates are adequately prepared with content specific knowledge for their specific subject.

C. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers

The themes of *high quality* professional and *school renewal* direct the teaching of pedagogical content knowledge for the unit. The unit ensures that candidates are proficient in creating a broad range of instructional strategies including technology applications.

Initial Programs

Candidates are assessed on the application of *high quality* pedagogical content knowledge in professional education courses, most of which have field-based components. Candidates work collaboratively in methods courses and demonstrate application of content pedagogy in their field experiences and student teaching. Pedagogical content knowledge is summatively assessed at various transition points. Pedagogical content knowledge data from candidate, alumni, and employer surveys are also reviewed.

Technology is a valued component of pedagogical content knowledge under the third theme, *school renewal*. Candidates work with educational software such as Inspiration, Publisher, PowerPoint, Front Page, Excel, Access, Bryce, and KidPix. In methods courses candidates provide evidence in portfolios of how technology is integrated into teaching and learning. Technology is assessed in elementary and special education programs, in reading/language arts, and in the portfolio. Elementary candidates are also assessed on technology during student teaching, and special education candidates are assessed on general and assistive technology during practica and student teaching.

Formative assessment of pedagogical content knowledge related to using multiple instructional strategies delivered through effective communication increases as elementary and special education candidates progress through the program. Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed in several writing assignments and during 30 hours of observations and interactions with students and school personnel in P-12 classrooms.

In the secondary program, candidate pedagogical knowledge is assessed in all professional education coursework. Pedagogical content knowledge standards for candidates are summatively assessed at program completion. Special education candidates are evaluated by special education school supervising teachers on standards related to pedagogical content.

The technology survey in spring 2004 conducted with initial candidates at the conclusion of student teaching indicated that 90 percent self-reported they were “well prepared” or “somewhat prepared” on 10 of the 12 technology indicators and 50 percent self-reported they were “well prepared” on six of these technology indicators. The technology survey also indicates that over 90 percent of initial candidates reported being “well prepared” or “somewhat prepared” to “*plan engaging lessons*” and to “*integrate technology into P-12 subject areas.*” The themes survey in spring 2005 indicated that 86 percent of initial candidates agree that program requirements contribute to their “*development of technology skills related to the license or degree pursued.*”

Advanced Programs

Advanced candidates demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skills prior to admission through their initial preparation and teaching experience. Instruction and assessment includes candidate ability to generate multiple paths of instruction, multiple methods for meeting goals, and orchestration of learning in group settings. Candidates are assessed on communication skills through collaborative “critical friend” and cooperative learning assignments involving the design and evaluation of highly effective pedagogy.

Instructional strategies include *school renewal* technology applications directed at improving the teaching of content to their students in clear and meaningful ways. Technology is emphasized as a valued instructional tool and formatively assessed through coursework using the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards as the basis for technology applications.

The elementary and secondary program summatively assesses pedagogical content knowledge at SDP III through the capstone teacher as researcher project. Candidates are assessed on their

ability to prepare a problem statement explaining the issue that will be studied, apply intervention to the problem identified, apply technology applications, and self-assess a teaching video. The SDP III teacher as researcher writing also includes technology applications such as tables, charts, and word processing.

Surveys also provide data on pedagogical content knowledge. More than 90 percent of responding administrators agree that recent graduates of the elementary and secondary program utilize “*effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques*” that SOE prepared their teachers to be professionals who “*bring new ideas and skills to the school*” and that SOE prepared their teachers to “*demonstrate how to use a variety of instructional strategies.*”

More than 80 percent of advanced candidates reported satisfaction with their preparation on ISTE standards, in the “*application of technology applications expected in their school settings,*” regarding “*proficiency on Internet applications used in instruction of students,*” and with their understanding and use of technology.

D. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

Initial Programs

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are systematically developed and formatively assessed in the initial professional education courses and summatively assessed at SDPs. The initial programs assess *high quality* professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills such as foundations of education, child development and learning, ethics and laws, school organization, family involvement, and professional roles and responsibilities. Initial candidates are prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge that will contribute to *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*. Candidates analyze how children and adolescents develop their early concepts and beliefs from home environments and community settings that are racially and/or ethnically different from their own. Coursework and field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on knowledge and skills.

Elementary candidates complete at least 240 hours of field experience prior to student teaching, while secondary candidates complete at least 100 hours and special education candidates complete at least 300 hours. Activities and assignments in field and clinical experiences include skills related to teacher roles in the professional community. Candidates observe, interview, and visit departments and school personnel to gain a greater understanding of the overall working of the school community and to apply their knowledge of ethics, laws, and policies in their daily interactions with students, families, and communities.

Elementary and special education candidates apply and evaluate learning theory and knowledge of human development in the educational psychology block and deliver specific content in field-based placements. Elementary candidates acquire specific knowledge of diverse cultures through methods courses and the required multicultural course. Special education majors blend content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge from their specialty area and are required to complete most elementary education methods courses.

The elementary program assesses foundations and development at SDP III through a portfolio review. Elementary candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge is assessed by university and school supervising teachers prior to program completion.

Secondary education candidates complete coursework in educational psychology with lesson and unit planning to meet individual needs of students. In other secondary education courses candidates prepare developmentally appropriate learning activities that are relevant to the content selected, adapting instruction for individual needs. Candidates also demonstrate professional commitments and responsibilities as they plan and demonstrate proficiencies. Formative assessments are given for lesson plans, small and large group instruction, and self-evaluation and reflection on the application of these skills. Developmental standards are also assessed by the secondary program. More than 94 percent of university faculty and school supervising teachers rated the professional and pedagogical knowledge of candidates as “proficient” or “basic”.

Special education candidates are assessed on formative professional and pedagogical knowledge. Table 1.5 indicates professional and pedagogical knowledge ratings by special education school supervising teachers (“exemplary” or “proficient” for fall 2003 and spring 2004 and “proficient” ratings for fall 2004 and spring 2005).

Table 1.5: Special Education Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge Assessment

Standards Assessed in M470	F03 (n=6)	S04 (n=5)	F04(n=5)	S05(n=3)
Lesson planning	66%	100%	60%	0%
Interaction with staff/parents	100%	100%	80%	33%
Professional responsibilities	100%	100%	100%	33%

The elementary T2T candidates complete at least 90 hours of field experience prior to student teaching in which professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are instructed and assessed. Secondary T2T candidates are formatively assessed on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through the same courses as the initial secondary education candidates until program completion, completing 100+ hours of field experience prior to student teaching. An evaluation of the first cohort of elementary and secondary T2T candidates led to changes in how professional and pedagogical knowledge instruction was delivered. Candidates in the second cohort were given more field experiences and were assigned mentors earlier in the program.

Candidates in special education are introduced to foundations of education, professional laws, ethics and policies, and diversity of communities. Class work reinforces and extends candidate knowledge of how disability and growth and development interact. The portfolio for the first field experience includes an assessment on knowledge of development through a comparative study of age peers with and without exceptionality.

Surveys are also used to assess candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge. More than 84 percent of employers agree that IUS prepared the novice teacher to “*be an effective educator in a multicultural society,*” to “*understand how students differ in their approaches to learning,*” to “*demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community,*” and to “*engage in continuous self assessment, professional development, and growth.*”

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary programs are assessed both formatively within coursework and summatively on advanced *high quality* preparation of effective classroom teaching that leads to *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*. Candidates contribute to school effectiveness and collaborate with community resources. Surveys involving candidates, alumni, and employers are also used for program review.

Program standards assess whether teachers are committed to students and their learning, demonstrate an understanding of how students develop and learn, recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly, think systematically about their practice, seek advice of others, and draw on research and scholarship to improve practice. Candidates are formally assessed on a situation analysis in which they describe the factors that impact the school setting and influence curriculum, on advanced understandings of instruction for students from diverse family backgrounds, and on foundations in child and adolescent learning and development. All core courses include advanced proficiencies in monitoring student growth and progress and effectively communicating this information to parents and community.

In addition, candidates are assessed on professional and pedagogical development through content, cognate and elective coursework such as early childhood development, middle childhood development, exceptionalities, homeless and migrant families, legal issues, and new language learners. SDP III assesses candidate ability to research and engage professional communities.

Survey data indicate that more than 84 percent of responding administrators agree that teachers “*plan lessons based on students and the community,*” that they “*demonstrate the ability to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners,*” that they utilize “*continuous self assessment, professional development and growth,*” and that they “*demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community.*”

The unit conceptual framework provides the basis for *high quality* development of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers, including the abilities to work with families and communities in *school renewal* in a *multicultural society*. Programs assess pedagogical knowledge and skill development of real-world teaching with learning situations involving diverse students and working with school, families, and professional communities.

E. Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Other school personnel program candidates collect and analyze data related to their work, reflect on practice, and use research and technology to improve student learning directed towards *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*. Other school personnel candidates are formatively assessed in courses and summatively assessed at decision points within each program. Surveys of candidates, alumni, and employers provide the unit with further documentation regarding professional knowledge and skills of candidates in other school personnel programs regarding *educators engaged in growth*.

First-year counseling candidates focus on basic skills in individual and group counseling. Skills are assessed through audio and video tapes of actual counseling sessions, using a detailed rubric to evaluate specific skills. In the second year, candidates gain specific skills in assessment and career counseling and focus on skills needed to develop and implement an effective counseling program. A focus of the second year is the design of a “Close the Gap” project in the internship school. Candidates use data analysis to identify a problem, research-appropriate strategies, and then carry out a variety of group, individual, and system interventions to impact student success. A final report on the project and a portfolio that outlines a model school counseling program is completed as the culmination of SDP IV. Other activities such as test coordination, specific education procedures, and advocacy activities are integrated into the internship year.

Professional knowledge and skills pertaining to the use of technology are also assessed. Counseling candidates make extensive use of web-based information on career and college resources. School data are accessed from websites and web-related resources are utilized for school improvement projects. Counseling candidates demonstrate technology skills by designing a counseling public relations brochure, newsletter, or website. Data on professional knowledge and skills at SDP III are systematically collected and reviewed.

Candidates in educational leadership are formatively assessed on the use of current research as they address current issues and board policies and study legal barriers to student learning. Candidates participate in a clinical supervision project that addresses effective instruction, evaluate and revise school improvement plans, and evaluate professional development plans. They conduct a school vision project that requires reflection on best practices. Candidates research instructional and leadership issues related to diverse learners as defined by No Child Left Behind. They design a teacher interview using research on teacher quality.

An important piece of summative data is the educational leadership portfolio, which is part of the exiting interview from the program. Required projects from each course are mapped to program standards and assessed in each course. A professional development project, a teacher interview project, a school budget presentation, and a culture conversation are included in the portfolio as well as artifacts prepared during the practicum.

Candidates access the internet, critique a school/district technology plan, and demonstrate mastery of current technologies to manage school operations. Candidates design PowerPoint presentations, create Excel spread sheets, research web based publications, and log at least five hours using technology in administration.

Survey data are used by the unit to assess other school personnel in the area of technology and abilities to work with families and communities. Data from the alumni survey indicates that 76 percent of educational leadership respondents agree that IUS prepared them as a “*technological leader*,” 86 percent agree that IUS prepared them as a “*multicultural leader*.” Employers rated “*uses technology appropriate for counseling*” and “*social and cultural diversity skills*” at 2.8 on a 3.0 scale. Data from the themes survey indicates that 84 percent of the counseling and educational leadership respondents agree that their program is “*contributing to development of technology*.”

F. Dispositions

Candidates are assessed on the eight dispositions as identified in the conceptual framework under the theme of *caring professional*. The dispositions are assessed formatively at the course level and summatively at transition points in initial and advanced programs. Candidates are assessed both by university faculty and by field-based supervising teachers as appropriate.

Candidates are advised of professional disposition expectations in materials distributed at admission and at various points throughout programs. Dispositions are addressed in course conferences and interviews with individual instructors and/or the program teams. Program faculty use remediation plans for individual candidate disposition growth as appropriate.

Initial Programs

Disposition assessments are used as candidates progress through initial programs to ensure that candidates are exhibiting the appropriate *caring professional* dispositions to teach. Dispositions are assessed formatively within coursework and field experiences, and reviewed summatively at decision points. Initial program candidates submit portfolio artifacts that show dispositions through reflections, philosophy statements, diversity activities, professional development activities and collaboration. Surveys are used to obtain information about program effectiveness regarding the eight dispositions.

Candidates sign a code of ethics document prior to their first field experience. Dispositions related to teaching and learning are assessed through reflective journal writing and field experience logs. Elementary and secondary candidate disposition data are systematically collected and reviewed at transition points SDP II and SDP IV. Secondary dispositions are reviewed prior to admission to the secondary program, at the conclusion of general methods, and at the conclusion of student teaching at SDP IV.

Surveys are used to assess candidate dispositions. Responding administrators agree that IUS prepares novice teachers to “be caring professionals.” Candidates agree that their program makes a positive difference in their abilities to be “caring professionals who are concerned about students, colleagues, and the community.”

Candidates for the T2T elementary and secondary programs are informed of the importance of dispositions during advising sessions. One criterion for admission is evidence of successfully working with youth. During the interview process for admission, candidates are required to describe how they are *caring professionals*. Once admitted to the program, elementary education T2T candidates are assessed at the end of their first block of courses, after the second block, and prior to student teaching. Secondary T2T candidates are assessed after the educational psychology block, general methods, and student teaching.

Before beginning the first field experience, successful candidates for special education pass a criminal history check. University faculty and special education school supervising teachers evaluate special education candidate dispositions in each of three practica and in student teaching.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary program are licensed teachers and are expected to exhibit appropriate teaching dispositions upon entrance to the program. They are assessed on the eight dispositions, a key element of *educators engaged in growth*. Candidates are assessed at summative decision points on their abilities to reflect on disposition growth and on areas for continued improvement. Disposition concerns noted in coursework by graduate faculty are reviewed by the program team. Surveys of employers, candidates, and alumni are also used to assess program effectiveness in disposition growth.

Admission (SDP I) and program completion (SDP IV) require advanced program candidates to self-assess dispositions. SDP I data indicate that candidates self-report “concerns” upon entering the program in professional dispositions involving personal management, a commitment to inquiry, and database decision making. SDP II data indicate that candidates self-reflect growth areas as professionalism, effective communication, and abilities to collect and analyze data and that time management is an on-going challenge. Elementary and secondary candidates are also assessed on disposition growth at SDP III, through the teacher as researcher project.

Candidates in the elementary and secondary program complete a disposition writing assessment in each core course. A standardized rubric for each core course encourages consistency and fairness. The disposition writing assessments from the core courses are summatively reviewed at the completion of the core courses.

Surveys also document program effectiveness in advanced preparation regarding dispositions. A survey of elementary and secondary candidates in spring 2005 finds that 98 percent agree that their programs are “*making a positive difference in their abilities to be caring professionals who are concerned about students, colleagues, and the community.*” The employer survey in 2005 indicates that 94 percent of responding administrators agree that IUS prepares the candidate to “*be a caring professional.*”

Other School Personnel

Candidate dispositions as *caring professionals* are assessed in counseling and educational leadership programs. Assessments are completed formatively within coursework, summatively at transition points, and through surveys conducted with employers, candidates, and alumni.

School counseling uses formative assessments of dispositions as candidates move from SDP II to SDP III during the first year of the clinical cohort. They are assessed in the second course in the cohort, and any concerns are followed with an individual conference and a remediation plan. Candidates receive another formative assessment in the first semester of field work and are evaluated by the site supervisor and university supervisor. In this same semester, candidates are evaluated by the instructor on multicultural counseling. As candidates move from SDP III to SDP IV, they are formatively assessed on dispositions by university and site supervisors in the first semester of internship. Any concerns become part of the candidate goals for the second semester of internship. There were no disposition concerns at SDP III or SDP IV for counseling candidates completing programs over the past four years.

Educational leadership candidates are introduced to dispositions, standards, and portfolio requirements and learn about professional ethics. The program assesses candidate dispositions formatively in coursework. Summative assessments of dispositions are made at SDP III and in the educational leadership practicum. Candidates also write a self-reflection related to the dispositions. In 2004-2005, 100 percent of educational leadership candidates at SDP III were assessed as “acceptable” on the overall rating of dispositions. Educational leadership candidates evaluated in 2004-2005 at SDP IV by P-12 educators rated candidates at 99 percent “acceptable” on dispositions.

Educational leadership practicum candidates are surveyed annually and regularly self-assess proficiencies such as “*sensitivity/diversity in dealing with persons from different backgrounds*” as “exemplary” or “proficient.” Candidates in other school personnel programs agree that their programs are “*making a positive difference in their abilities to be caring professionals who are concerned about students, colleagues, and the community.*”

G. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Initial Programs

Elementary and special education candidates learn about and apply the principles of *school renewal* involving assessment, adjusting instruction to children’s developmental levels, and providing a positive learning environment. Secondary candidates learn about the teaching-learning process, instructional development, standardized testing, and motivation and classroom management. These principles are introduced in the educational psychology block, applied and practiced in the planning and teaching components of the general and specific methods blocks, and used in student teaching.

Candidates are assessed on the degree to which they can demonstrate student achievement and on how well they address the needs of all learners during student teaching. Assessments from student teaching are used for individual candidate assessment and aggregated for program review. Ratings by BSED university and school supervising teachers indicate combined ratings of over 90 percent “proficient” or “basic” in areas of student learning (refer to Table 34 of the IR).

Candidates in the BSED special education program are rated as “proficient” or “basic” by 100 percent of special education supervising teachers on student learning standards: selects, administers and interprets formal and informal assessment; creates and maintains accurate records; communicates assessment results; and involves students in self-assessment and goal-setting.

Survey data are also used to evaluate program effectiveness in the area of learning for all students for elementary and secondary candidates. Surveys of employers find that 98 percent agree that novice teachers are “*high quality educators,*” 94 percent agree that novice teachers “*demonstrate individual and group motivational strategies,*” and 87 percent agree that novice teachers “*prepare formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the*

continuous development of the learner.” The technology survey indicates that 95 percent of candidates are prepared to use technology to “*facilitate P-12 student learning and/or skill development,*” and 90 percent are prepared to use technology to “*analyze achievement data for groups of P-12 students.*” The themes survey indicates that 92 percent of initial candidates agree that their program prepares them in the “*understanding and skills needed to relate to a diverse and multicultural society in order to take an active role in ensuring that all children receive a high quality education.*”

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED programs are assessed on understanding of the basic principles of effective student learning, including establishing motivating environments for learning and assessments utilized to adjust developmental levels in instruction. Candidate learning is assessed formatively within coursework, summatively, and through surveys of employers, alumni, and candidates.

Review of candidates’ goals at program entrance indicates that candidates seek additional information about assessment. Candidates have numerous opportunities to expand and refine their skills in using student data to improve instruction and student learning through formative course assessments, including using assessment tools/procedures for their classroom and completing a diversity project that includes pre- and post-assessment.

Candidates create curriculum units that include criteria for judging the impact of teaching on student learning, complete projects that demonstrate impact on student learning while completing field work, and plan and re-plan based on performance data of the students. Summative assessments for the SDP III teacher as researcher project demonstrate candidate ability to accurately assess and analyze student learning and make adjustments to instruction.

Surveys indicate that 99 percent of candidates agree that their program prepares them with the understanding and skills needed to “*relate to a diverse and multicultural society in order to take an active role in ensuring that all children receive a high quality education.*” Similarly, 98 percent of elementary and secondary alumni agree that IU Southeast “*prepared them for this job.*”

H. Student Learning for Other School Personnel

Other school personnel candidates understand that their work has the potential to impact large groups of students. Candidates are assessed on *high quality* skills needed for *school renewal* within a *multicultural society* in which all students learn. Candidates are assessed on their abilities to create positive learning environments.

Counseling program candidates consider the developmental levels of students and obtain experience in empirically based decisions. Candidates develop assessments based on individual interventions and prepare an individual counseling case report, develop a case plan for a group of students and audiotape the sessions, and identify a “close the gap” project, design a set of

strategies, implement them, and assess the impact on student learning. A final project and portfolio are completed as the culmination of SDP IV.

Educational leadership program candidates study school data and write and critique a school improvement plan, analyze test results, determine effective instructional leadership strategies, and use data to develop spreadsheets to prepare a school improvement plan. Standards 1-6 and 8 of the INTASC standards assess candidate abilities to promote the success of all students with all candidates rated as “proficient” or “basic” on these standards in 2004-2005.

Surveys indicate that 95 percent of counseling and educational leadership candidates agree that their program is *“preparing them with the understanding and skills needed to relate to a diverse and multicultural society in order to take an active role in ensuring that all children receive a high quality education,”* that 91 percent of counseling alumni agree that *“IU Southeast education prepared you for this job,”* and that 90 percent of educational leadership candidates consider themselves “proficient” in *“problem analysis—to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information”* and *“motivational leadership—ability to get others involved in problem-solving situations.”* On a three-point rating scale, counseling employers rate *“effective use of appropriate assessment tools”* at 2.8, *“applies test results to school improvement”* at 2.5, *“skills in developing, implementing, and evaluation”* at 2.7, *“strategies for positive school climate”* at 2.7, and *“systematic approaches to student social and academic achievement”* at 2.8.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The conceptual framework provides the basis for the unit’s programs and is woven throughout. Formative and summative assessments; candidate, alumni and employer surveys; and interviews with employers, candidates, supervising teachers, and alumni all support the conclusion that the unit prepares candidates to work effectively in schools as teachers and other professional school personnel both at the initial and the advanced levels. Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement: None

New: None

Corrected: None

Continued: None

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Assessment System

The unit assessment system (UAS) was designed with involvement from a variety of stakeholders, including unit faculty, teacher candidates, university representatives, and members of the P-12 community. Implementation of the unit assessment system is the responsibility of all stakeholders including unit faculty, arts and sciences faculty, adjunct faculty, and clinical supervisors. Primary responsibility for implementation of the unit assessment system is placed upon the unit's Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation (PAUE) team.

The UAS feedback loop identifies the roles and responsibilities for the collection, aggregation, and analysis of data for the assessment of candidate progress. The initial level programs are mapped to INTASC standards and the Indiana content and developmental standards for teacher preparation. Advanced level programs are mapped to NBPTS, ISLLC, and ASCA standards as appropriate. The course learning objectives of unit syllabi at the initial and advanced levels are matched to the conceptual framework's outcomes to ensure that all framework outcomes are taught and assessed in program coursework.

Each program has a complete set of expected artifacts and outcomes assigned by courses. Each program includes an artifact or checkpoint scoring rubric that shows each course in the program and its required artifacts. The guide also shows where each of the program checkpoints occur. These checkpoints include demonstration of competence to ensure that candidates meet all requirements. The undergraduate licensure programs each have four checkpoints, with models that relate to conceptual frameworks, coursework, methods, field experiences, and exiting from the program. Initial licensure programs at the post baccalaureate level (special education SEPB and Transition to Teaching) also have four checkpoints, with models that are similar to undergraduate initial programming. Advanced programming in Elementary and Secondary MSED, Educational Leadership and Counseling MSED checkpoints include admission, admission to practicum/cohort, completion of coursework/practicum, and recommendation for licensure/graduation.

Proficiencies are assessed via checkpoint summary forms in specified courses and field-based placements. The unit has designed a systematic procedure that provides an overview of the process of tracking and working with candidates who have been identified either as having deficiencies or as doing exemplary work. Admission and exit criteria are used at both the initial and advanced levels. A process is in place for matriculation decisions via committee review, and any deficiencies are remediated through program advisors and faculty. Candidates have the ability to challenge program decisions. A specific process of candidate remediation is governed by each program and is reviewed by committees at the programming level and unit level. Documentation of recent candidate challenges was identified in evidence.

According to minutes from various faculty meetings and interviews, rubrics and checkpoint forms were developed over a five-year period to assess proficiencies, the conceptual framework, INTASC, NBPTS, ASCA, and ISLLC, as well as evidence of mastery of the content and developmental standards. Rubrics are used at both the initial and advanced levels to assess assignments, artifacts, and outcomes aligned to the conceptual framework. Minutes and oral and written statements support that professional development is provided for adjuncts on the use of rubrics to facilitate inter-rater reliability. Fairness in the evaluation of candidates is encouraged by relating assessments directly to the unit standards and using multiple assessment points and multiple assessment instruments.

Artifacts are assessed in a variety of ways. Candidates are provided expectations for each assignment through syllabi and can view Decision Point rubrics via IUS website. Work is underway to organize formative and summative data for candidate review online via the *Milestones* program. This information should be available for candidate use within the next year.

The unit uses systematic and consistent strategies to determine whether assessments are predictors of candidate success at the initial level. At the initial and advanced levels, the UAS collects formative and summative data. Examples of formative data collected includes Praxis I scores, course marks, grades on in-class assignments and artifacts evidencing mastery of the conceptual framework areas, field experience evaluations, case studies, and portfolios. Summative data collected includes NTE/Praxis specialty tests (Praxis II Specialty Area tests), grades, student teaching evaluations, cumulative grade point averages and /or minimum grades, and portfolios. The UAS provides timelines and checkpoints for initial candidate progression through the program. For each checkpoint, multiple measures are used to gather information about candidate performance.

At each checkpoint, the above measures are used to arrive at decisions about candidate performance. The unit uses data to track candidate placements, monitor candidate performance on Praxis examinations and ensure that candidates work with diverse student populations in schools. These data are used to verify that candidates and program completers demonstrate mastery of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for their level of preparation.

As with the initial program, there is a set of checkpoints for advanced candidates. There are three advanced programs: the MSED Elementary & Secondary program, the Educational Leadership program, and the Counseling MSED program.

The unit has developed and provided rubrics that are carefully aligned to the conceptual framework, content, and development standards for the State of Indiana, as well as program professional standards to ensure that each candidate is made aware of assessment expectations and that multiple opportunities exist for candidates to meet or exceed expectations. It was evident from interviews that all faculty and candidates rely on the use of rubrics and have access to the rubrics in courses, via the IUS website and/or during advising meetings.

Through candidate interviews it became obvious that candidates receive a substantial amount of time with their advisors outside of class and faculty are genuinely interested in candidates' successes.

B. Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation

Initial and Advanced

The unit maintains an assessment system that provides information on candidate proficiencies, dispositions, knowledge, performance, unit operations, and program review. Multiple assessments exist, including cooperating teacher questionnaires, instructor/course questionnaires, state licensure tests, candidate grade point averages, field experience evaluations, communication proficiencies, student teaching assessments, and benchmark evaluations.

While data have been systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed from 2001 – 2005, the majority of aggregations reflect data from academic years 2003 – 2005 due to early changes and modifications to ensure validity and reliability. Data are gathered at various points throughout the term, but most data are collected each semester as summative data. Information is gathered and processed through the unit database coordinator and UAS coordinator's office. Data can be reported at any time to faculty through their program chairs or committees to respond to curricular, programmatic, or field experience queries. By the early fall semester, all faculty review the previous year's aggregated annual data with their program groups, Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP), and stakeholders. These discussions include both internal and external reviews of data.

The database reflects that current technology is used to collect data on teacher candidates. The unit has invested in *Peoplesoft*, *Excel*, and *NCS Pearson Software* through the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment that will enable the unit to learn from the past, understand what is happening today, make predictions about candidates' successes, and make decisions based on data to improve the program. Support for data analysis has been received in one full-time and one part-time staff positions.

The unit assessment coordinator is responsible for collecting and inputting performance data about candidates into the database system via *NCS Pearson Software*. The data base coordinator is responsible for aggregating the data and putting the data into readable tabular forms so that the unit can make decisions. Data are given to the initial and advanced program committees who make recommendations to the faculty, who then make recommendations to the Assessment Committee. The NCATE Steering Committee and COPEP (Council on Preparing Education Professionals) Committee includes members of the faculty, staff, and P-12 community and is responsible for the oversight of the assessment process.

The unit maintains a record of formal candidate complaints and documentation of resolutions. These logs are documented and held within individual student candidate files, within programming areas, and a master copy is maintained in the office of the dean of the School of Education. While the nature of the complaints varies, "grade dispute" is the most frequent complaint. All noted complaints were resolved using internal processes.

C. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Initial and Advanced

The unit systematically uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficiency of its courses, programs, field experiences and clinical practices. The unit analyzes program evaluations and aggregates candidate performance data to initiate program revisions and program changes. A formal history of changes exists in numerous forms, including memos, meeting notes, drafts of documents, and organized alterations to programming sheets. Interviews conducted with members of the PAUE team document that the unit regularly and systematically initiates program changes and modifications based upon performance data.

Checkpoint sheets and student access to checkpoint standing via their individual accounts through advising software are in place to better structure and inform candidates of their progress.

Exhibits and interviews suggest that the following data have been regularly and systematically collected, reported, reviewed, and discussed, including course evaluations, initial program completers survey, initial employer's/principal survey, Title II data (Praxis I and II reports), evaluations of candidates' performance in early field experiences, evaluations of early field experiences, evaluations of candidate performance in student teaching experiences, evaluations of university supervisor in student teaching experiences, evaluations of student teaching experiences, and evaluations of candidates' dispositions.

As part of the process of reflection, according to the *Institutional Report* and interviews with initial program candidates, elementary candidates are required to meet with advisors at each programmatic checkpoint. Assessment data are shared with candidates in all program so that candidates may see how well they are attaining the relevant program knowledge, skills, and dispositions throughout their coursework.

At the beginning of each field experience and student teaching in initial programs, candidates are required to reflect on their teaching and dispositions and then create a plan for improvement. At the midway point and at the end of each field experience and student teaching, candidates reflect and discuss their progress with their cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

At the midway point and the end of each practicum semester in the educational leadership program, candidates reflect and discuss their progress with their mentors and university supervisors. During the final experience in each advanced program, candidates assess their professional dispositions. Candidates complete the unit's forms and discuss areas of concern with the university supervisor(s).

According to the *Institutional Report* and an interview with members of the PAUE team, unit faculty are required to complete an annual report in which they detail their accomplishments of the past academic year in the areas of teaching, service and research. The dean responds to these reports with a written evaluation. Faculty must address previous weaknesses in the next annual report.

Full-time faculty are evaluated by candidates at the end of each semester using a five-point scale. A summary of these evaluations regarding teaching effectiveness was in evidence. These data indicate that candidates believe faculty provide quality instruction in both initial and advanced programs. Faculty have access to these documents and utilize them in making course and programmatic changes.

Numerous data-driven changes have occurred at both the initial and advanced levels. For example, since the inception of the revised unit assessment system in elementary education, one licensure, seventeen assessment, four admission, four curriculum, eight course requirements, and one procedural change have occurred. An example of these changes in the elementary program included modification of summative portfolio rationales due to inconsistent performance on reflections based on checkpoint III data. Data at the advanced levels have involved similar modifications over the 2000 – 2005 school years. For example, changes evidenced in the master's program in elementary and secondary education have had one licensure, four assessment, four admission, two curriculum, seven course offering, six course requirement, and five procedural changes. An example of these changes at the advanced level included modification of the content course list to remove courses not routinely offered, and additional coursework based on candidate surveys was added.

Each program is responsible for meeting with stakeholders and with COPEP to review growth plans and meeting of annual goals related to the conceptual framework as well as program-level checkpoints.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Overall, the unit, with the involvement of the professional community, has implemented an assessment system aligned to its conceptual frameworks, candidate proficiencies, and INTASC and state standards. The unit systematically uses data from the initial and advanced programs to evaluate candidates' performances and proficiencies, efficiency of its courses, field experiences, and clinical practice. Multiple assessments are systematically used for program revisions and evaluations of candidate performances. The unit systematically shares data with all components of the college, including the content faculty, various committees within the college, external stakeholders and candidates to improve program, faculty, and candidate performances.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Corrected: None

Continued: None

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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Initial and Advanced Programs

The School of Education field and clinical experiences for programs at both the initial and advanced levels are designed, developed, and evaluated in collaboration with school partners. For each program area, advisory groups consisting of P-12 teachers or counselors, administrators, recent program completers, and candidates meet several times a year with unit faculty teams to monitor and review programs and assessments related to candidates' levels of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and make recommendations for improvements in field and clinical experiences. Archived meeting minutes reflect ongoing collaboration and decision making in the development of field placement policies, performance rubrics, and assessment measures to improve the quality of field experiences. These standards-based rubrics and assessments are a part of the SOE school-based assessment system and are aligned with the themes of the conceptual framework and state and national content and performance standards.

In 2003, the Field and Clinical Experiences Team was added to the SOE quality teams to monitor field experiences and ensure compliance with NCATE Standard 3. Co-chaired by the two field placement coordinators, this quality team includes SOE faculty and two P-12 representatives. The field placement coordinators also serve on initial program teams and the elementary and secondary MSED program teams. The coordinators facilitate communication among programs and the field placement office.

Both formally and informally, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and candidates are provided ongoing opportunities to communicate with SOE supervisors about aspects of the program including the candidates' content preparation, pedagogy, rapport with university supervisors, and required forms. The partners' perspectives are sought by SOE personnel related to what they view to be program strengths, areas of concern, and suggestions for improvement. Through surveys, email, phone calls, and the SOE website, as well as through personal contact, stakeholders are encouraged to offer their professional opinions about the field experience programs. Cooperating teachers and candidates report that they feel the SOE is responsive to their feedback, and indicate that their feedback has resulted in improved field experiences and learning experiences for both the candidates and their students.

Some of the many examples offered by cooperating teachers and administrators included their input into the development and revision of the assessment rubrics, modifications in course content to better prepare for the field experiences, raising candidate awareness of different school day structure (4X4 Block vs. traditional 7-8 period day), and providing additional seminars in

particular topics such as classroom management. School partners are highly satisfied with levels of collaboration and continuing improvements that have been made in the quality of field experiences and capabilities of candidates with whom they work.

Student teaching placements are collaboratively determined. At the initial level for both elementary and secondary programs, candidates submit their placement preferences to their respective field experience coordinator. The coordinator makes a placement decision that takes into consideration the candidate’s previous placements and that will offer the candidate the greatest breadth and depth of experience. The Field Experience and Clinical Practices Quality Team monitors the type and frequency of candidate placements in diverse settings. The field experience coordinator and the school administrator jointly determine what they believe to be the most appropriate candidate/cooperating teacher match.

At the advanced level, where most candidates already are working in schools, most of the clinical and practicum experiences take place in the schools in which they work. At this level, the candidate selects an administrator or counselor he/she would like as a mentor. If that person agrees, the superintendent must also agree to the working relationship for administrators and the principal must also agree for the counselors; the SOE program practicum instructor then proceeds to meet with both the candidate and the mentor to explain the roles and responsibilities of the parties. Special education candidates’ experiences take place in their classrooms.

In addition, candidates have opportunities to meet practicum requirements through summer work. For example, gifted and talented education includes a three-credit-hour summer practicum where candidates provide direct instruction to various developmental levels of high ability students under the supervision of university clinical faculty

B. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Initial and Advanced Programs

The chart below identifies the field experience and clinical practice components required in all programs at both the initial and advanced levels.

Table 3.1 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

PROGRAM	FIELD EXPERIENCES (Observation and/or Practicum)	CLINICAL PRACTICE (Student Teaching or Internship)	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS
Elementary	H340—30 hrs: Observe, assist teacher, attend board meeting, interview teacher; M201—30 hrs: tutoring, small group work, prepare instructional materials; study motivation, intelligence, classroom management; M301 for M300—30 hrs: visit religious places of worship-mosque, temple, Crane house; tutor ENL students; M301 for M310/311—30 hrs: prepare integrated unit and teach 4 lessons(done individually); M301 for E339/340/E325—60 hrs prepare and teach units in language arts and social studies (usually done in small groups); M301 for E328/E343—30 hrs: prepare and teach units in mathematics and science (usually done in small groups); M301 for E341—12 hrs: tutor one on one with student identified as a struggling reader. Total: 222 hrs.	M425—16 weeks (640 hrs) of student teaching: full responsibilities for 8 weeks. Total: 640 hrs	862 hrs.
Elem. T2T	M310,M311,E325,part of E490—45 hrs: observe, work	M500 (Reading 2 &	775 hrs.

	w/small groups, plan & teach two lessons (social studies & language arts), develop integrated unit, case study on developmental observations, delineate diversity in observed classroom. E339,E340,E343,M500—90 hrs: observe, plan & teach lessons in reading, language arts, math, develop classroom management plans and videotape implementation. Total: 135 hrs.	Student Teaching)—16 weeks (640 hrs): first six weeks applying skills from diagnostic reading course, 10 weeks of student teaching--full responsibilities for at least 8 weeks. Total: 640 hrs	
Secondary	H340—30 hrs: Observe, assist teacher, attend board meeting, interview teacher; M201—30 hrs: in a middle school/junior high, work in resource room for 3 periods, interview regular and special ed teachers, write extensive reflection on aspects of MS/JH schools and students; M301—40 hrs: observe, evaluate, critique, prepare & teach 5 lessons, spend 5 hours in special ed resource room. Total 100 hrs.	M480—10 weeks (400 hrs) of student teaching: full responsibilities for at least 6 weeks. Total: 400 hrs.	500 hrs.
Sec. T2T	M500 (practicum-taken twice)--60 hrs: in a middle school/junior high, observe, interview, teach at least 3 lessons, work with minority/special needs students, study cognitive development; M301—40 hrs: observe, evaluate, critique, prepare & teach 5 lessons; Total 100 hrs.	M500 (student teaching)—10 weeks (400 hrs) of student teaching: full responsibilities for at least 6 weeks. Total: 400 hrs.	500 hrs.
Special Education	H340—30 hrs: Observe, assist teacher, attend board meeting, interview teacher; M201—30 hrs: tutoring, small group work, prepare instructional materials; study motivation, intelligence, classroom management;; M301 for M310/311—30 hrs: prepare integrated unit and teach 4 lessons(done individually); M301 for E339/340/E325—60hrs prepare and teach units in language arts and social studies (usually done in small groups); M301 for E328/E343—30hrs: prepare and teach units in mathematics and science (usually done in small groups); M301 for E341—12 hrs: tutor one on one with student identified as a struggling reader. M470 –270 hours: teach lessons, complete technology audit, study IEPs, write behavioral plans, and conduct assessment; Total: 462 hrs.	K480—16 weeks (640 hrs) of student teaching; 8 in elementary, 8 in secondary settings. Total: 640 hrs.	1102 hrs.
SEPB	M550A and M550B—180 hours: assist teacher, observe, prepare instructional materials, prepare lessons based on IEPs, work with paras, use community resources; Total: 180 hrs.	K480-two 8-week placements; Total: 640 hrs.	820hrs.
Elem/Sec MSED	H520—20 hrs: diversity, service-learning projects; J500—20 hrs: evaluate and reflect on curriculum and instruction; P507—10 hrs: create test & rubric to assess student work; P510—10 hrs: reflect on student motivation &/or learning; P515—10 hrs: case observation project/paper on child development; P570—10 hrs: create behavior management plan; total 40-60 hrs.	Teacher inquiry research project; Total 40 hours.	100+ hrs.
Counseling MSED	G524—100 hrs: individual & group counseling, guidance lessons, observe PT conferences; total: 100 hrs.	G550—300 hrs (teachers)—600 hrs (non-teachers): experience in all three levels, (one diverse); include case studies of multi-cultural counseling, ENL, disability; school reform project. Total: 300—600 hrs.	400—700 hrs.
Educational Leadership	A500—2 hrs: interview principal; A510—6 hrs: interview, attend board meeting, speak about their school; A608—10 hrs: use source documents on board policies to apply to own school; A635—2 hrs: gather data from board; A638—10 hrs: develop school improvement plan; A625/A627/A653—10 hrs:	A695: 100+ hrs: serve on school committees, participate in community organizations, and	150-160+hrs.

	build and analyze a school schedule; S655/E536/S655—10-20 hrs: spreadsheet analysis of school data, develop instructional plan; observe teacher, conference, and develop improvement plan; total: 42-52	administer school regulations. Total: 100 hrs.	
--	---	---	--

Candidates at all levels and in all programs participate in a series of developmentally appropriate field experiences where they are provided opportunities to gain proficiency in areas outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards. Each program provides candidates with clinical experiences and assessment tools which correspond with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for successful program completion. Threaded throughout the experiences is a reinforcement of the candidates’ need to address diversity issues and to be able to adapt instruction to meet the needs of all students. The evaluation checklists and accompanying rubrics are used at benchmark decision points to identify and monitor candidate proficiencies and professional growth. In addition, candidates are engaged in reflective practice wherein they identify their perceptions of their strengths and areas in need of improvement.

Candidates are skilled in the use of technology for instruction. All candidates at the initial program level take *W200 Use of Computers in Education*, which provides them with a foundation for creating instructional activities using technology. They receive instruction, produce lessons and presentations, and are assessed on their proficiency in using various computer programs including Inspiration, MSPublisher, PowerPoint, Excel, and HyperStudio. In methods class, field experiences candidates are required to identify the forms and availability of instructional technology at their site. They are required to develop lesson plans incorporating available technology, and then teach the lesson. Field experience and cooperating teachers relate that the candidates are well versed in the use of technology as an instructional tool; they often teach their cooperating teachers how to use the programs and related activities. Advanced level programs also require that candidates become proficient in the use of technology in their program areas. For example, educational leadership technology projects include the use of the Internet and websites to access knowledge bases, use technology to communicate the school’s mission/vision statement, create a schedule, and use the Internet to locate school-based DOE information on demographics

Clinical school-based faculty are selected through a collaborative effort between the SOE and school partner administrators. SOE data surveys reflect that cooperating teachers are professionally involved master teachers whose teaching is an example of best practices. The Indiana teachers must have a master’s degree and at least three years of teaching experience; the Kentucky teachers must have a master’s degree and four years teaching experience. In addition, potential and current field supervisors are regularly asked to submit information identifying them as accomplished school professionals: professional development background, service as a trainer, leadership roles, membership in professional organizations, awards and recognition, professional presentations and publications, and previous experience as a field supervisor. This information is confirmed by the school administrators, who participate in matching the candidates with their clinical school based faculty.

As programs have moved to performance-based assessments, both university and P-12 educators continue to be retrained for their roles as supervisors and mentors. Each program at both the initial and advances level provides school-based clinical faculty with both an orientation session and training in conferencing with candidates, helping them plan, observing, documenting, and understanding the stages of student learning and teaching. Each mentor and/or cooperating teacher is provided a handbook which details the expectations and responsibilities of the supervisor, and this information is reviewed by the university supervisor with the school-based supervisor and the candidate. They are also invited to participate in various professional development activities presented to the SOE faculty.

To help ensure that the elementary clinical experiences are a good fit, a group of 30 area administrators, teachers, and IUS professionals suggested and helped to develop the MATCH policy. At meetings prior to the clinical experience, the classroom teacher, principal, and the candidate meet to discuss the placement. If any one of the three feel it is not a good match, that person is to contact the Coordinator of Field Placement to explore a change in placement. In addition, if a candidate is experiencing significant difficulties and there is some belief that he/she would not be successful, the cooperating teacher, candidate, and university supervisor may agree that the candidate should conclude the current student teaching assignment and participate in the Professional Improvement Plan where additional faculty guidance and support is provided. Student teaching is resumed in the next semester. Candidates, field experience supervisors, cooperating teachers, and administrators all report that faculty support both during and after program completion is one of the greatest strengths of the program.

C. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn

The attached table provides a five-year overview of the number of initial program candidates eligible for clinical practice each semester and the corresponding number of program completers.

Table 3.2 BSED Clinical Practice Spring 2001-Spring 2005

Program	S01	F01	S02	F02	S03	F03	S04	F04	S05
BSED Elementary	51* (51)	39* (39)	42* (41)	48* (48)	61* (61)	54* (53)	42* (42)	41* (41)	32* (31)
BSED Secondary	37* (37)	N/A	35* (35)	N/A	50* (49)	N/A	64* (63)	N/A	52* (52)
BSED Special Ed	1* (1)	0	5* (5)	0	2* (2)	1* (1)	1* (1)	4* (4)	1* (1)
T2T (Elem and Sec)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8* (8) (7 elem/ 1 sec)	N/A	1* (1) (sec)

* indicates the number of program candidates who **were eligible** to student teach

() = indicates number of program candidates who **completed** student teaching

Entry and exit criteria are adhered to for clinical practice. Multiple assessments are used in clinical practice to evaluate candidate performance and student learning. Assessments are completed by candidates, schools, and unit faculty.

Initial Programs

All initial program BSED applicants have field placements during *H340 Education and American Culture*, completed prior to admission to the SOE in urban, diverse setting in the Louisville/Jefferson County schools. Classroom teachers evaluate candidates in seven areas in *H340*, including candidate ability to work with diverse learners.

The initial elementary, secondary, and special education programs incorporate *H340* school-based assessments for decision making in SDPI. Candidates are assessed on their abilities to help all students learn as they work with small groups, prepare literacy strategies matched to reading styles, develop social studies concepts including issues of diversity, and develop management plans and assessment rubrics. Candidates also teach six or more lessons to classroom size groups of elementary school students.

The BSED elementary and special education program SDP II reviews are conducted through a review of evaluations of field experience in general methods field experiences. Candidates must also have a 2.5 in all the content areas in the final semester before acceptance into student teaching. Student teaching is assessed by clinical university faculty and school supervisors. University supervisors and school supervising teachers rate each elementary education candidate on five standards involving planning, classroom environment, effective teaching strategies, professionalism, and application of elementary K-6 standards. Dispositions are formally evaluated in *M310* by university-based clinical supervisors for SDPII and by school-based clinical supervisors for SDP IV in *M425 Student Teaching*. Dispositions are also formally assessed in each elementary field experience.

The secondary BSED program also incorporates early field experiences from *H340* and *M201 Laboratory/Field Experience in Educational Psychology* in determining admission to secondary education (SDPI). Candidates pass SDPIII field experience criteria before enrolling in *M480 Secondary Student Teaching*. Summative Decision Point IV ensures that candidates have successfully completed student teaching clinical requirements. Secondary education candidates are assessed in field experiences (*M201*, *M301*, *M480*) by the school supervising teacher and university supervisor on dispositions. Clinical supervisors in the field and school supervising faculty evaluate candidates on program standards focused on meeting the needs of all learners. Each student teaching candidate is assessed at mid-term and at the end of the experience by the university supervisor and school supervising teacher on the candidate's attainment of program standards. Dispositions are assessed by the school supervising teacher, also at mid-term and at completion of the experience through the INTASC standards the SOE disposition form.

Secondary candidates complete proficiencies related to teaching all students through observations in special education resource rooms, and work with minority and special needs students in inclusive settings. At this level, candidates develop their abilities to provide high

quality instruction and to display appropriate professional dispositions when working with students at the level/s for which they are preparing. The secondary education general methods practicum also includes the development of lesson planning and five hours of observation in a special needs classroom. Secondary general methods candidates are placed for a 40-hour practicum in secondary schools in southern Indiana or a Jefferson County Public Schools high school, which is selected because of its diverse student population. Lessons are prepared and presented as part of an integrated unit.

Initial special education BSED candidate performance is assessed through five summative decision points: SDPI, SDPII, SDP2.5, SDPIII, SDPIV. The first two are shared with the elementary education program; the final three assessment points are specific to the major. The third assessment point occurs at the first of three 90-clock-hour practicums. The fourth decision point is determined by 2.5 overall GPA and successful completion of the previous decision points and all courses covering the required standards. School-based clinical supervisors and university-based clinical supervisors evaluate candidates in each of these three placements in areas of professionalism, instructional competencies, classroom management, assessment, and collaboration. Dispositions are assessed in each field experience. During the student teaching, candidates' ability to apply their knowledge and skills in context and adjust curriculum to meet the individual needs of exceptional students over extended periods of time is assessed by the school supervising teacher and the assigned IUS supervisor

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the M.S. in Elementary and Secondary Education program complete multiple assessments in field-based course assignments directed at ensuring that all students learn. The service learning project directed at understanding underlying social conditions affecting learning is completed and assessed formatively by the course instructors of H520 Education and Social Issues.

Summative Decision Point II, at the conclusion of the core courses (H520, J500, P510, P507) involves candidate self-reflection on dispositions related to classroom teaching experiences and new knowledge and understandings gained from each of course. Candidates reflect on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions while in the core courses and have opportunities to receive feedback and engage in critical friend discussions with other candidates.

SDPIII is completed no later than 30 hours into the program and after completion of SDPII requirements. The field-based teacher as researcher inquiry project requires candidates to document a solution-oriented investigation through problem identification, systematic data collection, reflection analysis, data-driven action taken, and finally, problem redefinition process. The project is individually assessed by assigned program faculty utilizing a 'blind review' similar to procedures candidates would experience if submitting a manuscript to a professional journal for review. All areas of the SDPIII rubric must be scored as "complete" prior to program completion at SDPIV and an overall GPA 3.0 or higher.

MSED faculty assigned to evaluate SDPIII meet several times each year to discuss scoring and rater reliability issues. The university coordinator informs candidates regarding satisfactory

completion of SDP reviews, additional clarifications that are needed, or the need for a candidate remediation plan. Summative Decision Point IV is the final review to ensure that all program standards have been met and a final reflective analysis of dispositions and goals has been submitted.

Other School Personnel

In the three semesters of field work (*G524* and two semesters of *G550*) counseling MSED candidates are evaluated by both university and site supervisors. Field work requirements are coordinated with coursework and are evaluated by course instructors. Specific assessments of standards are assessed through rubrics. A skill audit based on the IPSB standards is assessed by university and site supervisors in the first semester of internship.

Counseling assesses Summative Decision Point III at the completion of the practicum and Decision Point IV at the completion of the internship using multiple measures linked to program standards. Candidates taking practicum must have a B in the course and score a Basic (85%) on the rubric for individual counseling tapes and group counseling tapes. *G550 Internship in Counseling* is a two-semester, six-credit hour, field experience taken in the fall and spring of the third year of the program. Internship candidates must earn at least a 3.0 each semester and a score of Proficient (90%) on the rubrics for counseling tapes and observations. A required ethics application case must be scored at Basic level. The internship supervisor uses the practicum skill audit and reflection to assist the candidate to set goals for the internship. Candidates are asked to reflect on numerous activities in the practicum and internship manuals. Both university and site supervisors do formative evaluations of candidates in practicum and the first semester of internship. Dispositions are also evaluated. The university supervisor is responsible for informing candidates of any concerns and developing a remediation plan.

A Close the Gap year-long school improvement project for *G542/G562 Organization and Development of Counseling Programs/School Counseling Interventions, Consultation, and Program Development* is completed in the internship schools. During internship elementary counseling interns complete a special education case from initial referral to final placement. Secondary counseling interns do three special education activities selected from a provided list which includes a case conference, initial referral, and transition plan.

Educational leadership candidates must receive a satisfactory review of standards positioned in at least five of the program courses (with 3.0 GPA or higher) at SDPII before approval to enroll in *A695 Practicum in Educational Leadership*. Practicum candidates demonstrate competencies linked to the program standards assessed at Decision Point III. There are 21 areas in which candidates are assessed by their mentor clinical supervisors, including sensitivity to diversity. While in the field, candidates are expected to continue building their program portfolio with attention to a program standard on performance as a multicultural leader. Proficiency in the program standards is assessed in SDP III. Satisfactory completion of SDPIII includes reflective writing in numerous areas evaluated, as well as 90 percent Basic or Proficient on the mentor evaluation rubric, and 'Acceptable' ratings for the practicum log, shadow experience, educational platform, and portfolio completion. Dispositions are assessed summatively at the

conclusion of *A695* by the university supervisor. Candidates demonstrate proficiency on state-required assessments and dispositions, and 3.25 GPA for license application at SDP IV.

In all programs, both initial and advanced, candidates are required to engage in reflection related to their field experiences. Reflective activities include class and electronic discussions; daily observation-reflection journals which include analysis of lessons taught, strategies used, developmental issues related to student growth, diversity, and interactions with colleagues; self-critique of videotaped lessons, and portfolios. A review of documented evidence, as well as confirmation from candidates and faculty, ensures that candidates at both levels are continually required and encouraged to engage in standards-based reflection related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Overall Assessment of Standard

In summary, all unit programs extensively use field experiences and clinical practice that are designed and implemented with its school partners. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors use multiple methods to assess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Continued: None

Corrected: None

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.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The mission of the unit is to prepare candidates at the initial and advanced levels for a diverse world. The unit accomplishes its mission through implementation of the SOE Diversity Plan and learner-centered programs that are developmental, inquiry-focused, and standards-based. The SOE Diversity Plan is both a commitment to and a structure for the unit to implement and assure coherent actions directed towards developing educators who demonstrate proficiencies representative of pluralistic perspectives. Aligned to standards such as INTASC, NCATE, Indiana content and developmental standards, ISLLC, ASCA and/or NBPTS standards, the goals cover four areas impacting the work of the unit:

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Educational Access, Recruitment, Participation, and Retention
- Culture, Climate, and Community Outreach
- Professional Development

Commitment to diversity is found in theme four, multicultural society, of the conceptual framework. The unit has experienced a renewed energy as a result of diversity infused into coursework, updated curriculum materials, new faculty representation, and partnerships with diverse schools. Additionally, diversity-related events are included in the recent campus newspaper, *The Horizon*. The Office of Equity and Diversity presents topics that address racial issues.

Unit diversity initiatives since the last NCATE visit were developed and are continuously monitored with stakeholder involvement. The Diversity Quality Team ensures program compliance to the diversity theme and to NCATE standards. This team includes SOE faculty and convenes an advisory board that includes a wide diverse representation from the surrounding communities for the purpose of gathering community input into the design and implementation of SOE diversity initiatives.

The unit clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during their professional program. Curriculum and accompanying field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. A consultant was hired in 1999-2001 to work with individual teaching faculty on integrating diversity into curricula. Following a review of the conceptual framework by a second outside consultant in 2003, English as a New Language (ENL) was added to the knowledge base. Diversity in course syllabi has been reviewed and diversity knowledge bases mapped within programs.

Candidates learn to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity and develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles shaped by cultural influences and are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including those with exceptionalities. Three of the eight professional dispositions assessed by all programs are specifically related to diversity. These include “*respect the legal and ethical norms and values of education;*” “*effectively interact and collaborate with others and foster similar behaviors among students;*” and “*[candidates] are committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals*”.

As illustrated during the poster sessions, candidates are informed of the importance and value placed on knowledge, skills, and dispositions regarding diversity in a variety of formats. Information sessions are held prior to program admission and at key phases within programs where the four themes are discussed. Also, candidates are informed of requirements and expectations on diversity through course syllabi and program handbooks.

Initial Programs

According to the *Institutional Report*, the institution has recently strengthened general education requirements for the IU Southeast baccalaureate degree to include a stronger emphasis on diversity. In fall 2005, initial program candidates were required to complete two or more three-hour diversity courses from a broad selection of campus coursework. The initial elementary education required course, *M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society*, is an approved course that fulfills the general education requirement. Initial program secondary candidates were previously required to complete one diversity course in general education, but in fall 2005 the requirement increased to two or more diversity courses.

H340 Education and American Culture is completed by initial Bachelor of Science in Education (BSED) candidates prior to SOE admission. The course includes field experiences evaluated by school-based clinical supervising teachers related to the potential candidate’s ability to work and relate to diversity found in school settings. *H340* candidates are assessed by school supervising teachers on “*understanding how students differ in backgrounds*” and “*reflecting on teaching students with different backgrounds.*”

The initial elementary BSED program has designed and implemented coursework and field experiences into blocks that include diverse learning and assessments. Block One (*P250/P251/M201*) includes lectures and discussions on diverse learning styles, gender issues in the classroom, and research-based approaches to individualizing instructions and as well as readings and video presentations addressing Afro-centrism in schools. *M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society*, piloted in spring 2004, is required in Block One for elementary education. Candidates are assessed through written responses to readings, journal entries and reflection papers on tutoring and a research paper addressing policy issues on diversity education.

Block Two of the elementary and special education BSED program includes knowledge and skills directed at preparing candidates for culturally responsive teaching. Block Three in the elementary BSED program includes language arts and social studies methods. The course, *E325 Social Studies in the Elementary School*, includes readings and discussions, guest speakers,

experiential activities, study trips, planning and teaching of instructional units. All are related to diversity, pluralism, international perspectives, and social engagement. Block Four of the initial elementary program includes *E343 Mathematics in the Elementary School*, *E328 Science in the Elementary School*, and *E341 Methods of Teaching Reading*, as well as music, fine arts and health (if not taken prior to this block). These courses advance multicultural awareness and responsiveness. Ethnocentrism, profiles of cultural learning- styles, non-western science, mathematics, arts and music, gender biases, and authentic assessment are addressed through readings, research and discussion.

The secondary BSED program has also designed and implemented coursework and field experiences into blocks that include diverse learning and assessments. For example, in the *P250 General Education Psychology/P255 Educational Psychology for Middle and Secondary Teachers /M201 Laboratory Field Experience*, secondary candidates learn about the cognitive, social, emotional, and instructional needs of minority students, and the impact of gender, socio-economic status, and exceptionalities. In *M441 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Social Studies*, secondary candidates develop lessons on topics related to justice, fairness, equality, multicultural education, gender, and living in a global and diverse world. Candidates complete and are assessed on a unit of study with at least one lesson modified to meet the needs of a student with special needs and a second lesson directed towards minority students.

The special education BSED program embraces multiple exceptionalities and diverse student populations as the core component of the program. Candidates not only recognize the significance exceptionality has for students and their families, but also how other diversities impact learning and behavior.

Assessments of candidate proficiencies include data collection regarding candidate abilities to help all students learn. Candidates are assessed on their responsiveness in teaching, ability to teach all children, and to create an inclusive learning environment.

Initial candidates are also monitored and assessed on dispositions related to diversity (#3 “*candidate is committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals*,” #1 “*candidate respect the legal and ethical norms and values of education*,” and #2 “*candidate effectively interacts and collaborates with others and fosters similar behaviors among students*”). For example, in spring 2005, 100 percent of *M425* elementary education student teaching candidates and 98 percent of *M480* secondary student teaching candidates scored “acceptable” (the highest rating) on combined dispositions #1, #2, and #3 as rated by P-12 educators.

Surveys also inform the unit regarding diversity initiatives. The Employer Survey in 2005 (n=47) of 2003-2004 first-year IUS teachers indicates employers “agree” or “strongly agree” at 83 percent that IUS “*prepares teachers to understand how students differ in their approaches to learning*,” at 75 percent “*to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners*,” and at 9 percent to “*demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community*”. The Themes Survey in spring 2005 indicated that 97 percent of initial candidates “agree” or “strongly agree” that their program prepares them with the “*understanding and skills needed to relate to a diverse and multicultural society to take an active role in ensuring that all*

children receive a high quality education”.

Advanced Programs

The elementary and secondary MSED program utilizes the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Diversity Knowledge Bases. Interviews with graduate students revealed that advanced candidates integrate multicultural curriculum into core content areas as they study specific cultures and curriculum to strengthen their knowledge and understanding of learning for all students.

The required course, *H520 Educational and Social Issues*, includes the study of the 13 AACTE knowledge bases of multiple diversities and the impact of these diversities on teaching and learning for the experienced teacher. Candidates are assessed on a Diversity Learning Project, in which diversity concepts are integrated into teaching content while a second required group project includes presentations on contemporary issues such as bilingual education, vouchers, and single-sex classrooms. Data from fall 2004 indicates that three candidates out of 52 (in three sections) scored below the ‘target’ 21 points on the assessment rubric for the *H520 Diversity Project*.

J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum incorporates multiple intelligences and effective teaching strategies for inclusive classrooms. *P510 Psychology in Teaching* engages candidates in the study of psychological development in marginalized ethnic and racial cultures, as well as cultural influences on motivation and principles of culturally responsive teaching and curriculum development. Other coursework taken as content, cognate, or elective hours also addresses diversity. In *E549 Advanced Study in the Teaching of Language Arts in the Elementary Schools*, candidates study effective ENL language arts strategies.

The elementary and secondary MSED program also assesses dispositions related to diversity. Advanced candidate dispositions are reviewed at each of the four SDPs. The results of a 2004 content analysis of SDP2 indicated that candidates consider their knowledge learned about diversity as one of the major contributing aspects of their professional growth. Candidates often include research on multiple intelligences, differentiated curriculum, and motivation related to P-12 standards. Content analysis of SDP III writing samples indicates that the fourth CF theme of multicultural society is addressed through this field-based project. Additionally, the Themes Survey in spring 2005 indicate that 99 percent of MSED elementary and secondary candidates “agree” or “strongly agree” that their program is “*preparing [me] with the understanding and skills needed to relate to a diverse and multicultural society in order for [me] to take an active role in ensuring that all children receive a high quality education.*”

B. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Initial and advanced candidates have opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, exceptionalities, and religious groups in campus classrooms and in community P-12 schools. Candidates interact in classroom settings on campus and in schools with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, school faculty from other units, and school faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups. Faculty with whom candidates

work in professional education classes and clinical practice have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including students with exceptionalities. The campus and the SOE have specific guidelines to assist in meeting the goal of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. Through multiple SOE and campus initiatives, faculty diversity has increased since the last NCATE visit.

The faculty at IUS has increased by 17 percent over the last seven years, while minority representation has increased by 38 percent over this period and 20 percent over the last year. IUS minority faculty members represent 16.1 percent of all assistant professors, slightly below the national representation of 17.8 percent. Minority representation at the associate professor rank has more than doubled over the last seven years to 10 members representing 21.3 percent of all associate professors at IUS. This representation exceeds the national representation of 14.9 percent at the associate professor rank. At the full professor rank, minority representation at IUS has been relatively consistent over the last seven years. At IUS, 5.1 percent of all full professors are minority compared with 11.1 percent nationally. African-American representation at the associate professor rank at IUS has doubled over the last seven years to four members representing 8.5 percent of all associate professors. This is above the national African American representation of 5.3 percent. Asian-American representation among the faculty at IUS has increased by 71 percent over the last seven years and 33 percent over just last year to 12 faculty members representing 8.8 percent of the faculty. There is one Hispanic faculty member at IUS, representing 7 percent of the faculty and 2.1 percent of all associate professors. At the associate professor rank, Hispanic faculty account for 2.7 percent of all faculty nationally. There has been no Native American representation among the faculty at IUS since the last NCATE visit.

The SOE faculty is primarily European-American (85.7%) and African-American (7.1%). Faculty members exemplify a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds, some representing first-generation college graduates with personal experiences involving childhood poverty. In 1997, IUS had nine staff and 20 faculty members of color. By 2001, the total was 12 staff and 22 faculty of color. In 2003, the numbers increased to 15 staff and 28 faculty of color, as reported by the 2005 report submitted by the Office of Equity and Diversity. P-12 school based faculty (supervising teachers of all field and clinical experiences) report in a survey that they are 96% White, non-Hispanic; 3% Black, non-Hispanic; and 1% Foreign Asian. Adjunct faculty are 90% White, non-Hispanic and 10% Black, non-Hispanic. Table 4.1 indicates the diversity of full-time faculty:

Table 4.1 Diversity of Full Time SOE Faculty

<i>Category</i>	Fall 1999		Fall 2000		Fall 2001		Fall 2002		Fall 2003		Fall 2004	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Male	8	36.4	7	31.8	7	30.4	9	33.3	9	32.1	9	31.0
Female	14	63.6	15	68.2	16	69.6	18	66.7	19	67.9	20	69.0
TOTAL	22		22		23		27		28		29	
American Indian or Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Black, non-Hispanic	-	-	1	4.5	2	8.7	2	7.4	2	7.1	2	6.9%
White, non-Hispanic	22	100	20	90.9	20	87.0	23	85.2	24	85.7	25	86%
Foreign Latin American	-	-	1	4.5	1	4.3	2	7.4	1	3.6	1	3.4%
Foreign Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.6	1	3.4%
Total Minority & Internat'l	0		2	9.1	3	13.0	4	14.8	4	14.3	4	14.3%

Female representation at IUS over the last seven years has increased steadily. Representing 38.7 percent of the faculty at IUS, they are slightly above the national female representation. The representation of women among the three faculty ranks at IUS also exceeds the national representation. At the full professor rank, women account for 32.2 percent of the faculty at IUS, compared with 22.4 percent nationally. Similarly, women make up 40.4 percent of all associate professors at IUS, compared to 36.9 percent nationally. At the assistant professor rank, women represent 48.4 percent of the faculty at IUS compared to 44.8 percent of all assistant professors nationally.

The vice chancellor of academics affairs asserted that diversity in higher education is a challenge shared across the IUS schools. In collaboration with the campus, the unit has worked to improve faculty diversity since the last NCATE visit. Increasing efforts are made by the unit to identify P-12 school supervisors who offer a broad range of diversity knowledge and experiences to assist candidates with effective learning for all students. Student teachers are increasingly placed in Louisville schools where school-based school supervising teachers are more diverse. Candidates participating in the Explorations on Diversity Education (summer in Ecuador) have had opportunities to work with international teachers in public and private school programs.

C. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Initial and advanced candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in professional education courses on campus and in schools. The groups work together on committees and education projects related to diversity education and the content area. The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase and maintain candidate diversity.

Candidate diversity in the unit has fluctuated within the last three academic years (2002-2005) as follows in ranges of numbers of candidates: American Indian/Alaskan (range 1-6), Asian or Pacific Islander (range 2-6), Black (range 36-51), Hispanic (range 2-7), Other Groups (range 1-7), and Non US (range 2-4). However, the recent increases in enrollment resulting from the Kentucky reciprocity agreement hold promise for more candidate diversity. Additionally, females consistently outnumber males, and candidates represent a wide range of socioeconomic statuses. Many candidates are first-generation college students.

D. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Field experiences and clinical practice in settings with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are designed for initial and advanced candidates to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.

According to data from the Indiana Department of Education, students with limited English skills in Indiana have increased approximately 150 percent between 1998 and 2004. This is only one example of a significant diversity trend developing in southern Indiana, particularly in more densely populated areas, such as Greater Clark and New Albany Floyd County school corporations. Unit programs offer substantial field and clinical experiences in diverse settings as well as systematic community service learning opportunities, which involve tutoring, reading programs, initiatives in homeless shelters, and other school-related education activities with students from diverse and ENL backgrounds. Table 4.2 indicates the ENL student population in southern Indiana schools:

Table 4.2 ENL Student Population in Service Area Schools

School Corporation	02-03	03-04	04-05	02-03 to 04-05 Increase
Clarksville Community School Corporation	13	27	47	261%
Greater Clark Schools	100	168	200	100%
New Albany Floyd County School Corporation	77	192	206	167%
North Harrison School Corporation *	0	0	0	0%
Paoli Community School Corporation	1	1	1	0%
Perry County Community Schools	3	2	2	-33%
South Harrison County	10	13	26	160%
Switzerland County School Corporation	0	0	0	0%
West Clark Community Schools	3	5	23	666%

*Reported that students enrolled for only short (1-3 months) periods of time.

The unit is monitoring this phenomenon and taking measures not only to effectively respond to this student population area, but also to provide more opportunities for candidates to work with ENL students within a changing multicultural society.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The goal of the unit is to prepare educators who can help all students learn and can teach from cultural and global perspectives. The unit clearly articulates the proficiencies that initial and advanced candidates are expected to develop during their professional program. Curriculum and accompanying field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. A number of initiatives have taken place to increase the diversity of teacher education candidates at IUS, often in conjunction with the Office of Equity

and Diversity. The unit's Diversity Plan assures coherent actions directed towards developing educators who demonstrate proficiencies representative of pluralistic perspectives.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Continued: None

Corrected:

(1) The student body does not sufficiently reflect racial diversity.

Rationale:

The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase and maintain candidate diversity.

(2) The unit's plan for recruiting and admitting racially diverse candidates has not been implemented, evaluated, or revised since 1998.

Rationale:

The unit is monitoring this phenomenon and taking measures not only to effectively respond to this student population area but also to provide more opportunities for candidates to work with ENL students within a changing multicultural society.

(3) Full-time faculty members are not culturally diverse.

Rationale:

The campus and the SOE have specific guidelines to assist in meeting the goal of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. Through multiple SOE and campus initiatives, faculty diversity has increased since the last NCATE visit.

(4) The unit does not have a comprehensive plan to recruit, hire, and retain a diverse faculty.

Rationale:

The SOE Diversity Plan is both a commitment to and a structure for the unit to implement and assure coherent actions directed towards developing educators who demonstrate proficiencies representative of pluralistic perspectives.

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.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Qualified Faculty

According to the institutional report and documented in the evidence presented, there are 29 full-time (one position vacant) and fifty part-time faculty, including supervisory faculty, in the unit. The 21 full-time tenured and tenure-track members of the professional education faculty have earned doctorates in their education specialty that qualify them for their assignments. Ten hold the rank of full professor, six hold the rank of associate professor and five hold the rank of assistant professor. To provide added faculty to support candidate needs and reduce the number of adjunct faculty, the Indiana University Board of Trustees approved the hiring of eight full-time professional education lecturers who possess advanced degrees in their specialty field. All unit faculty have P-12 experiences and hold or have held teaching and/or administrative licenses.

Adjunct faculty are hired to help ease full-time faculty overloads, teach courses requiring specific knowledge and/or skills not held by full-time faculty, or to replace a full-time faculty member on sabbatical leave or working on a grant project. According to the faculty manual, adjunct faculty are hired based on letters of recommendation, coursework competence, licenses held, professional experience, vitae, and interviews.

As verified in the faculty manual, a tenure-track faculty member from each program serves as the program coordinator. Adjunct teaching is monitored by an appropriate program coordinator to ensure coherence and integrity of the program. Although adjunct faculty do not enjoy all the rights and privileges of full-time faculty, they are expected to participate in the candidate evaluation of the teaching program, hold conferences with candidates by appointment, attend meetings when requested, and participate in cultural and social activities at the university. Each adjunct faculty member is provided full access to university e-mail and Internet services and has full university library privileges.

Interviews demonstrate that adjunct faculty are subject to an annual performance review. As part of the review process, each is required to submit candidate evaluations of teaching. Evaluation evidence includes a 24-item survey regarding teaching quality and effectiveness as reported in percentages of responses on a Likert scale (SA –strongly agree; A – agree; U – undecided; D – disagree; and SD – strongly disagree). As survey examples indicate, the first survey item reveals that 100 percent of candidate responses **strongly agree** that “I would rate the quality of this course as outstanding, and the second item reveals that 96 percent **agree** that “I would rate this instructor as outstanding.” The results of these surveys are included in the annual report. Results for all adjuncts for 2004-2005 reveal that 96 percent of the candidates agree that “my instructor using teaching methods well suited to the

course” and 95 percent agree that “my instructor stimulates my thinking”. Aggregated data are evaluated by the program coordinators and the dean for continued employment consideration and ultimately placed in individual personnel files. Interviews with adjunct faculty confirm that results from this formal survey, as well as informal candidate input at the completion of a course, are used to adjust course content and delivery strategies as needed.

Supervising faculty are selected by the Office of Field Experiences based on prior experiences as P-12 teachers, principals, supervisors, counselors, and/or central office staff. A majority of unit faculty have field and/or clinical supervision as part of their assigned load.

School-based supervising teachers hold at least a master’s degree, have contemporary professional experiences in the area and level they supervise, and are licensed in the areas they teach. As reported by several candidates and P-12 faculty, school-based mentors often mentor faculty members within their buildings who are working toward a degree in counseling or a license in administration.

Cooperating teachers are initially selected by the school principal or director of special education to determine interest and expertise to work with candidates in field experiences and student teaching. Supervising faculty and cooperating teachers collaborate to determine optimal placement of candidates. Interviews with supervising faculty and cooperating teachers reveal a close working relationship, joint initial training, and continuous telephone and e-mail communication. Student teachers have the advantage of personal telephone and e-mail communication with both supervising faculty and cooperative teachers.

B. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

As discussed in the faculty manual, modeling best practices is a major element for tenure and promotion consideration. One element that is used to assess faculty is a candidate survey that provides feedback and opportunities for subsequent coursework adjustments. Reflection and documentation on these adjustments are an expected element for annual faculty reviews with the unit dean and program coordinator, and are subsequently forwarded to the vice chancellor of academic affairs for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Unit faculty are expected to demonstrate a high quality and thorough understanding of the content they teach. As described in the faculty manual, content knowledge is first assessed in the application and interview process and then by a program coordinator who reviews the vitae and syllabi prior to assigning teaching coursework. In addition, candidates evaluate teaching faculty at the end of each semester. As related in an interview with the unit faculty, peer review is also used as an assessment tool to support each other to improve instruction. The final content knowledge review is conducted during the annual faculty evaluation and tenure-promotion procedure as described in the faculty manual.

Documented evidence shows that faculty teaching reflects the unit’s conceptual framework. A review of syllabi shows that generally three of the four conceptual framework themes are incorporated into syllabi. As examples, *high quality* is monitored by reviewing standardized testing results and external surveys. *School renewal* reflects the integration of technology throughout course offerings, as evidenced by technology mapping for various courses.

The *caring professional* is monitored through candidate evaluations of faculty. The Multiple Option System (Multi-Op) could be referred to as a caring professional instrument. The survey instrument consists of a catalog of 198 items from which faculty may select to develop rating forms. Evidence shows that the data are compiled and analyzed for program improvement decision-making. Items are measured in three areas:

- Candidate intellectual development resulting from the course;
- Instructors teaching style and methods; and
- Specific course elements such as exams, grading, laboratory activities and written assignments.

Teaching and leading in a *multicultural society* also is emphasized throughout the documentation. Faculty are responsible for addressing in their course offerings a variety of diverse topics including, but not limited to, cultural awareness and racial/ethnic prejudice. A documented 2004-2005 survey monitoring diversity in education courses indicates that both full-time and part-time faculty members teaching undergraduate and graduate courses incorporate elements of diversity in their syllabi. Summary data depicts curriculum mapping that gives the course title, the diversity issue presented, the standards' indicators, and the activity assessed.

Evidence shows that faculty instruction includes teaching strategies that encourage candidate development of reflective critical thinking, problem solving, and professional disposition awareness through reflective writing assignments, applications of knowledge through projects, presentations, and portfolio assignments. To help promote this development, there is evidence that faculty use a variety of instructional strategies. The results of a spring 2005 full-time and adjunct faculty survey document that faculty use at least 40 different teaching strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles, including but not limited to, collaborative and cooperative teaching practices that candidates utilize in P-12 classrooms. Diversity and technology are used throughout their teaching. Specifically, the use of technology is mapped according to ISTE standards, the course, and the teaching activity/assessed.

Interviews with several candidates and faculty members support the notion that faculty are concerned about the effectiveness of their teaching on candidate learning. According to responses during these interviews, faculty regularly review candidate evaluations, reflect on the contents, and make course adjustments to improve candidate learning. Candidates and graduates report that the faculty set high standards for candidate performance, are highly qualified in what they teach, and make every effort to ensure that candidates graduate as highly qualified professionals. Interviews with several P-12 teachers and administrators verify that graduates are highly qualified in content and pedagogy and are highly marketable.

C. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Scholarship activities are an expected component for promotion and tenure. These activities are related to publications, exhibits, presentations at professional meetings, and applied research toward teaching and service that are shared with other professionals. As defined in the faculty manual, this research

may involve such endeavors as policy studies or curricular development using best teaching practices designed to expand the knowledge base in the education profession.

Ample evidence is provided to indicate that full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty participate in scholarly work in their fields of specialization. Each tenure-track faculty member is allocated three semester credit hours of reassigned time each semester for scholarly activity. As defined by unit criteria based on the mission of the institution, the evidence includes publications, presentations at professional meetings, consultations, and other scholarly activities identified in **Table 5.1**, and journal articles, book reviews, presentations, and other research based on NCATE criteria and found in **Table 5.2**.

As described in the 2004 NCATE Annual Report, a systematic system for data collection was implemented to track scholarly activities of part-time, adjunct faculty. As shown in **Table 5.3**, part-time faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels participate in scholarly activities including, but not limited to, membership in professional organizations, attending and presenting at professional conferences, writing grant proposals, and developing curriculum guides and handbooks. In addition, during an interview with adjunct faculty, it was revealed that they work closely and collaboratively with full-time faculty, are represented on the faculty senate, and are part of the faculty hiring process.

Table 5.1 2002-2004 Faculty Scholarship Based on Unit Criteria

Activity	Number
Publications	100
Presentations at Professional Meetings	421
Consultations	24
Application of Expertise to Applied Situations	32
Inservice and Professional Development Related to Scholarship	52
Grants and/or Awards Applied for and/or Received	86

D. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Service to the unit, the campus, the university system and the community is expected from unit faculty. Evidence indicates that unit faculty provide service to the college/university, P-12 school partners and other constituent groups in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit’s mission.

Examples of service projects for P-12 schools include:

- Providing inservice and professional development opportunities;
- Serving as judges in speech contests, history days, and science fairs;
- Providing supervisor and mentor training for practicum supervisors;
- Consulting with schools on Even Start, school improvement strategies; and
- Curriculum development and test data analysis.

Table 5.2 2002-2005 Faculty Scholarship Based on NCATE Criteria

Referred Journal Articles	41
Book Chapters	10
Book Reviews	15
Books	7
Presentations: State	64
Presentations: Regional	31
Presentations: National	53
Presentations: International	11
Grant Proposals Funded	72
Other Projects, Research, Writings	49

Other documented examples of education-related service include such activities as those performed at the local level, including, but not limited to:

- Conducting a focus group of parents to provide input to their school district on after-school programs;
- Serving as officers in local Phi Delta Kappa chapter; and
- Serving on the board of directors for organizations such as the Floyd County Head Start and the Jeffersonville Library.

Active involvement in professional associations is expected of unit faculty. Evidence indicates that unit faculty are involved in professional associations, including, but not limited to:

- Sponsoring candidate organizations such as Kappa Delta Pi, Pi Lambda Theta and the Student Education Association;
- Serving as members and officers in the local chapter of Phi Delta Kappa; and
- Serving on the board of directors for organizations such as the greater Louisville Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Jeffersonville Library, the Floyd County Head Start, and the university Cultural Resources Center.

Table 5.3 Part-time Faculty Participation in Scholarly Activities

Number of Part-time Faculty	Percent of Participation	Activity
39	80	Attended one professionally-related conference
39	67	Attended two or more professionally-related conferences
39	87	Of the 80 conferences attended, part-time faculty made 60 presentations at these conferences
39	41	Engagement in scholarly activities; such as writing grant proposals, curriculum guides, school plans, books and handbooks

39	100	Membership in at least one professional organization
----	-----	--

Unit faculty also provide service to state, national and international organizations, including, but not limited to:

- Serving on state boards or committees such as the Board of Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics;
- Serving on boards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children; and
- Designing the “International Curriculum” Model project for UNESCO.

E. Collaboration

Interviews with unit and arts and sciences faculty, and P-12 personnel, show that the unit and arts and sciences faculty collaborate with P-12 schools to improved teaching and candidate learning. Responses during interviews confirm a warm, caring, and cooperative relationship among those responsible for providing educational experiences for candidates.

Table 5.4 illustrates several examples of collaboration between the unit faculty and other members of the teaching profession designed to improve teaching and enhance learning for candidates in their preparation to become professional educators.

Additionally, examples of collaboration are evidenced in the following specific projects:

- Unit faculty work in the alternative program with initial and advanced candidates who are full-time teachers being observed in their own classrooms. In this setting, on-the-spot consultations are readily available regarding instruction and program management.
- A unit partnership with Farnsley Middle School is designed to improve candidates’ abilities to teach writing to middle school students. This is a nationally recognized collaborative E-mentoring project whereby candidates are trained by Farnsley staff to use technology to enhance writing skills of seventh grade students. Subsequently, coordinated by the school technology expert, candidates work with Farnsley seventh grade students via e-mail toward improving their writing skills. As reported by the Farnsley principal, this effort resulted last year in raising seventh grade writing skills by 10 percentage points.
- The FACET (Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching) program that provides service across campus that impacts the improvement of faculty teaching through peer mentoring and workshops on improving teaching.

Table 5.4 Examples of Faculty Collaboration

P-12 Schools	School Improvement Team member
	Co-presenting at in-service training and professional development sessions
	External evaluator for P-12 school grants
Arts and Sciences	Membership on program advisory committees
	Assistance with the science Olympiad

	<i>W300</i> course development writing with the English Department
Other Campus Units	Assisting with new student orientation
	Membership on campus committees and governance
	Participation in FACET Peer Mentor Program
Broader Professional Community	Writer for state standards in Guidance Curriculum
	Bell South Superintendents' Network
	Co-presenting at educational conferences
	Indiana Network of Schools committee

F. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance. According to responses during a faculty interview, evaluations of the unit faculty are used to enhance teaching, research scholarship and service to the unit, school partners, and other constituent groups.

As noted in the faculty manual, the unit provides guidelines for the documentation of performance for teaching, scholarship, and service. This documentation provides the basis for the required annual report from full-time faculty that is the basis for determining annual merit pay, third-year unit reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and for promotion to full professorship. Included in these annual reports are accomplishments in teaching, scholarly activity, and service and improvement goals for the upcoming year.

Faculty performance assessment begins with a confidential meeting with the unit dean. The dean prepares an annual document for each faculty member noting specific strengths and areas of improvement. Signing the document indicates that the faculty member has reviewed the document and has had the opportunity to discuss the contents with the dean. Subsequently, the dean forwards the signed document to the vice chancellor of academic affairs for further consideration.

Each new full-time faculty member is assigned a mentor from the unit to assist in discussing best practice teaching strategies, scholarly projects, and service opportunities, and the preparation of the required annual report and the dossier for the third year review. Adjunct faculty are assisted and reviewed by specific program coordinators. As reported in faculty interviews, the relatively new peer review process enhances performance documentation and a more collegial personal and professional relationship.

G. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Based on needs identified in faculty annual evaluations, the unit provides professional development opportunities for faculty that are designed to develop new knowledge and skills related to the unit's conceptual framework for educators engaged in growth. The Faculty Development Quality Team offers suggested topics related to faculty expressed or implied needs, such as a discussion regarding test bias and student exceptionalities. According to responses during a faculty interview, specific professional development topics dealing with performance

assessment, diversity, technology, and emerging practices are prepared and presented through “Brown Bag Lunches.”

Interviews with unit and P-12 faculty substantiate professional development for cooperating teachers that begins with a formal initial orientation regarding expectations and continues throughout a student teaching experience in more informal ways. Supervising faculty and P-12 teachers meet face-to-face with student teachers several times during the student teaching experience and as needed via the telephone and e-mail to offer information and guidance. As reported during interviews, student teachers have ready access to phone numbers and e-mail addresses of both supervising and P-12 faculty to call or e-mail for assistance as needed.

Interviews with several faculty members verify that unit faculty take advantage of opportunities to attend professional local, state, regional, and national conferences that are funded for professional development. Attendance at any of these conferences becomes part of the annual report if evidence demonstrates that a link exists between new learning and improvement in teaching.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Documentation reveals that unit faculty possess appropriate degrees and experiences for the roles they are assigned, especially with respect to relating teaching to elements of the conceptual framework and to candidate learning. According to candidates and graduates interviewed and other documentation provided, the faculty are considered to be high quality and caring professional educators. Evidence provided in required annual reports depicts a system to assess faculty performance that reveals a faculty that are highly productive, are involved in professional development and exhibit best practices in teaching, scholarship and service, and who are involved in collaborative activities with partner schools and other members of the educational community that produces highly competent and marketable graduates.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Corrected:

(Initial) The unit does not provide cooperating teachers with systematic professional development in supervision beyond orientation.

Rationale: There is substantial evidence that the unit provides professional development for supervisors beyond orientation, systematically, through formal and informal communications and related activities.

(Advanced) Scholarly activities among part-time faculty with assignments in advanced programs are limited in areas of generation and dissemination of new knowledge and participation in professional organizations.

Rationale: As described in the 2004 NCATE Annual Report, and verified through interviews, a systematic system for data collection was implemented to track scholarly activities of part-time, adjunct faculty. The data shows that part-time faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels participate in scholarly activities including, but not limited to, membership in professional organizations; attending and presenting at professional conferences; writing grant proposals; and collaborating with other educational professionals in the development of curriculum guides and policy/procedure handbooks.

Continued: None

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.

Level: *Initial and Advanced*

A. Unit Leadership and Authority

The professional education unit at Indiana University Southeast (IUS) is the combined total of all programs, both initial and advanced, that prepare candidates for professional roles in P-12 school building settings. The campus houses 16 professional education programs. Seven of the programs are initial programs and nine are advanced. The unit is clearly identified and operated as a professional community that collaborates through the Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP). This group was established in 2004 so that a more efficient coordination among the various disciplines, advisory committees, and educational professionals from outside the university system would be enacted.

The School of Education (SOE) dean has the authority and assumes the responsibility for educational processes of the unit. The unit interacts with central administrators and other units in the institution through the COPEP and the Governance and Resources Quality Team (GRQT). The GRQT is responsible for monitoring the various aspects of Standard 6. Examples of collaboration and interaction that are linked to the four conceptual framework themes include:

- Meetings are held with the IU Education Council that is chaired by the IU dean of education;
- The SOE dean serves as the liaison with the IU system;
- Program coordinators are responsible for directing faculty regarding the evaluation and improvement of programs;
- Program coordinators are involved in advisory groups, faculty meetings, communicating with faculty and staff, and advising the SOE dean regarding these matters;
- Program teams and the six quality teams, consisting of faculty and professional staff, meet regularly to ensure that unit goals, the Strategic Plan, Diversity Plan, and the conceptual framework are specifically aligned with the six NCATE standards;
- The SOE dean convenes meetings as needed with local participating school administrators and curriculum coordinators;
- Expertise is gained from members of the program advisory committees that are composed of faculty, candidates, graduates, schools, and community and meet at least annually to review programs, assessments and the various field experiences; and
- Collaboration with groups outside the unit is enhanced by holding an annual awards reception to recognize members of the educational community who provide guidance and in other ways contribute to the success of the unit's candidates.

Minutes of meetings, discussions with faculty, and interviews confirm that the unit follows through regarding collaboration of the deliverance, review, evaluation, and general operations of its programs.

Candidates can receive advice and counseling on a regular basis through their assigned advisors. Advisors are continually updated by a professional staff member whose job it is to advise candidates as well as keep program coordinators and other advisors updated on any changes and information that need to be passed on to candidates. In addition, advanced candidates attend orientation sessions as applicable to their own programs. Candidates can receive personal counseling, disability services, mentoring services, financial assistance, and academic support counseling services and information as well as information about their programs through various online websites.

Examination of recruitment and admissions policies reveals that they are accurate and consistent and are clearly outlined in brochures, the IUS Bulletin (catalog), and on IUS websites. Brochures and the catalog are available at Campus Media Services, the Office of Admissions, and the Office of the SOE Dean. Brochures and pertinent information also are available at several other sites on campus.

B. Unit Budget

The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to provide programs that prepare candidates to meet state and NCATE standards. Indiana University Southeast (IUS) has spent approximately \$42,615.00 per student/candidate (salaries, general expenses, travel) to graduate 5,431 students over the past six years. More specifically, the School of Education graduated 1,463 candidates and expended \$8,360.00 per candidate from the unit's budget total of \$12,380,907.00 over the same six year period. Allocations have increased 68 percent for salaries and hiring of full-time faculty, and general fund expenses increased 53 percent between 1999 and 2004. Actual unit general fund expenditures for fiscal year 2004 were \$2,745,094.00 as compared to \$2,754,457.00 in 2005. Allocations for fiscal year 2006 are \$2,829,852.00.

State budget constraints have affected all state universities in Indiana, but during the period from 2002-2005 the unit has supplemented its budget through internal grants of \$36,210.00 and external grants of \$1,354,605.00. External grants required matching funds amounting to \$84,831.00.

Travel funds include professional development funds and funds used for travel for supervisors of field experiences and student teaching. These funds also are applied to full-time tenured faculty who can request up to three hours of reassigned time per semester to pursue scholarly work. These funds incurred a general increase of approximately 13 percent between 1999 and 2004 but did undergo a cut of 6.5 percent from 2003 to 2004 due to the aforementioned state budget cuts to higher education institutions. Each faculty member is allocated approximately \$400.00 for professional travel and additional funds are reallocated from other line items as needed and as approved by the school dean.

The vice-chancellor for academic affairs is a strong advocate of the sabbatical leave program for professional development, summer fellowships, and the internal professional development program for faculty. Ten SOE faculty were awarded sabbaticals for scholarly activities between 2002 and spring 2006 at a total cost of \$346,671.00. Funds for these programs are allocated

through the general academic affairs budget. Faculty are expected to stay current in the area of their discipline, and pursue scholarly activities, as well as to provide service to the campus and larger community in some way.

An analysis of expenditure reports indicates that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations in proportion to other units on campus. There have been no appreciable cuts in the budget since 1999 that have affected the quality of programs in the unit. There is flexibility in line items such that funds can be transferred as needed and approved by the college deans. Line item budget allocations are determined by historical trends, student tuition and fees, input from faculty and the deans, and state budget allocations to the university.

Technology is funded campus-wide through the Department of Institutional Technology and Community Engagement (ITCE). For example, the life-cycle replacement for all campus computers is three years. Sources for technology funding come from student fees, (supply student computer labs and consultants who staff the labs), state funding, and student tuition. College deans may also use funds from their budgets to purchase specific equipment, but multiple purchases, laptops for example, are requested through the ITCE. A total of \$4,818,430.00 has been expended on technology from fiscal years 2000-2005, which explains the student computer ratio of 8:1 and every faculty and staff member having an office computer.

The library accounts are not allocated by university school, but discussions with unit faculty indicate that their requests are granted, and they have input as to what is to be purchased for the Curriculum Materials Center. The Center has 80 cultural kits and presently houses 15,350 holdings in all. Approximately one-third is related to children's literature. Discussions with candidates reveal that the Center does serve their needs, and they are able to check out materials and kits as needed. For example, since 2003 \$9,486.00 (616 new titles) has been spent to upgrade the Curriculum Materials Center, and the process is continuing.

The library is one of the state's ten sites for the distribution of textbook adoption materials. After the state review process is completed, these textbooks remain in the Curriculum Center for use by candidates and members of the community as well. In addition, the library allows local community members library cards to encourage community participation.

Actual expenditures for library books and materials for the fiscal year 2003 were \$521,129.00, \$562,736.00 in 2004, and \$542,060.00 in 2005. Allocations for the fiscal year 2006 are \$536,636.00.

The institution, historically, has had a strong commitment to the education profession, and this has been reflected in the budgeting process. An examination of budget documents and expenditure reports confirm that the unit receives adequate funds to support its programs including technology, general library services, curriculum library, and professional development.

C. Personnel

There are 21 full-time faculty and eight full-time lecturer positions, an increase of seven full-time staff since 2000, who teach classes within the unit. There is one full-time lecturer position

vacant. In order to limit the use of part-time faculty, seven faculty have been hired in the capacity of either tenure-track faculty or lecturer. The teaching load for full-time faculty is 12 credit hours, and nine credit hours for tenure-track and advanced program faculty. Specific formulas are used for faculty to participate in advising, supervising field-experiences, service, and other pertinent activities. Program coordinators also receive three credit hours of released time to perform their administrative duties.

Clinical practice is built into the teaching load with three hours released time for each 15 candidates supervised at the initial and advanced levels, and the load is limited to a maximum of 18 per faculty member. Faculty generally do not supervise more than 13 candidates each semester, and the average supervisory load per faculty member is five candidates in one semester. In addition, the average advising load is 15 students. First-year faculty also advise students as appropriate.

The unit's Student Services/Field Placement Office has two full-time professional staff members and one full-time secretary who coordinate and see to the implementation of all field-experiences and connections with cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers receive \$14.00 per week of service, and Kentucky pays extra if their cooperating teachers hold a masters degree and at least four years of experience.

Part-time faculty are required to have at least a master's degree and a major in their subject area in order to teach undergraduate classes. They use the appropriate unit-developed syllabus for courses they teach including the relevant connections to the conceptual framework and required standards. They participate in orientation activities and are mentored and advised by the dean and full-time faculty as needed.

Interviews with faculty and staff reveal that the five full-time support staff, including a full-time database coordinator and a part-time receptionist, provide adequate support to the unit. Additionally, part-time student assistants are assigned as needed. There is presently one graduate assistant assigned to the unit who mentors graduate students in a "teacher as researcher" research project. A total of ten have been involved with this project. There are funds available for other graduate assistants as needed.

D. Unit Facilities

The School of Education is housed in several buildings that include the McCauley-Nicholas Graduate Center, Hillside Hall, Crestwood Hall, Knobview, and the Life Science Building that houses the elementary and secondary science laboratory. Additionally, select classes are offered in area school locations. These buildings are well maintained, have commons areas for students, and adequate restroom facilities. Classrooms are of sufficient size and have technological equipment needed to provide meaningful instruction. Faculty ensure that the classrooms are inviting and provide a stimulating atmosphere for student learning. The campus-wide Classroom Committee continually evaluates the needs of faculty and candidates and assists in the future planning and upgrading of campus facilities. For example, future planning calls for upgrading and expanding the old library building to provide more space for student commons, food services, and a full conference center. A new education and technology building also is planned,

and there is hope among the faculty and college students/candidates that new dorms will be constructed as well.

The new 75,000 square foot library that opened in January 2005 houses a Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) and Center for Cultural Resources (CCR). An inspection of the facility revealed that these centers have sufficient space and provide an inviting place for candidates, faculty, and community visitors. The CRC and CCR provide ample opportunities for candidates to use hands on materials, as well as current textbooks reference books, fiction and nonfiction books as well as 80 various multicultural kits and information for use with students in P-12 school situations. With the advent of the new centers, weeding of older materials and purchase of new resources has been a continual process.

E. Unit Resources Including Technology

The unit allocates resources through the budgeting process that provides funds by program. The vice-chancellor for academic affairs and the SOE dean keep abreast of technology needs and are flexible in allocating funds to ensure that candidates have the necessary up-dated equipment and training to meet required technological standards and then apply them within their class situations, field experiences, and future job opportunities. For example, the WHAS (television station) Crusade for Children Grant provides a variety of hands on materials for use by education candidates and is housed in the School of Education.

Inspection of facilities and documents show that the various technology labs across campus house over 850 computers. A lab is designed specifically for education candidates, and a distance learning lab, smart boards, various instructional learning stations, and learning labs with technicians are available to assist students/candidates.

Over 600,000 volumes of printed and electronic type and audio-visual materials are available in the new library to assist candidates and faculty in their research and pursuit of knowledge. Candidates and faculty may access the library's electronic services, both on and off campus, by use of an assigned password. Other services available are research assistance, interlibrary loan, full-text information sources and online catalog terminals furnishing access to more than 7,000,000 volumes in the IU system and in libraries across the region. In Hillside Hall an exceptional personal collection of over 7,000 items of children's literature is available that has become a "treasured" resource in the eyes of faculty and candidates.

College technology resources fully support development and maintenance of the unit assessment system. A full-time database coordinator enters data and, along with the unit assessment coordinator, analyzes and interprets the data to assist faculty and administration in reviewing and evaluating programs and analyzing assessment outcomes for the purpose of improving student learning. The Office of Integrated Technology assists by providing technological staff development and assistance and funding where possible to supplement other sources.

Evidence acquired through interviewing candidates and faculty, observing students/candidates in the various buildings, and viewing presentations and portfolios prepared by candidates indicates

that the technological resources are utilized extensively and aligned with the conceptual framework and standards.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Unit governance and resources support the operation of both the initial and advanced programs with sufficient budget, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Since the last NCATE visit, a new library housing an extensive Curriculum Resource Center and Center for Cultural Resources has been added.

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Continued: None

Corrected:

The use of part-time faculty is excessive.

Rationale:

In order to limit the use of part-time faculty, seven faculty have been hired in the capacity of lecturer.

Materials in the Curriculum Laboratory are limited in number and breadth and in some cases, dated. Space for users is also limited.

Rationale:

The new library houses a Curriculum Resource Center and Center for the Cultural Resources that has sufficient space to house the hands on materials, textbooks and other resources needed for candidates to use with P-12 schools. Weeding of older materials and resources and purchase of new materials and resources with the guidance of unit faculty has taken place and is continuing.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Class visitations: E339/E340 Language Arts/Reading Methods, P250 Elementary Education Psychology, M464 Secondary Reading Methods, M310 Elementary General Methods, H340 Education and American Culture

Schools Visited: New Albany High School, Farnsley Middle School, Children's Academy, Bridgepoint Elementary School, Jeffersonville High School, Wilson Elementary

Documents reviewed: *Portfolios and student projects* for Counseling, Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Computers in Education, Elementary Science methods, Secondary Education—Science, Social Studies, English, Reading; Special Education, Educational Technology, and T2T; *Institutional:* Campus Strategic Plan, IUS newsletters, IUS brochures, Academic Handbook 2005, IUS Reference Books 1999-2005, IUS Annual Reports 2002-2004; *Unit:* Conceptual framework, Strategic Plan, SOE Policy Manual, Mapped Standards, Faculty Handbook, Reports—Title II, NCATE, IPSB (Division of Professional Standards Reports), Third Party Testimony.

Exhibits:

Standard 1: 1.1 PRAXIS I & II, GPA Indicator of Content Knowledge, BSED Summative Assessment of Content Knowledge, Special Education BSED Assessment of Content Knowledge, BTAP data reports, employer survey, alumni survey, supervising teacher surveys, MSED elementary and secondary core course assessment of content knowledge, MSED elementary and secondary content knowledge in other coursework, elementary and secondary MSED surveys; *1.2* other school personnel formative assessment of content knowledge, Educational Leadership summative assessments, School counseling summative assessment of content knowledge, Educational Leadership mentor survey, SLLA exams, Ed Leadership state score changes, Disaggregated SLLA results, MSED Counseling employee survey, alumni survey, Educational Leadership practicum candidate survey; *1.3* BSED surveys of pedagogical content knowledge, BSED technology applications in W200, technology applications in BSED coursework, BSED elementary and special education formative assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, H340 assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, BSED elementary and special education block 3 and 4 assessment, T2T assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, BSED secondary education pedagogical content knowledge, Special Education M470 assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, technology survey, themes survey, MSED assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, advanced technology coursework, MSED SDPIII summative assessment of content knowledge, technology surveys, themes survey. *1.4* best practices of pedagogical content knowledge, H340 professional and pedagogical content knowledge, BSED elementary and special education assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, elementary BSED summative assessment, BSED secondary assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, BSED secondary developmental standards, Elementary T2T professional and pedagogical knowledge, Special Education SEPB assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge, Special Education SEPB portfolio assessment, employer survey, MSED formative assessment of professional and pedagogical content knowledge in content, cognate and elective coursework, MSED SDPIII research and engagement

with professional community, employer survey; **1.5** Counseling professional knowledge related to technology, Counseling professional knowledge related to website resources, Counseling G562 school improvement projects, Counseling public relations utilizing technology, Educational Leadership A608 applications of research, Educational Leadership A500 school vision project, School Leadership assessment of professional knowledge, Ed Leadership portfolio, Ed Leadership technology skills, alumni and themes surveys; **1.6** SOE dispositions, informing candidates on dispositions, remediation plans for dispositions, H340 code of ethics, H340 disposition assessment, BSED assessment of dispositions, employer survey, supervisor teacher survey, qualitative disposition data from supervising teacher, Special Education BSED assessment of dispositions, MSED disposition analyses, MSED SDPII original assessment, MSED SDPII writing, MSED SDPII review, MSED pilot survey of dispositions, MSED SDPIII 04-05 assessment of dispositions, MSED surveys, disposition assessment for other school personnel, School counseling assessment of dispositions, Educational Leadership formative assessment of dispositions, Educational Leadership summative assessment of dispositions, Educational Leadership practicum survey; **1.7** initial program formative assessment of student learning, BSED assessment of student learning in student teaching, Special Education BSED assessment of student learning in student teaching, survey data, themes survey, MSED review of SDPI goals, MSED core course assessment of student learning, MSED assessment of student learning in other coursework, MSED SDPIII data-based inquiry project, survey reviews; **1.8** Other school personnel impact on student learning, Counseling G550 intervention and case report, Counseling Close the Gap project, Educational Leadership school data study and school improvement plan, effective instructional leadership strategies, Educational Leadership technology applications in student learning, themes and alumni surveys, Educational Leadership practicum candidate survey, Counseling employer survey.

Standard 2. **2.1** Implementing UAS in 2000-2001, conceptual framework development, UAS personnel support, NCATE quality teams, UAS progress 2001-2002, , IPSB unit assessment report 2002, IUS Campus Academic Assessment Committee, UA rating system review, UAS progress in 2002-2003, UAS progress in 2003-2004, UAS progress in 2004-2005, campus AAC and OIRA compliance, unit assessment system operationalized, advisory groups, advisory group involvement in data reviews, Dean's Advisory meetings, communications to candidates, assessment of dispositions, summative decision points, SDP reviews, data collected on scantron forms overview, candidate reflection, rater training, program exemplars, secured data, PAUE roles and responsibilities; **2.2** data collection procedures, overview of data collection analysis/evaluation, data report format, PAUE review of data reports, data sources, additional indirect data surveys, remediation plans, petitions and appeals procedures, review of candidate complaints, Peoplesoft transition; **2.3** BSED elementary program improvements, BSED secondary improvements, Special Education improvements, MSED program improvements, Counseling program improvements, Educational Leadership program improvements, elementary BSED predictors of success, secondary BSED predictors of success, Special Education predictors of success, MSED predictors of success, Counseling predictors of success, Educational Leadership predictors of success.

Standard 3. **3.1** Collaboration involving school partners, stakeholder group meetings, BSED collaboration with partners, MSED elementary and secondary teacher as researcher pilot, MSED elementary and secondary collaboration with school partners, MSED Counseling collaboration

with school partners, Education Trust Transforming School Counseling initiative, Counseling MSED Advisory group involvement, Educational Leadership collaboration with school partners; **3.2** Overview of field experiences, H340 field experiences, M201 field experiences, Elementary BSED field experiences, secondary BSED field experiences, BSED clinical practice, clinical practice assessment of student learning, BSED portfolios, Elementary T2T field and clinical experiences, BSED Special Education field and clinical experiences, BSED high quality clinical faculty, supervising teacher survey, school supervising teacher report, Affiliation Agreements, support to student teachers, communication utilizing technology, communication utilizing technology, BSED field and clinical feedback to program, MSED field experiences, MSED SDPIII clinical inquiry project, MSED SDPIII feedback to candidate, advanced program additional teaching license clinical experiences, Counseling clinical experiences, support and feedback to Counseling candidates, support and feedback to Educational Leadership candidates, reviews of clinical assessments, partnerships to enhance school renewal; **3.3** Demographic information on field placements, entry and exit criteria for clinical practice, BSED Elementary Education summative decision point reviews, BSED Secondary Education summative decision point reviews, BSED disposition assessment in clinical practice, BSED Special Education summative decision point reviews, MSED Elementary and Secondary summative decision point reviews, MSED review of SDPIII, MSED SDPIV assessment, Counseling summative decision point reviews, Diversity placement for Counseling candidates, Counseling clinical assessments, Educational Leadership summative decision point reviews, sharing best practices in school settings.

Standard 4. **4.1** DQT initiatives, consultant review of diversity in curricula, consultant review of conceptual framework, diversity knowledge bases, diversity in course content, dispositions related to diversity, unit emphasis on diversity, program assessments of diversity, General Education requirements related to diversity, Elementary BSED Block 1 diversity work samples, Elementary BSED Block 2 diversity work samples, Elementary BSED Block 3 diversity work samples, Elementary BSED Block 4 diversity work samples, Secondary BSED general methods diversity work samples, Secondary BSED specific methods diversity work samples, Special Education BSED diversity work samples, initial program diversity feedback to candidates, BSED disposition assessment of diversity, employer survey, themes survey, MSED H520 assessment of diversity, MSED J500 diversity work samples, MSED core course diversity work samples, MSED cognitive/content/elective diversity concepts, MSED self assessment of disposition growth, MSED SDPIII assessment of diversity, themes survey, Counseling diversity assessment, themes survey, Educational Leadership Diversity Work Samples, Educational Leadership A695 Assessment of Multicultural Leadership, themes survey, other diversity curriculum initiatives; **4.2** IUS report on status of minority faculty, SOE status of minority faculty, IUS report on status of gender, SOE diversity in teaching experiences, service area demographics, guest speakers and lecturers representing diversity, collaboration with content faculty on diversity, additional faculty initiatives, demographic information on clinical supervisors; **4.3** Candidate diversity, IUS initiatives to increase candidate diversity, graduate focus group 2004, undergraduate focus group 2004, diversity climate pilot survey 2003-2004; **4.4** ENL field placements, diversity in field experiences scantron form, use of technology to document field placements, H340 field placement information on diversity, M300 service learning project, Farnsley Middle School Field Placement, Elementary BSED diverse field experiences, Secondary BSED diverse field placements, Secondary BSED diverse field

experiences data, Special Education BSED diverse field experiences, MSED H520 service learning project, School Counseling diverse field experiences, Educational Leadership shadow experience.

Standard 5. 5.1 Full-time faculty qualifications, Full-time faculty vitae, professional education P-12 experience licenses, Faculty Manual Academic Appointments, overview of adjunct appointments, implementation of adjunct hiring, keeping adjunct faculty informed, adjunct qualifications, monitoring use of adjuncts, full-time faculty positions since Fall 2000, candidate evaluation of adjunct faculty, Higher Education clinical supervision, *5.2* Tenure and promotion guidelines for teaching, SOE definition of tenure and promotion, School Review Committee process, application interview process, Standard Multi-Op Evaluation, Multi-Op Manual, Spring 2005 survey syllabi, Caring professional evaluation on Multi-Op, monitoring diversity in SOE courses in 2004-2005, monitoring diversity in SOE coursework in 2003-2004, diversity mapping documents, Spring 2005 faculty survey, Spring 2005 faculty survey: syllabi, Spring 2005 faculty survey: teaching strategies, Annual reports: Best Practices in Teaching, dossiers for promotion and tenure, faculty reports of best practices in teaching, instructional use of technology, technology mapping, Spring 2005 faculty survey: assessment of candidate performance, campus and SOE teaching expectations, SOE revised teaching guidelines 2005, faculty awards for teaching, recent graduate alumni survey 2004; *5.3* IUS guidelines on scholarship, SOE guidelines on scholarship, scholarly activity of faculty; *5.4* IUS guidelines on service, SOE guidelines on service, service in P-12 schools, SOE documentation of service, SOE documentation of service, SOE documentation of service to the SOE; *5.5* overview of faculty collaboration, collaboration linked to candidate learning; *5.6* IUS process for faculty evaluation, SOE guidelines on faculty evaluation, annual reports, SOE faculty mentors, promotion and tenure list; *5.7* professional development activity, professional development annual reports, faculty professional development opportunities.

Standard 6. 6.1 School Council minutes, Quality Team minutes, NCATE Steering Committee minutes, SOE Policy Manual, Advisory Committee membership, Advisory Committee input examples, Annual awards reception and expenditures; *6.2* funding and reassigned time, ILTE support; *6.3* workload summaries, workload summaries: committee assignments, supervision policy, unit supervision loads: program supervision loads, IU system financial support to personnel, SOE staff meetings; *6.4* SOE facilities, Classroom Committee report; *6.5* spending for teaching supplies, program expenditures, bookstore initiative, Curriculum Resource Center, Curriculum Resource Center orders. Technology labs, WHAS Crusade for Children funding, Assessment System funding.

Persons interviewed:

Administration:

School Administrators: Bill Amerson, Jeffersonville HS; Sheryl Burns, No. Harrison Elementary; Neyland Clark, No. Harrison School Corp; Pam Cooper, Clarksville Middle School, Theresa Shade Duke, Grant Line Elementary School; Omer Middleton, Green Valley Elementary, Elaine Murphy, Mt. Tabor Elementary School; Thomas Rohr, Greater Clark School;

Lauretta Starks, Maple Elementary School; Lynne Wheat, Jefferson Co. Public Schools, Myra Powell, Border Elementary School; Sharon Jones, Slate Run

IUS Deans: Susan Moffett, Ben Nassim, Cliff Staten, Gloria Murray

IUS Administrators: Sandra Patterson –Randles, Gil Atnip, Larry Mand, Steve Taksar, Mary Anne Baker, Marty Rosen, Jackie Love. Marty Rosen, Mike Kerstiens

Staff/Faculty

Advisory Group—Jim Adams, MEST; Johnny Alse, Diversity; Lisa Jones, Counseling; David Losey, MEST

Librarian: Melanie Hughes

COPEP: Bill Sweigart

Students:

Candidates-Undergraduates and T2T: Angela Crecelius, Sara Endler, Ashley Fleming, Dawn Flock, Julie Graham, Jessica Oehman, Brooke Schlise, Greg Smedley, Jenna Toon, Debbie Zehnder, Jene Bledsoe, Brooke Lannan

Candidates—Graduate Programs: Donna Atwood, David Bobb, Sonja Broyles, Chelsea Burkhart, Edna Curl, Roger Emily, Mia German, Tracy Hodson, Velvet Maupin, Frank Myszak, Melinda Schultz, Marla Squires, Julie Straight, Chris Von Dissen, Wes Wiles, Keri Williams, Teresa Zollman

Recent graduates-Undergraduates—Sarah Dorton, LuAnn Emily, Erin Hussein, Bruce Bethard, Alessa Forsee, Amina Rickard, Dennis Watson

Recent graduates—Graduate programs—Amanda Hurst, Kim Bauman, Bunny Nash-Gardner, Scott Gardner, Todd Read, Ken Stites

Group Interviews:

Cooperating Teachers: Thad Atkins, Nancy Givens, Ashley Manger, Doug Wacker, Melissa Richards, Beth Peterson, Connie Renschler, Ann Williams, Gail Messmore

Graduates/License Completers—First year teachers: Molly Ridell, Jennifer Dutschke, Christina Schotter

SOE Program Coordinators/Licensing Advisors: Carolyn Babione, Jim Clements, Robin Fankhauser, Teesue Fields, Lee Morganett, Jane Riehl, Cathy Shea, Barbara Thompson-Book

Full-time Faculty—Carolyn Babione, Kevin Sue Bailey, Neil Brewer, Faye Camahalan, Donna Daily, Carl deGraaf, Robin Fankhauser, Teesue Fields, Margaret Harshfield, Magdalena Herdoiza-Estevez, James Hollenbeck, Nancy Hoffman, Kathryn Jackson, William Jamski, Ann Jones, Mary Jo Lewellen, Lee Morganett, Gloria Murray, Jeanette Nunnelley, Gary Pinkston, Susan Ridout, Walter Ryan, Catherine Shea, Rosemarie Smead, Frances Squires, Barbara Thompson-Book, Guy Wall, Stanley Whitaker

Adjunct Faculty—Lisa Jones, Hilda Kendrick, Lisa Lock, David Losey, Janet Payne, Debbie Schweitzer, Linda Wilson

Content Faculty—Anne Allen, Linda Gugin, Elaine Haub, Diane Reid, Kim Bonacci

CORRECTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

There were no corrections to the Institutional Report (IR).