

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institutional Report

Indiana University Southeast

BOE Visit December 3-7, 2005

Contact Information

Carolyn Babione, PhD
NCATE Coordinator
IU Southeast School of Education
4201 Grant Line Road
New Albany, IN 47150
cbabione@ius.edu
<http://www.ius.edu/education>

Table of Contents

Index of Tables	3
I. Overview of the Institution	4
Indiana University (IU) Context	4
Indiana University Southeast (IUS) Campus Profile	4
Mission of the Campus	5
School of Education Overview	6
Changes Since the Last Visit	6
II. Conceptual Framework	8
Shared Vision	10
Coherence	10
Professional Commitments and Dispositions	10
Commitment to Diversity	11
Commitment to Technology	11
Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards	11
III. Evidence for Meeting Each Standard	13
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	13
Element 1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates	14
Element 2: Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel	18
Element 3: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates	21
Element 4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates	25
Element 5: Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel	31
Element 6: Dispositions for All Candidates	33
Element 7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates	37
Element 8: Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel	40
Standard 2: Program Assessment and Unit Capacity	42
Element 1: Assessment System	42
Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation	51
Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement	54
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	56
Element 1: Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners	56
Element 2: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	58
Element 3: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn	64
Standard 4: Diversity	68
Element 1: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences	69
Element 2: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty	76
Element 3: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates	79
Element 4: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools	80
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	83
Element 1: Qualified Faculty	83
Element 2: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching	85
Element 3: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship	88
Element 4: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service	89
Element 5: Collaboration	91
Element 6: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance	92
Element 7: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development	92
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	94
Element 1: Unit Leadership and Authority	94
Element 2: Unit Budget	96
Element 3: Personnel	97
Element 4: Unit Facilities	98
Element 5: Unit Resources Including Technology	99

Index of Tables	Page
Table 1: SOE Candidates Enrolled in Program in Spring 2005	6
Table 2: Program Faculty 2004-2005	7
Table 3: Spring 2005 SOE Full- and Part-Time Candidate Enrollment	8
Table 4: PRAXIS I Passing Rates	14
Table 5: PRAXIS II Pass Rates	15
Table 6: GPA Averages for BSED Candidates at SDPI	16
Table 7: Exiting GPA Average for BSED Candidates	16
Table 8: Elementary BSED Content Knowledge	16
Table 9: Indiana Internship (BTAP) Pass Rates	17
Table 10: GPA of Elementary and Secondary MSED	18
Table 11: Elementary/Secondary MSED Content Knowledge Assessment	18
Table 12: Counseling MSED Content Knowledge Assessment	19
Table 13: ETS Institutional Summary Report: School Leadership Series	20
Table 14: GPA Averages for Other School Personnel Candidates	20
Table 15: Elementary BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	22
Table 16: Special Education M470 Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	23
Table 17: Special Education Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	23
Table 18: BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment by Employer	23
Table 19: Elementary BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	24
Table 20: Elementary and Secondary MSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	25
Table 21: H340 Professional Pedagogical Knowledge Assessment	26
Table 22: Elementary BSED Portfolio SDPIII Assessment	26
Table 23: Elementary BSED Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment	27
Table 24: Secondary BSED Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	28
Table 25: Secondary BSED Early Adolescence and Young Adulthood Standards Assessment	28
Table 26: Special Education BSED Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge Assessment	29
Table 27: Elementary/Secondary MSED Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment	30
Table 28: Counseling MSED Professional Knowledge SDPIII Assessment (2004-2005)	32
Table 29: H340 Disposition Assessment	33
Table 30: Elementary BSED Disposition Assessment at SDPII/SDPIV	33
Table 31: Secondary BSED Disposition Assessment	34
Table 32: BSED Candidate Response to Dispositions	34
Table 33: Other School Personnel Candidate Response to Dispositions	37
Table 34: Elementary and Secondary BSED Student Learning Assessment	38
Table 35: Special Education BSED Student Learning M470 Assessment	39
Table 36: Elementary and Secondary MSED Student Learning SDPIII Assessment	40
Table 37: Elementary and Secondary MSED Student Learning Employer Assessment	40
Table 38: Counseling MSED SDPIV Completion Rates	41
Table 39: Summative Decision Point Overview for Initial and Advanced Programs	48
Table 40: Summative Decision Point Overview for Other School Personnel	49
Table 41: Program Revisions and Conceptual Framework	51
Table 42: SOE External Data Collection 2000-2005	52
Table 43: Field and Clinical Practice by Program	58
Table 44: Initial Program Clinical Supervisor Training	61
Table 45: Advanced Program Clinical Faculty Training	64
Table 46: Diversity of Full Time SOE Faculty	76
Table 47: Diversity of Adjunct SOE Faculty	77
Table 48: ENL Student Population in Service Area Schools	80
Table 49: Faculty Qualifications: Full Time	83
Table 50: Higher Education Clinical Faculty 2004-2005 Summary	85
Table 51: Faculty Scholarship 2000-2004 Based on IUS SOE Criteria	88
Table 52: Faculty Scholarship 2000-2004 Based on NCATE Criteria	88

Table 53: Faculty Service Based upon SOE Criteria for Service	90
Table 54: Faculty Collaboration	91
Table 55: Faculty Evaluation	92
Table 56: Faculty Participation in Professional Development Activities	93
Table 57: Faculty Professional Development Related to Conceptual Framework	93
Table 58: Base Budget	96
Table 59: SOE Grant Activity	97
Table 60: IUS Budget by School—Six-Year History	97
Table 61: Full-time Faculty Positions Added 2000-2005	97

I. Overview of the Institution

Indiana University (IU) Context

Indiana University Southeast (IUS) is one of the eight campuses that is part of the Indiana University system. Indiana University (IU), created in 1820 by an Act of the General Assembly, is one of the oldest state universities in the Midwest. IU has more than 100,000 students on its eight campuses and remains one of the largest institutions of higher education in the United States.

Indiana University Southeast (IUS) Campus Profile

IUS is located in New Albany, Indiana and is part of the Louisville, Kentucky metropolitan area, a region of approximately one million people. The metropolitan area consists of a highly diversified economy based on health care, education, business, government, social services, and manufacturing. 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 exists with Jefferson, Oldham, and Bullitt counties in Kentucky. According to 2003 U.S. census data, the ethnic and racial composition of the Indiana area is 6.1% minority and 93.9% white, and in Kentucky the composition of the area served is 21.6% minority and 78.4% white.

IUS is a comprehensive university offering 38 bachelor's, 6 master's and 9 associate's degree programs. IUS began awarding degrees in 1968, and approximately 17,000 people have graduated from IUS--the great majority of whom remain in the local community to live and work. Over 180 full-time faculty members, who hold degrees from leading universities throughout the nation, provide students with up-to-date, high-quality courses and programs of study.

The campus has a long history of excellence in teaching and community initiatives. While IUS is committed to scholarship, and service, this campus has achieved distinction within the IU system for its aggressive pursuit of excellence in teaching, as evidenced by the high percentage of faculty members who have garnered multiple teaching and scholarship awards. In addition, programs are enhanced through modern campus facilities on a beautiful 180-acre tract at the foot of the "knobs" area of Southern Indiana.

IUS is organized into campus-based schools that include Arts and Letters, Business, Continuing Studies, Education, Natural Sciences, Nursing, and Social Science. The

Indiana University Bulletin 2005-2007 describes these programs in detail. Campus programs operate with considerable local administrative and educational autonomy within the IU system. Appointment, termination, and salary decisions are made at the campus level. Curriculum, course, and faculty assignment decisions are made at the school level. New teacher education courses and programs are reviewed by the Indiana University Schools of Education Council, consisting of faculty representatives from all campuses, to insure that students may transfer credits to any IU campus with a comparable program.

IUS, a commuter campus with no residential housing, has an enrollment in 2004 of 6,238 full- and part-time students. The IUS student body for 2004 consists of 62.1% undergraduate female, 63.6% graduate female, 37.9% undergraduate male and 36.4% graduate males, 6.1% minority undergraduates and .8% minority graduates. The undergraduate median age is 22 and the median age for graduates is 31. While IUS has traditionally served the relatively small communities of southeastern Indiana, an increasing number of candidates reside in metropolitan Louisville and attend IUS through a reciprocal tuition agreement between Kentucky and Indiana. This agreement permits eligible residents of Jefferson, Oldham, and Bullitt counties in Kentucky to enroll at IUS at in-state tuition rates. Kentucky enrollment for Fall 2004 at IUS included 18.1% of undergraduate students and 43.3% of graduate students. IUS is proud of its success in providing education to a diverse population that has both traditional and non-traditional students.

Mission of the Campus

The mission of Indiana University Southeast is to be a “*challenging, innovative, and supportive learning community committed to the intellectual and social growth of students, to the cultural and economic well-being of both southern Indiana and the greater Louisville metropolitan area, and to the advancement of knowledge in the context of a global society.*” The IUS vision is to become an outstanding regional university by: achieving excellence in all its programs and activities; providing a broad range of highest quality professional services to the community through collaborations, partnerships, and applied research; and providing a broad range of cultural activities and events that enrich the life of the campus community. IUS strives to create learning experiences for students that combine theory and practice, using the best equipment, facilities, technologies, and community resources. The vision for the campus is to be the best regional university in the nation.

Indiana’s level of earned bachelor’s degrees for residents over the age of 25 is significantly lower (19.8%) than the national average of 25%. The 2000 Demographic Profile of Indiana indicated that African Americans represented 9.3 percent of 18-year-olds in the state while only 4.6 percent of the 2000 Indiana bachelor’s degrees were received by African Americans. Asians were 1.1 percent of the 18-year-olds in Indiana and 2.1 percent earned the bachelor’s degrees. Latinos were 4.8 percent of the 18-year-olds and were awarded 2.4 percent of the Indiana bachelor’s degrees.

School of Education Overview

The School of Education (SOE) supports the campus mission in becoming the “*best regional university in the nation.*” The SOE mission statement, revised in 2001 to reflect current practices and beliefs about education, is “*to develop high quality, caring professionals who stimulate continuous renewal of schools within a multicultural society.*” The unit prepares initial program teachers, advanced program teachers, and other school personnel under this mission. The unit prepares professionals who are reflective in their practice, engaged in growth, caring in making decisions, and capable of facilitating student learning.

The IUS School of Education offers the Bachelor of Science degree leading to initial teaching licenses in elementary, secondary and special education. At the advanced level the unit offers a Masters of Science in Education degree in elementary, secondary education, and school counseling. Advanced elementary and secondary MSED candidates may add additional teaching licenses in gifted and talented, kindergarten, middle school, computer education, reading and educational leadership. The unit has two recently developed post-baccalaureate initial licensing programs: a state-mandated Transition to Teaching (T2T) program for elementary and secondary licensing and a post baccalaureate initial license for special education (SEPB). **Table 1** provides a Spring 2005 overview of programs:

Table 1: SOE Candidates Enrolled in Program in Spring 2005

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

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

Changes Since the 1999 NCATE Visit

Since the last NCATE visit, the unit has undergone a number of changes involving program design, personnel, enrollment, and facilities. An interim dean was appointed for 2001, fully appointed as the dean in 2002, and reappointed in 2005. Major program changes were required for alignment to new state and professional standards. The unit transitioned program candidates to the new standards and assessment requirements using

the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) licensing change dates and the NCATE 2000 transition plan. Candidates admitted to programs prior to June 2002 follow Rules 46-47 licensing standards and requirements if the program is completed by June 30, 2006. Initial and advanced candidates who entered programs after June 2002 meet new Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) Rules 2002 requirements.

Unit initiatives that have significantly impacted the unit since the last NCATE visit include:

- formative and summative assessment reviews in each program
- adoption of unit goals, disposition statement and conceptual framework
- southern site for Science Olympiad competitions
- adoption of the teacher as researcher model for the elementary and secondary MSED
- state mandated alternative teaching license (T2T program)
- redesign of H340 Education and American Culture with urban field experience
- new diversity course requirement for elementary education majors
- new general education requirements
- unit committees renamed with new descriptions
- Ecuador summer study abroad program
- gifted and talented education and computer technology licensing areas
- \$500,000 in external grants with area school corporations in technology, standards, mentoring

Upgraded facilities have also made a positive contribution towards improving SOE program quality. The Hillside Hall education computer lab now includes updated educational software and computer stations. A new science education classroom was added as part of a \$10 million renovation and expansion to the Life Sciences Building in 2001. The new \$15 million library opened in 2005 and houses the multicultural-focused Education Curriculum Lab. IUS opened a new Graduate Center in Jeffersonville to provide easier access to coursework for Louisville candidates in business, continuing studies and education. Plans are underway for a new student services building.

Major personnel changes have strengthened the unit since the last NCATE visit. Full-time faculty have increased from 18 to 29, adding four minorities. A technology faculty position and a full-time database staff position have been added and additional release time is provided for the unit assessment coordinator. **Table 2** indicates the faculty distribution by programs for 2004-2005:

Table 2 : Program Faculty 2004-2005

Program	Full-Time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Elementary	11	10 (plus 5 as field supervisors)
Secondary	5	2 (plus 4 as field supervisors)
Special Ed	3	2
MS in Elem/Sec Ed	4	13
Counseling	2	3
Ed Leadership	4 (including dean)	2

Note: a tenure-track faculty member from each program serves as the program coordinator.

Since the last visit, enrollment in the unit has increased from 956 students in Fall 1999 to 1083 students in Spring 2005. **Table 3** indicates Spring 2005 enrollment in the professional education initial and advanced programs:

Table 3: Spring 2005 SOE Full- and Part-Time Candidate Enrollment

Gender	Full-Time Undergraduates	Part-time Undergraduates	Full-Time Graduates	Part-time Graduates
Male	80	24	10	157
Female	256	53	14	489
Total	336	77	24	646

IUS minority enrollment was 4.9% in 1999 and 6.1% in 2004. In the SOE, diversity rose from 3% in 1999 to 5% in 2004. Self-reported candidate diversity for Spring 2005 included: 42 African Americans, 4 Hispanics, 3 Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 2 Non-Resident Aliens.

II. Conceptual Framework – “Educators Engaged in Growth”

The SOE logo, “Educators Engaged in Growth,” denotes both commitment and reflective action of the conceptual framework (CF). The CF establishes the expectations for unit faculty and candidates to engage in life-long professional growth aimed at bringing about renewal in schools within our multicultural society.

The mission of IUS and the mission of the unit align and support each other. Both address commitments to intellectual and social growth of students and the advancement of knowledge in a global society. The campus vision of collaboration and partnerships is demonstrated by the unit’s outreach efforts to include faculty from other campus schools, P-12 schools, school supervising teachers, and candidates.

The unit began the process of revising the CF in 1999. The initial programs adopted INTASC and Indiana Developmental and Content Standards. The elementary BSED program incorporated the Danielson model as a framework. The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) outcomes were adopted by the MS in Elementary and Secondary Education program. During 2000-2001 the mission, goals, belief statements, themes, and dispositions were reviewed and aligned with one another. These documents provided the foundation for the conceptual framework approved in Fall 2001 by the SOE faculty. SOE faculty and other stakeholder groups (content faculty, alumni, school supervising teachers and administrators, candidates) were involved in the development and continuous review of these documents.

The CF describes the unit’s philosophy and purpose and articulates professional commitments to knowledge, professional practices, dispositions, teaching competence and student learning. The CF provides the unit and the campus with an articulated and coherent direction for preparing professional educators to work in P-12 schools through four themes that direct *educators engaged in growth*:

- *High Quality Educators*
- *Caring Professionals*

- *Continuous Renewal of Schools*
- *Multicultural Society*

Each theme incorporates a set of knowledge bases about learning, teaching, practice, and professional competence, and signifies commitments to professional education at IUS.

The first CF theme, *high quality*, defines educators as shaped and reshaped by their continuous preparation, educational practices and teaching environment. High quality educators know and can teach their content. They have general and discipline-specific teaching knowledge and apply best practices differentially when working with different learning needs. IUS prepares educators to not only understand their discipline but to possess the teaching knowledge and reflection necessary to create environments where students learn. The unit assessment system is incorporated into this theme to ensure that assessments are of *high quality* and situated in real-world problems relevant to authentic experiences of educators in the field.

The unit firmly believes that high quality educators cannot separate sound educational decision making from the dispositions associated with *caring professionals*. IUS prepares educators who are effective in and out of the classroom with students, other professionals, parents and the community through demonstration of attributes. This second CF theme addresses dispositions in ethics, laws and policies, and the roles and responsibilities of professional communities. The unit prepares educators who work collaboratively and collegially with one another, set good examples, and support positive social behavior.

A caring highly qualified educator is also well positioned to participate in the *continuous renewal of schools*. This third CF theme is defined as having knowledge of schools as organizations, knowledge about central issues that are at the center of school change, and skills to analyze and revise new approaches proposed in reforms. This theme includes candidate demonstration of effective communication skills, inquiry in educational settings, assessment of P-12 learning, and the utilization of appropriate technologies to manage and monitor school change.

The high quality, caring professionals who focus on stimulating continuous renewal of schools cannot be successful unless they are mindful of the diverse and global societies in which we live. The fourth theme, *multicultural society*, addresses diversity in student populations, families and community. The theme stresses the central human values of social justice, equal opportunity, and respect for the dignity of all, regardless of their backgrounds and individual characteristics. The unit prepares candidates for diversity through the multiplicity of identities of culture, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, gender, religion, sexual orientation, geographic origin, and exceptionalities. This theme is operationalized through pluralistic perspectives that include program curricula, diverse field and clinical experiences, assessments and evaluations, and SOE faculty and staff development.

Shared Vision

The CF document and its executive summary reflect high expectations regarding current knowledge bases, an understanding of the complexity of teaching as contingent on students' needs and instructional goals, and the need for continual reshaping of schooling by changing and diverse societies. *Educators engaged in growth* is a shared vision developed and reviewed with the SOE professional community.

Each program team maintains an advisory group 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 work of these groups validates competencies for the professional roles of program candidates. The CF was designed to undergo continuous development as the unit continues to be “engaged in growth” and the vision and descriptions documented in the CF are reviewed annually by the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Quality Team (PAUE).

Coherence

The CF is shared and reviewed with stakeholder groups to ensure that it is continually reflected in curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices and measures used for candidate assessment. The conceptual framework shapes the entire preparation of candidates. Candidates must possess competencies in all four themes of the conceptual framework to be considered a high quality educator for their level of preparation.

The CF is also reflected in data sources compiled and reviewed from current program candidates, employers, alumni and external data reviews from national and state assessment sources. Aggregated program data measures growth of candidates and unit programs. These data are evaluated by stakeholder groups to determine overall program success and decision making regarding continuous improvement.

Professional Commitments and Dispositions

The importance and relevance of the dispositions are reflected in the second CF theme, *caring professionals*. SOE dispositions are assessed at various points in initial and advanced programs to ensure that the unit prepares high quality educators. Higher levels of applications, analyses and self-evaluation are utilized with advanced program candidates to document disposition growth. The dispositions include:

- respect the legal and ethical norms and values of education;
- effectively interact 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 database decision-making and fair practices, and
- commit to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement.

Commitment to Diversity

The CF theme, *multicultural society*, defines diversity for the unit. In addition to the commitment reflected in the fourth theme of the CF, diversity is operationalized through a five-year diversity plan that includes program curricula, diverse field experiences, and diversity initiatives for faculty and staff development. Diversity goals cover four areas impacting the work of the unit: curriculum and instruction; educational assessment, recruitment, participation, and retention; culture, climate, and community outreach; and professional development.

Commitment to Technology

The CF theme, *continuous renewal of schools*, includes a commitment to preparing candidates who are able to use instructional technology to help all students learn and to increase professional productivity. Instructional technology is integrated through standards for curriculum, field and clinical experiences, assessments, and evaluations. The unit assessment system also relies heavily on technology applications for aggregate and disaggregate data used for program evaluations and unit operations. Technology applications are extensively utilized for the overall operations of the unit including budgets, personnel, databases of candidate information, and course scheduling.

Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards

Candidates meet the CF theme, *high quality professionals*, through high standards as set forth through 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 Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB).

The initial licensing programs of elementary, secondary and special education include standards for knowledge, skills, and dispositions established by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) as well as content and developmental standards developed through national organizations as delineated through NCATE and IPSB. Initial candidates demonstrate general education knowledge related to the arts, communications, history, literature, mathematics, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structure of the discipline(s) they teach and plan and create educational experiences that make these aspects meaningful for students. Unit standards include specific program content standards developed by specialized professional organizations: Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), International Reading Association (IRA), International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Middle School Association (NMSA), National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program meet standards established by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The educational leadership standards align with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC) and IPSB content and developmental standards. Counseling uses the

American School Counseling Association (ASCA) standards as guidelines. Program standards align and incorporate IPSB's developmental standards with standards on best practices as identified from learned societies. Performance-based program assessments are mapped to the appropriate CF theme(s) and aligned to state and national standards and to program coursework to ensure that all standards are addressed through program requirements and assessments.

Each program has decision points where multiple data sources are summatively collected on individual candidates and reviewed to document candidate progress and success. Major assessment points, identified as summative decision points (SDPs), are mapped to the performance-based assessment system. Summative decision points assess candidates on standards addressed in the CF at crucial points in each program, including transition into and exit from field-based experiences.

Scantron scoring rubrics are used to collect individual candidate data regarding summative decision making for assessment and improvement of candidate learning. Both quantitative and qualitative evidence of candidate progress is electronically compiled, stored, and retrieved. Candidates receive on-going feedback regarding their progress at the major summative decision points. Evaluations are designed for continuous improvement by providing opportunities for remediation when appropriate.

Candidates are informed of the mission, CF themes, and standards-based assessments through printed materials accompanying application packets, handbooks, pre-admission advising sessions, course syllabi, unit website, and the IUS Bulletin. Particular details regarding academic grading policies and other issues relative to academic success of the unit CF are available through the IUS website <http://www.ius.edu/academics/> and the SOE website <http://www.ius.edu/Education/>.

Not all program candidates have matriculated through their program assessment system to date, depending on when candidates entered and will complete program requirements. Consequently, data on the new and old programs are presented in this report.

In summary, the unit's conceptual framework provides the basis for the philosophy that distinguishes IUS graduates from other institutions. The framework establishes a shared vision in preparing *educators engaged in growth* to work in P-12 schools. The CF establishes the direction for high-quality, challenging and innovative programs. Unit programs provide opportunities for students to gain skills, knowledge and dispositions for growth and success as candidates strive to meet changing community needs. The CF guides and focuses faculty and candidates through candidate performance, assessment, field experiences, diversity, faculty performance and continued development, and unit governance.

III. Evidence for Meeting Each Standard

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 all candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Introduction

Preparing educators is a campus-wide effort at Indiana University Southeast. The IUS mission, the School of Education mission, and the SOE conceptual framework provide the primary structure and foundation for the preparation and assessment of IUS SOE candidates. Teacher education candidates, in initial and advanced programs, demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. All programs have clearly identified professional and developmental standards and assessments aligned to the CF to ensure that candidates meet professional, state, national, and institutional standards. Formative assessments are conducted within coursework while summative assessments (SDPs) are conducted at transition points within each initial and advanced program to assess *educators engaged in growth*.

The Bachelor of Science in Education (BSED) includes initial programs in elementary education, special education, and secondary education. The undergraduate elementary BSED program 130-credit hours delivered in five blocks with cohorts up to 50 candidates. Special education and elementary education majors are in the same cohort through general and specific content methods courses taking P250/252/M201, M310/311, E325/M301, E339/E340/E341, and E328/M301 together. Special education majors take additional 42-credit hours of special education coursework. Undergraduate secondary education candidates complete a 130-credit hour program delivered in cohort groups ranging from 35 to 75. Secondary candidates select a licensing area in science, mathematics, language arts and or social studies and can also add minors outside of their teaching majors in language arts, mathematics, physical science, life science, earth-space science, chemistry, physics, historical perspectives, government and citizenship, psychology, sociology, economics, geographical perspectives, French, German, Spanish, journalism, theatre arts, and computer education.

In addition to the traditional initial programs, post-baccalaureate elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T) candidates complete a 24-credit hour program in cohort groups ranging from 7 to 11. Secondary T2T candidates complete an 18-credit hour program integrated into the secondary BSED program in cohort groups ranging from 1-3. Special education alternative route SEPB candidates complete 42-45-credit hours.

Elementary and secondary MSED program candidates have six years to complete a 36-credit hour program. Advanced candidates can add additional teaching areas in special education (27-39-credit hours), gifted and talented education (15-credit hours), kindergarten (15-credit hours), computer education (15-credit hours), and reading (24-

credit hours). Other areas can be added to a secondary education license. Candidates do not matriculate in cohort groups.

Other school personnel licensing programs include building level education leadership administration (24-credit hours) and the school counseling MSED program (48-credit hours). Counseling cohort groups range from 12 to 16 candidates. Educational leadership candidates do not matriculate in cohort groups.

Element 1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content knowledge is articulated in the conceptual framework’s first component, *high quality* educator, which addresses the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structure of the discipline(s) candidates plan to teach. High quality educators must know their content and be able to apply this knowledge in school settings.

Initial Programs

IU Southeast elementary and secondary BSED candidates gain in-depth content knowledge from general education requirements, their content specializations, and professional education. Once admitted to initial programs, the unit assesses progress in content knowledge formatively in coursework, at several summative decision points (SDPs), and externally through PRAXIS national testing. Data on content knowledge from employer, candidate, and alumni surveys are also reviewed.

The elementary education and special education BSED programs admit candidates twice each year while secondary education admits candidates annually. Initial program applicants seeking admission at summative decision point I (SDPI) to the SOE are required to demonstrate basic content knowledge through PRAXIS I national testing of reading (PPST required score 176), writing (PPST required score 172), and mathematics (PPST required score 175). The unit's aggregate pass rate of basic skills on PRAXIS I average 97% or higher as reported in Title II [1.1.a]. **Table 4** indicates the aggregated PRAXIS I scores for initial candidates admitted from 1999-2004:

Table 4: PRAXIS I Passing Rates

Date	Number Taking Assessment	Aggregate Basic Skills	PPST Reading	CBT Reading	PPST Writing	CBT Writing	PPST Math	CBT Math
1999-2000	95	98% *(92%)	100% *(95%)	100% (97%)	100% *(98%)	100% (98%)	98% *(91%)	100% (93%)
2000-2001	137	99% *(95%)	100% *(98%)	100% (98%)	100% *(99%)	100% (99%)	100% *(96%)	99% (96%)
2001-2002	98	93% *(96%)	100% *(98%)	98% (99%)	96% *(99%)	100% (99%)	100% *(98%)	98% (99%)
2002-2003	169	99% *(97%)	100% *(99%)	100% (100%)	100% *(99%)	100% (100%)	100% *(98%)	100% (99%)
2003-2004	157	98% *(98%)	97% *(98%)	100% (99%)	97% (99%)	100% (100%)	97% (98%)	99% (99%)

*Statewide pass rate in parenthesis

The PRAXIS II national testing requirement for the Indiana teacher license provides another indicator of the quality of content knowledge of SOE initial teacher candidates. PRAXIS II subtests or single assessments are available in Title II and ETS reports [1.1.b]. **Table 5** represents overall performance at or above the state average for initial (traditional and alternative route) preparation programs on PRAXIS exams:

Table 5: PRAXIS II Pass Rates

PRAXIS II	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002
PRAXIS II Content Area Aggregate Scores	Num/ pass/ %pass/ IN	Num/ Pass/%pass/ IN	Num/ Pass/ %pass/ IN
Academic Content (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	106/ 104 / 98%/99%	151/150 / 99%/ 99%	87/ 86/ 99%/ 98%
Teaching Special Populations	5	2	4
Summary Totals and Pass Rates	95/ 94/ 99%/95%	136/ 135/ 99/ 96%	98/ 91/ 93/ 94%

PRAXIS II	2002-2003	2003-2004
PRAXIS II Content Area Aggregate Scores	Num/ pass/ %pass/ IN	Num/ Pass/ % pass/ IN
Academic Content (Math, English, etc.)	155/ 151 / 97%/ 98%	146/135/92%/ 97%
Teaching Special Populations	2	2
Summary Totals and Pass Rates	169/ 163/ 96%/96%	157/144/ 92%/96%

Source: ETS PRAXIS

T2T and the alternative route special education (SEPB) requires PRAXIS I passing scores for unconditional admission. Secondary T2T candidates are required to also pass PRAXIS I and II prior to admission [1.1.c]. For elementary T2T and SEPB candidates, PRAXIS II is required for state licensure and can be taken during or after student teaching.

The first T2T candidates began Spring 2003 with one secondary science and seven elementary candidates. These eight candidates successfully completed their coursework and field experiences within a year. The average PRAXIS I scores of the eight candidates for each of the tests (reading, math and writing) were: reading (182), writing (178) and math (178). All seven elementary T2T candidates passed the Elementary Education Curriculum Instruction and Assessment (EECIA) exam with an average score of 177. The secondary T2T candidate passed the PRAXIS II exam scoring four points higher than the qualifying score [1.1.d].

Initial program BSED and post-bac applicants must also meet entrance GPA requirements for SDPI. Initial elementary and special education BSED candidates must have a GPA of 2.50 or higher in all college-level course work including W131 English Composition, H340 Education and American Culture, S121 Public Speaking, T101 Math, and one course each from the social studies and the science content areas. Initial secondary education BSED applicants must have a 2.75 minimum GPA for admission with a grade of C or higher in designated coursework including communication and mathematics coursework, professional education courses, and in each secondary licensing area(s) [1.1.e]. **Table 6** indicates basic content knowledge as assessed through overall GPAs for initial program applicants from Spring 2002 through Fall 2005:

Table 6: GPA Averages for BSED Candidates at SDPI

Elem/Special Education	Number of Applicants	Accept GPA Average
Spring 2002	84	3.3
Fall 2002	70	3.2
Spring 2003	43	3.3
Fall 2003	48	3.1
Spring 2004	62	3.6
Fall 2004	48	3.4
Spring 2005	29	3.2
Fall 2005	52	3.2
Secondary		
Fall 2002	49	3.3
Fall 2003	68	3.1
Fall 2004	62	3.4
Fall 2005	72	3.3

Source: SOE Records Office

GPA requirements are utilized as an indicator of content knowledge: 2.5 GPA for initial elementary and special education and 2.75 GPA for initial secondary education in the content coursework required for licensing and in professional education coursework. **Table 7** indicates the high level of content knowledge as initial candidates, including alternative route, complete programs as evidenced by program completion GPAs:

Table 7: Exiting GPA Average for BSED Candidates

Program Completion	Elementary & Special Education	Secondary
2000 Overall	3.392	3.253
2001 Overall	3.439	3.181
2002 Overall	3.421	3.275
2003 Overall	3.501	3.177
2004 Overall	3.464	3.289

Source: SOE Records Office

Content knowledge is also assessed summatively in student teaching and candidate portfolios [1.1.f]. Data collected from special education supervising teacher placements (form SOE 0090 Rev003) indicates that 100% of candidates evaluated between Spring 2003 and Spring 2004 were rated at exemplary, proficient, or basic on item #6 “*demonstrates skill mastery of subjects being taught*” [1.1.g]. **Table 8** indicates university and school supervising teacher ratings of elementary and secondary BSED candidate content knowledge:

Table 8: Elementary BSED Content Knowledge

Elementary BSED (Form 0081)	Semester/Number/ Proficient or Basic %
Demonstrates knowledge of planning for each of the content areas	(S03) (n=124) *100%
	(F03) (n=114) 100%
	(S04) (n=142) 100%
	(F04) (n=102) 99%
	(S05) (n=68) 100%
Demonstrates use of professional standards and content standards in mathematics, science, English/language arts, social studies (averaged together)	S03) (n=124) *89%
	(F03) (n=114) 92%
	(S04) (n=142) 94%
	(F04) (n=102) 84%
	(S05) (n=68) 94%
Secondary BSED M480 (Form 0087)	Semester/Number/Proficient or Basic %
Knowledge of subject matter	(S02) (n=58) *100%
	(S03) (n=105) *99%

	(S04)	(n=126)	98%
	(S05)	(n=108)	100%

*Includes exemplary rating eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0081/0087

Initial programs also monitor external data provided by the Indiana Beginning Teacher Internship Assessment Program (BTAP) [1.1.h]. **Table 9** indicates that 1.26% of IUS initial licensed first year Indiana teachers have failed the internship program since the last NCATE visit:

Table 9: Indiana Internship (BTAP) Pass Rates

Year	Number	Passed	Number Reported as Not Passed	No Status Reported on Internship
2000-2001	84	97%	2 (math, elementary ed)	19
2001-2002	68	100%	0	6
2002-2003	57	100%	0	4
2003-2004	95	98%	2 (biol., phys., chem., phys. 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.

Surveys are utilized by the unit to document initial program effectiveness involving content knowledge [1.1.i]. The Employer Survey in 2004 (n=31) indicates that 87% of building-level administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares first year teachers to “*know and teach their subject*” and 100% of administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares novice teachers to “*plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.*” The Employer Survey in 2005 (n=47) indicated that 91% of building-level administrators “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that IUS first year teachers “*know and teach their subject*” and 88% “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS first year teachers “*plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.*”

Alumni surveys are also used to document program emphasis on content knowledge. The Recent Graduate Alumni Survey in Spring 2004 (n=54) indicates that 98% of initial program alumni “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*IU Southeast offers high-quality academic programs*” and 85% “agree” or “strongly agree” that the “*courses in my major contribute to my current work success*” [1.1.j]. The initial program supervising teacher surveys also provide the unit with program proficiency in content knowledge (form SOE 0006) [1.1.k].

Advanced Programs

Elementary and secondary MSED candidates have already demonstrated content knowledge to obtain their initial teaching license. The application process (SDPI) requires candidates to hold or be eligible for an initial teaching license and document an overall undergraduate GPA of 2.5 and a 3.0 in any graduate coursework completed. Once admitted, advanced candidate content knowledge is assessed formatively within coursework and summatively at transition points SDPII (3.0 GPA in each core course), SDPIII (teacher as research inquiry project) and SDPIV (3.0 overall GPA). Program effectiveness is also evaluated through candidate, alumni, and employer surveys.

Standard 2 of NBPTS addresses teacher content knowledge. Content knowledge is assessed formatively through content-related projects in core courses: J500 Instruction the Context of Curriculum, P507 Testing in the Classroom, H520 Education and Social Issues, and P510 Psychology in Teaching. P510 and P507 assess advance candidates on specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students. J500 assesses candidates on abilities to create, organize and link subjects to other disciplines [1.1.1]. Additionally, candidates complete 6-credit hours of cognate coursework in their license area and 18 hours of additional coursework in which they strengthen content knowledge in areas such as math, science, social studies and literacy [1.1.m].

GPA is used to assess content knowledge. GPAs are monitored as candidates progress through the advanced program. Data in **Table 10** denotes GPAs at SDPI admission and at SDPIV for advanced program completion:

Table 10: GPA of Elementary and Secondary MSED

Elementary and Secondary MSED	2003 SDPI GPA	2003 SDPIV GPA	2004 SDPI GPA	2004 SDPIV GPA
GPA content knowledge	3.25	3.88	3.29	3.89

High quality of content knowledge is summatively assessed at SDPIII through the teacher as researcher inquiry project. Candidates demonstrate specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students. **Table 11** indicates elementary and secondary MSED candidate data on content knowledge assessment for 2004-2005:

Table 11: Elementary/Secondary MSED Content Knowledge Assessment

Teacher as Researcher Inquiry Project (n=30)	Percent “Complete” without Resubmissions
content mastery	100%
Critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving	100%

Source: SOE 0044

Surveys are also used by the unit to evaluate program effectiveness of **high quality** content knowledge [1.1.n]. The Employer Survey in 2005 (n=32) indicated that 100% of responding building-level administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares elementary and secondary MSED candidates to “*know and teach their subject.*” Additionally, 94% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that the program prepares advanced program completers to “*plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals*” [1.1.o]. The Recent Graduate Alumni Survey conducted in Spring 2004 (n=53) also provides the unit with evidence of candidate content knowledge as 83% of elementary and secondary MSED alumni indicated they “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*IUS offers high-quality academic programs.*”

Element 2: Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

Other school personnel candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of **high quality** central concepts through key courses with formative assessments as well as summative GPA and portfolio requirements. Content knowledge assessment for other school personnel is designed to prepare candidates for roles in **school renewal**. Survey data are also utilized for programmatic review of content knowledge.

The counseling program assesses content knowledge at various points within the program. No state or national testing is required for licensing or utilized in the assessment system for the counseling program. **Table 12** describes assessments used by the counseling MSED program to assess content knowledge:

Table 12: Counseling MSED Content Knowledge Assessment

Decision Point	Course	Content Knowledge Assessment
SDPI to SDPII (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
SDPII to SDPIII	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
SDPIII to SDPIV	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

Counseling content knowledge is summatively assessed at SDPIV. In Spring 2004 and Spring 2005, 100% of candidates were assessed as “proficient” in areas of G507 Career Unit, G562 Strategic Project, G550 Individual Session Tape, and G550 Group Session Tape.

Educational leadership candidates are assessed on content standards in formative assessments. A608 Legal Perspectives on Education assesses legal issues as they pertain to application of local, state and federal laws and policies specific to school situations. A653/A625/A627 Administration of Elementary and Secondary Schools and A653 Organizational Context of Schools uses a case study to assess the knowledge of the change process and the application of leadership skills and reflectivity on each school leadership standard [1.2.a].

The summative assessment of the 8 program standards for educational leadership occurs in SDPIII at the end of all coursework and A695 practicum. The assessment is based on the evaluation of work samples from courses, practicum and other evidence identified by candidates and completed by practicum supervisors who are university faculty. In 2004-2005, 100% of the educational leadership candidates (n=18) were rated as “proficient” or “basic” in all 8 standards covering instructional leadership, organizational leadership, collaborative leadership, ethical leadership, systemic leadership, technological leadership, and multicultural leadership (SOE 0057) [1.2.b]. Another indicator of the quality of educational leadership candidates is evidenced by the 2004-2005 practicum mentor ratings (n=19) on the “*degree of preparation of your protégé for the practicum*” average score of 4.2 on a 5 point scale [1.2.c].

For licensure, educational leadership 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% of Kentucky program completers passed the SLLA examination and Kentucky Specialist Test [1.2.d]. Program completers seeking licensure in Indiana were not required to take the SLLA examine until 2002 and 100% have passed. **Table 13** indicates averages for Indiana and Kentucky program completers:

Table 13: ETS Institutional Summary Report: School Leadership Series

Year	Number	IUS Range (Median)	National Range (Median)
1999-2000	16	171-182 (177)	169-182 (176)
2000-2001	14	171-178 (175)	170-182 (176)
2001-2002	15	171-188 (183)	168-181 (175)
2002-2003	25	171-182 (178)	172-181 (177)
2003-2004	34	172-184 (176)	170-183 (177)

Source: ETS

Indiana recently raised the passing score to 165 and Kentucky is in the process of raising the score to 170 [1.2.e]. The program and advisory group disaggregated SLLA exam results to review IUS test taker strengths and weaknesses and recommended holding an additional SLLA preparation seminar [1.2.f].

Surveys also inform the unit on program content knowledge for other school personnel. The Counseling Employer Survey in 2005 (n=11) indicates employers assess standards 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 (3=proficient, 2=basic) [1.2.g]. The Recent Graduate Alumni Survey in Spring 2004 (n=11) indicates that 94% of counseling and 100% of educational leadership (n=21) graduates “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*IU Southeast offers high-quality academic programs.*” The alumni survey also indicates that 100% of counseling graduates “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*the courses in my major contribute to my current work success.*” Educational leadership alumni indicate 90% “agree” or “strongly agree” that the program prepared them to be an “*organizational leader*” and “*systemic leader*” [1.2.h]. Educational leadership practicum candidates, surveyed annually (2002-2005), consistently report proficiencies such as instructional leadership and problem analysis with ratings of “exemplary” or “proficient” at greater than 90% [1.2.i].

GPA's are also utilized by the unit to assess content knowledge of other school personnel. **Table 14** indicates GPA averages for school counseling MSED and educational leadership:

Table 14: GPA Averages for Other School Personnel Candidates

Program	2003 Entering GPA	2003 Exit GPA	2004 Entering GPA	2004 Exit GPA	2005 Entering GPA	2005 Exit GPA
School Counseling	3.22	3.95	3.29	3.94	3.38	3.97
Ed Leadership	3.0 *	3.25 *	3.0 *	3.25 *	3.0 *	3.93*

*Candidates must have 3.0 to enter and 3.25 to exit. GPA data not tracked until 2005.

Source: Program Coordinators

Element 3: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

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

Initial Programs

Applicants in the initial BSED and post bac programs are assessed on the application of *high quality* pedagogical content knowledge in professional education courses, most of which have field-based components. Initial candidates work collaboratively in methods courses that include pedagogical content knowledge for each developmental level of content they plan to teach. Candidates demonstrate application of content pedagogy in their field experiences and student teaching. Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed formatively within methods coursework, in lesson plans and teaching evaluations during student teaching, and summatively at various transition points in programs. Pedagogical content knowledge data related to themes of *high quality* and *school renewal* are also reviewed from candidate, alumni, and employer surveys [1.3.a].

Technology is a valued component of pedagogical content knowledge under the third theme, *school renewal*. Facilitating student learning through the integration of technology begins with formative assessments in the required W200 Computers in Education course utilizing ISTE technology NETS standards. Initial program candidates work with educational software such as Inspiration, Publisher, PowerPoint, Front Page, Excel, Access, Bryce and KidPix [1.3.b].

The emphasis on technology is continued into general and specific methods courses as candidates learn technology applications to facilitate student learning, providing evidence in portfolios of how technology is integrated into teaching and learning [1.3.c]. Technology is assessed in elementary and special education BSED programs in block 1 and within the reading/language arts block assessment and in the portfolio. Elementary BSED candidates are also assessed on technology during student teaching by the supervising teacher and the university supervisor. Special education BSED 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 BSED candidates progress through the program [1.3.d]. Initial pedagogical content knowledge is introduced in H340 Education and American Culture which includes a 30 hour observation in P-12 classrooms. H340 assesses effective communication through several writing assignments and interactions with students and school personnel [1.3.e].

Elementary and special education BSED candidate pedagogical content knowledge is increasingly assessed in blocks two, three, and four. Block two of these initial elementary and special education programs includes assessments in M310 General Methods, M311 General Methods for Kindergarten and Elementary Teachers, M301 Laboratory Field

Experiences, K205 Introduction to Exceptional Children, and E449 Trade Books. Content-specific instructional methods are assessed in block three (language arts, reading, and social studies methods courses) and block four (science and mathematics methods courses and reading assessment) [1.3.f].

In the secondary BSED program, candidate pedagogical knowledge is assessed in all professional education coursework beginning with P250 General Educational Psychology, P255 Educational Psychology for Middle and Secondary Teachers, and the M201 field experience. Instructional designs and methodologies are included in M314 General Methods with a field experience involving lesson plan preparation. M464 Methods in Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Reading includes assessment of planning and delivery of reading, assessments of reading interests, administering reading inventories, and remediation for students [1.3.g].

Pedagogical content knowledge standards for BSED candidates are summatively assessed at program completion. **Table 15** provides combined university supervisor and school supervising teacher data on pedagogical content knowledge assessment as BSED candidates complete programs:

Table 15: Elementary BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

Elementary (Form SOE 0029)	Semester	Number	Proficient or Basic %
Standard 1 Knowledge of content for planning and preparation	(S03)	(n=29)	100%
	(F03)	(n=91)	99%
	(S04)	(n=84)	100%
	(F04)	(n=80)	100%
	(S05)	(n=61)	100%
Standard 3 Variety of strategies for effective instruction, including technology	(S03)	(n=29)	*100%
	(F03)	(n=91)	100%
	(S04)	(n=84)	100%
	(F04)	(n=80)	100%
	(S05)	(n=61)	100%
Secondary M480 (Form SOE 0087)	Semester/ n/	Proficient or Basic %	
Standard 4 Multiple instructional strategies	(S02)	(n=58)	*100%
	(S03)	(n=105)	*100%
	(S04)	(n=126)	98%
	(S05)	(n=108)	100%
Standard 6 Communication skills	(S02)	(n=58)	*100%
	(S03)	(n=105)	*99%
	(S04)	(n=126)	98%
	(S05)	(n=108)	100%
Standard 7 Instructional planning	(S02)	(n=58)	*100%
	(S03)	(n=105)	*100%
	(S04)	(n=126)	98%
	(S05)	(n=108)	100%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0029/SOE0087

Special education BSED candidates are evaluated by special education school supervising teachers on standards related to pedagogical content knowledge in M470 [1.3.h]. **Table 16** indicates “exemplary” and “proficient” combined ratings for Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 and “proficient” ratings for Fall 2004 and Spring 2005:

Table 16: Special Education M470 Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

M470	F03 (n=6)	S04 (n=5)	F04 (n=5)	S05 (n=3)
Lesson execution	83%	100%	80%	33%
Lesson conclusion	66%	100%	40%	0%
Teaching methods	100%	80%	40%	66%
Interactions to students	100%	100%	80%	66%

Source: SOE 0090 Rev003

Special education BSED students are also assessed on pedagogical content knowledge during K480, student teaching. **Table 17** indicates the percentage of candidates who received “exemplary,” “proficient,” or “basic,” ratings from special education school supervising teachers:

Table 17: Special Education Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

K480 Student Teaching	S03 (n=5)	F03 (n=3)	S04 (n=1)	F04 (n=7)	S05 (n=2)
Modifies behavior in response to supervisory feedback	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Uses good oral and written language	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Matches techniques, technology and materials to learner IEPs	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Variety of techniques and materials	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Effective feedback and questioning	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Establishes an engaging instructional environment	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%

Source: SOE 0089Rev003

The T2T elementary alternative route cohort begins the 24-credit hour program during the spring/summer with introduction to content pedagogy in educational psychology courses P251/P515 and M310 General Methods. As candidates continue, they are assessed on content pedagogy through coursework in language arts, reading, math, and science methods. Candidates complete M500 which includes Reading II and student teaching. Secondary Education T2T candidates are integrated into the traditional program and complete education psychology, methods courses and field experiences along with their peers. T2T data was aggregated with the elementary and secondary program data in 2003-2004.

Surveys also provide data on program effectiveness regarding pedagogical content knowledge. **Table 18** provides data on pedagogical content knowledge from employer surveys rated as “agree” or “strongly agree” regarding first year general and special education teachers prepared at IUS:

Table 18: BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment by Employer

Standard	2004 (n=31)	2005 (n=47)
Candidates understand how students differ in their approaches to learning	84%	83%
Candidates demonstrate how to use a variety of instructional strategies	93%	81%
Utilize effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques	91%	88%

Table 19 represents survey responses from elementary BSED supervising teachers of program preparation of candidates in pedagogical content knowledge ratings of “agree” or “strongly agree:”

Table 19: Elementary BSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

Semester	F01	S02	F02	S03	F03	S04	F04	S05
Number	44	32	23	58	43	36	43	32
Instructional strategies	86%	94%	91%	97%	89%	94%	97%	91%
Verbal, nonverbal, media communication	80%	91%	91%	97%	93%	97%	93%	100%
Forms of technology	75%	85%	78%	79%	84%	89%	91%	94%

Source: SOE 0006

The Technology Survey (n= 66) in Spring 2004 conducted with initial candidates at the conclusion of student teaching indicated that 90% self-reported they were “well prepared” or “somewhat prepared” on 10 of the 12 technology indicators and 50% self-reported they were “well prepared” on six of these technology indicators. The technology survey further indicates that 95% of initial candidates reported being “well prepared” or “somewhat prepared” at 95% to “*plan engaging lessons,*” and 93% to “*integrate technology into P-12 subject areas*” [1.3.i]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 (n=220), indicated that 86% of initial candidates “agree” or “strongly agree” that program requirements contribute to their “*development of technology skills related to the license or degree pursued*” [1.3.j].

Advanced Programs

Advanced candidates demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skills prior to admission through their initial preparation and teaching experience. Instruction and assessment at the advanced level includes the CF theme of **high quality** through standards related to candidate ability to generate multiple paths of instruction, multiple methods for meeting goals, and orchestration of learning in group settings. Advanced candidates are assessed on communication skills, an important component of the CF theme of **school renewal** through collaborative "critical friend" and cooperative learning assignments involving the design and evaluate 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 in the advanced program and formatively assessed through coursework using the ISTE NETS-T technology standards as the basis for technology applications [1.3.k]. Elementary and secondary MSED candidates may include advanced technology courses as part of their degree requirements (R531 Computers in Education, W520 Instructional Technology, W540 Computers in the Curriculum, and F500 Topical Exploration in Education) [1.3.l].

The elementary and secondary MSED program summatively assesses pedagogical content knowledge at SDPIII through the capstone teacher as researcher project [1.3.m]. Candidates are assessed on 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. Candidates are assessed on their abilities to modify, and evaluate teaching practice. The SDPIII teacher as researcher writing also includes technology applications such as tables and charts and word processing as they

complete writing drafts. **Table 20** represents MSED candidate data on pedagogical content knowledge assessment for 2004-2005:

Table 20: Elementary and Secondary MSED Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

Teacher as Researcher Inquiry Project (n=30)	Complete without Resubmissions
Problem statement applied to teaching context	100%
Applied to subjects/elaboration	87%
Reflective analysis of video instructional strategies	90%
Critical friend component	100%

Source: SOE 0044

Surveys also provide data on advanced program candidates' pedagogical content knowledge. The Employer Survey in 2005 (n=32) indicates that 91% of responding administrators "agree" or "strongly agree" that recent graduates of the elementary and secondary MSED program utilize "*effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques.*" All responding administrators (100%) "agree" or "strongly agree" that IUS prepared their teachers to be professionals who "*bring new ideas and skills to the school,*" and 97% "agree" or "strongly agree" that IUS prepared their teachers to "*demonstrate how to use a variety of instructional strategies.*"

A Technology Survey (n=137) in Spring 2004 indicated that 85% of advanced candidates reported satisfaction with their preparation on ISTE NET-Teacher Technology standards. The Graduate Student Technology Application Survey (n=153), conducted in Spring 2005, indicated that one-third of the respondents rated themselves as "highly proficient" and nearly two-thirds rated themselves as "adequate" in the "*application of technology applications expected in their school settings*" Over 50% rated themselves as "highly proficient" and 30% rated themselves as "adequate" regarding "*proficiency on Internet applications used in instruction of students*" [1.3.n]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 (n=119) indicates that 92% of candidate respondents "agree" or "strongly agree" that their advanced program contributed to their development of technology [1.3.o].

Element 4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

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* for 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. The SOE annual share fair showcases exemplary initiatives of *educators engaged in growth* [1.4.a].

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, how development relates to learning, ethics and laws, school organization, family involvement, and professional roles and responsibilities. Initial candidates are prepared in professional and pedagogical

content 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 numerous opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on knowledge and skills.

H340 Education and American Culture introduces initial candidates to school law, professional organizations and standards, professional ethics, bias and discrimination, educational philosophies, and school organization [1.4.b]. The H340 field experience includes observing and reflecting in writing the effect of P-12 teacher instructional and motivational strategies. H340 students are assessed quantitatively and qualitatively [1.4.c]. H340 assessments are used in the SDPI application and admission decision making. **Table 21** indicates professional pedagogical skills that are assessed in H340 school settings by school supervising teachers as “proficient” or “basic:”

Table 21: H340 Professional Pedagogical Knowledge Assessment

Standard	F04 (n=173)	S05 (n=184)
Understands how students differ	93%	81%
Reflects on teaching	93%	93%
Fosters relationships with teachers/staff/parents	87%	85%

Source: SOE 0222

Elementary BSED candidates complete 240+ hours of field experience prior to student teaching, while secondary candidates complete 100+ and special education 300+ hours. Activities and assignments in field and clinical experiences include professional and pedagogical 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 context and community. These experiences provide candidates with opportunities to apply their knowledge of ethics, laws and policies in their daily interactions with students, families and communities.

Elementary and special education BSED candidates apply and evaluate learning theory and knowledge of human development in the educational psychology block and deliver specific content in field-based placements [1.4.d]. Elementary candidates acquire specific knowledge of diverse cultures through methods courses and the required multicultural course, M300 Teaching in Pluralistic Society. Special education majors blend content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge from their specialty area in courses such as K453 Management Academic and Social Behavior. Special education majors are required to complete all elementary education methods courses, except for M300 and E337.

The elementary BSED program assesses foundations and development at SDPIII through the portfolio review [1.4.e]. **Table 22** data represents professional and pedagogical knowledge for elementary BSED candidates at the portfolio review of SDPIII:

Table 22: Elementary BSED Portfolio SDPIII Assessment

Semester/Year	Number	Acceptable	Unacceptable
F02	(n=60)	59 (98%)	1 (2%)
S03	(n=55)	55 (100%)	0

F03	(n=43)	43 (100%)	0
S04	(n=45)	44 (98%)	1 (2%)
F04	(n=31)	31 (100%)	0
S05	(n=29)	29 (97%)	1 (3%)

Source: SOE 0079

Elementary BSED candidate professional and pedagogical content knowledge has been assessed by university and school supervising teachers prior to program completion.

Table 23 indicates ratings of “proficient” or “basic:”

Table 23: Elementary BSED Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment

Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills SOE 0081	Semester/Number/ Proficient or Basic
(1c) Knowledge of students’ growth and development	S03 (n=124) * 99% F03 (n=114) 100% S04 (n=142) 100% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 100%
(1d) Instructional goals that include students’ interests and input	S03 (n=124) *100% F03 (n=114) 100% S04 (n=142) 99% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 99%
(1e) Knowledge and use of resources	S03 (n=124) *100% F03 (n=114) 100% S04 (n=142) 99% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 100%
(2b) Understands and respects cultural diversity in students and families.	S03 (n=124) *90% F03 (n=114) 88% S04 (n=142) 91% F04 (n=102) 89% S05 (n=68) 84%
(2c) Understand and respects differences in students’ abilities	S03 (n=124) *100% F03 (n=114) 100% S04 (n=142) 99% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 100%
(4a) Reflects on teaching	S03 (n=124) *99% F03 (n=114) 100% S04 (n=142) 99% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 99%
(4c) Communicates with families as appropriate	S03 (n=124) *94% F03 (n=114) 92% S04 (n=142) 88% F04 (n=102) 90% S05 (n=68) 91%
(4d) Contributes to the school community	S03 (n=124) *95% F03 (n=114) 88% S04 (n=142) 83% F04 (n=102) 87% S05 (n=68) 93%
(4e) Grows and develops professionally	S03 (n=124) *99% F03 (n=114) 97% S04 (n=142) 98% F04 (n=102) 100% S05 (n=68) 100%
(4f) Shows professionalism	S03 (n=124) *100% F03 (n=114) 98% S04 (n=142) 99%

	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	99%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Elementary and secondary Transition to Teaching programs did not begin until Spring 03.

Source: SOE 0081

Secondary education candidates complete coursework in educational psychology general and specific methods with lesson and unit planning to meet individual needs of students [1.4.f]. Formative assessments on the application of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are conducted in M314/M301 Secondary General Methods. 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 reflect on the application of these skills. Professional and pedagogical content knowledge is assessed by university faculty and school supervising teachers and combined ratings of “proficient” or “basic” are represented in **Table 24**:

Table 24: Secondary BSED Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

Standard	Semester	Number/	Proficient or Basic
Standard 2 Knowledge of human development and learning	(Sp 02)	(n=58)	*100%
	(Sp 03)	(n=105)	*100%
	(Sp 04)	(n=126)	98%
	(Sp 05)	(n=108)	100%
Standard 3 Adapting instruction for individual needs	(Sp 02)	(n=58)	*98%
	(Sp 03)	(n=105)	*100%
	(Sp 04)	(n=126)	96%
	(Sp 05)	(n=108)	100%
Standard 9 Professional commitment and responsibility	(Sp 02)	(n=58)	*98%
	(Sp 03)	(n=105)	*100%
	(Sp 04)	(n=126)	98%
	(Sp 05)	(n=108)	99%
Standard 10 Partnerships	(Sp 02)	(n=58)	*100%
	(Sp 03)	(n=105)	*98%
	(Sp 04)	(n=126)	98%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0087

Developmental standards are also assessed by the secondary BSED program [1.4.g].

Table 25 indicates “proficient” or “basic” ratings of early adolescence and young adulthood standards:

Table 25: Secondary BSED Early Adolescence and Young Adulthood Standards Assessment

Standard	Spring 02* (n=30)	Spring 03* N=66	Spring 04 n=85	Spring 05 n=37
Development of adolescents and young adults	100%	99%	100%	100%
Decision making	100%	100%	100%	100%
High school learning community	95%	94%	99%	100%
Curriculum	100%	99%	100%	100%
Instructional strategies	100%	99%	100%	100%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0085

Special education BSED candidates are assessed on formative professional and pedagogical content knowledge. **Table 26** 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 26: Special Education BSED 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%

Data Source: SOE 0090Rev003

The elementary T2T candidates complete 90+ hours of field experience prior to student teaching in which professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are instructed and assessed [1.4.h]. Secondary T2T candidates are formatively assessed on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills beginning in P250 Educational Psychology, P255 Educational Psychology for Middle and Secondary School Teachers, and a M201 field experience. They are assessed through the same courses as the initial secondary education candidates until program completion, completing 100+ hours of field experience prior to student teaching. T2T student teaching evaluations are embedded in the data of traditional program. An evaluation of the first cohort of elementary and secondary T2T candidates led to changes in how professional and pedagogical content knowledge instruction was delivered. The second cohort of T2T candidates were given mentors earlier in the program and more field experiences.

Candidates in the special education SEPB are introduced to foundations of education, professional laws, ethics and policies, and diversity of communities in K505 Introduction to Special Education for Graduates Students. K590 Special Topics: Advanced Characteristics, reinforces and extends candidate knowledge of how disability and growth and development interact [1.4.i]. The portfolio for the first field experience includes an assessment on knowledge of development through a comparative study of age peers with and without an exceptionality [1.4.j].

Surveys are also used to assess candidate professional and pedagogical content knowledge. The Employer Survey in 2004 (n=31) indicated employers “agree” or “strongly” agree that IUS prepared the novice teacher at 88% to “*be an effective educator in a multicultural society,*” 84% to “*understand how students differ in their approaches to learning,*” 93% to “*demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community,*” and 93% to “*engage in continuous self assessment, professional development and growth*” [1.4.k].

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program are assessed on *high quality* advanced preparation of effective classroom teaching incorporated into the CF theme of *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*. Candidates contribute to school effectiveness and collaborate with community resources. Advanced candidates are assessed both formatively within coursework and summatively. Surveys involving

candidates, alumni, and employers are also used for program review of professional and pedagogical content knowledge.

Candidates are formatively assessed on professional and pedagogical content knowledge in the four required 3-hour core courses. Program standards assess that advanced program teachers are committed to students and their learning, recognize individual differences in their students, adjust their practice accordingly, demonstrate an understanding of how students develop and learn, think systematically about their practice, seek advice of others, and draw on research and scholarship to improve practice. J500 candidates are formally assessed on a situation analysis describing the factors that impact the school setting and influence curriculum. The course, H520 Education and Social Issues, assesses advanced understandings of instruction for students from diverse family backgrounds. P510 and P507 assess 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 through roles and responsibilities in their professional communities [1.4.l].

Advanced candidates are further assessed on professional and pedagogical content 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. For example, candidates enrolling in W553 Methods and Materials for Teaching the Gifted and Talented are assessed on knowledge and skills for working with high achieving youth, their families and the community. W595 Practicum in Gifted and Talented Education candidates demonstrate understandings and applications for teaching children and adolescents with high abilities. In E545 Advanced Study of the Teaching Reading in Elementary School, candidates are assessed on reading strategies in various curriculum areas, appraise reading abilities, and develop techniques for cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity in the teaching process. R531 Computer in Education assesses technology in the educational environment to promote pupil learning and to advance teacher personal productivity. E506 Curriculum in Early Childhood Education and E524 Workshop in Early Childhood Education include the assessment of early childhood development, research in teaching and working effectively with families and community. Special education coursework, such as K505 Introduction to Special Education for Graduate Students and K553 Management of Academic and Social Behavior, provide knowledge on exceptionality development, legal and regulatory information, professional responsibilities, and community and family contexts [1.4.m].

SDPIII assesses advanced candidate ability to research and engage professional communities. [1.4.n]. **Table 27** indicates MSED candidate data on professional and pedagogical content knowledge assessed at SDPIII by faculty:

Table 27: Elementary/Secondary MSED Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessment

Teacher as Researcher Inquiry Project (n=30)	Percent “Complete” without Resubmissions
Research literature	83%
Reflective analysis of study	97%
Promotion of educational success & personal change	100%

Continuous self-improvement and professional growth	100%
---	------

Source: SOE 0044

Survey data are also utilized to evaluate candidate professional and pedagogical content knowledge. The Employer Survey in 2005 (n=32) for the elementary and secondary MSED program candidates indicate 94% of responding administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS teachers plan lessons based on students and the community, and 94% “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS teachers “*demonstrate the ability to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.*” These administrations (100%) “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares teachers for “*continuous self assessment, professional development and growth,*” and 84% “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares teachers who “*demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community*” [1.4.o].

Element 5: 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 MSED 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 SDPIV. 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 in other school personnel programs. Counseling candidates make extensive use of web-based information on career and college resources in G507 Career and Lifestyle [1.5.a]. School data are accessed from websites for the G542 Organization of Counseling Programs [1.5.b] project, and web-related resources are utilized for school improvement projects in G562 School Counseling [1.5.c]. Counseling candidates further demonstrate technology skills by designing a counseling public relations brochure, newsletter or website [1.5.d]. Counseling data on professional knowledge and skills at SDPIII has been systematically collected and reviewed in 2004 (n=16) and 2005 (n=16) as indicated in **Table 28:**

Table 28: Counseling MSED Professional Knowledge SDPIII Assessment (2004-2005)

Assessment	Year	Basic or Proficient
G504 Oral counseling exam	2004	(100%)
	2005	(100%)
G523 interventions video	2004	(100%)
	2005	(100%)
G532 group counseling tape	2004	(88%)
	2005	(100%)
G524 ethics/legal issues exam	2004	(100%)
	2005	(100%)

Source: SOE 0061

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 in A608 Legal Perspectives on Education [1.5.e]. E536/S655 Supervision in Elementary and Secondary Education assesses a clinical supervision project that addresses effective instruction, evaluating and revising school improvement, and evaluating professional development plans. A500 School Administration assesses a school vision project that requires reflection on best practices [1.5.f]. Educational leadership candidates in E536/S655 Supervision of Elementary/Secondary Schools research the instructional and leadership issues related to diverse learners as defined by NCLB. In A625/A627 Administration of Schools candidates design a teacher interview using research on teacher quality [1.5.g].

An important piece of summative data for professional knowledge and skills of education leadership candidates is positioned in 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 in E536/S655, a teacher interview project in A625/627/A653, a school budget presentation in A635, and a culture conversation in A608 are included in the portfolio as well as artifacts prepared during the practicum [1.5.h].

Program standard 7 of the educational leadership standards requires competencies and skills in technology. Candidates access the internet, critique a school's/district technology plan and demonstrate mastery of current technologies to manage school operations. Educational Leadership candidates design Power Point presentations, create Excel spread sheets, research web based publications, and during practicum log at least five hours using technology in administration [1.5.i].

Survey data are also 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 Spring 2004 (n=21) indicates that 76% of educational leadership respondents "agree" or "strongly agree" that IUS prepared them as a "technological leader," 86% "agree" or "strongly agree" that IUS prepared them as a "multicultural leader" [1.5.j]. Data from the counseling employer survey in 2005 (n=11) indicated on a 3.0 scale (3=proficient, 2-basic) employers rated "uses technology appropriate for counseling" and "social and cultural diversity skills" at 2.8. Data from the Themes Survey in Spring 2005 (n=54) indicates that 84% of the counseling and educational leadership respondents

“agree” or “strongly agree” that their program is “contributing to development of technology” [1.5.k].

Element 6: Dispositions for All Candidates

Candidates in initial and advanced programs are assessed on eight dispositions as identified in the conceptual framework under the theme of *caring professional* [1.6.a]. These eight dispositions are assessed formatively at the course level and summatively at transition points in initial and advanced programs. Assessment of dispositions has the same importance as other assessments such as GPA, portfolios, and PRAXIS scores. Candidates are assessed by university faculty and by field-based supervising teachers.

Unit candidates are advised of professional disposition expectations in materials distributed at admission and at various points throughout programs [1.6.b]. Dispositions are addressed in course conferences and interviews with individual instructors and/or the program teams. Program faculty utilize remediation plans for individual candidate disposition growth when appropriate to do so [1.6.c].

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 also used to obtain information about program effectiveness regarding dispositions.

Beginning candidates taking H340 Education and American Culture sign a code of ethics document prior to their first field experience [1.6.d]. Dispositions related to teaching and learning are assessed through reflective journal writing and field experience logs [1.6.e]. **Table 29** indicates H340 assigned school supervising teacher assessments as “proficient” or “basic” as an indication of initial disposition readiness for initial teacher preparation:

Table 29: H340 Disposition Assessment

Disposition Areas Assessed (12 sections)	Fall 04 (n=173)	Spring 05 (n=184)
Respects legal and ethical norms and values of education	93%	91%
Exhibits appropriate personal management behaviors	99%	99%
Exhibits enthusiasm for teaching	99%	96%

Source: SOE 0222Rev 000

Elementary BSED candidate disposition data has been systematically collected and reviewed at transition points SDPII and SDIV beginning in Spring 2002 [1.6.f]. **Table 30** indicates overall “acceptable” combined ratings of dispositions by university faculty and school supervising teachers for 2004-2005:

Table 30: Elementary BSED Disposition Assessment at SDPII/SDPIV

SDP Disposition Review	Fall 04	Acceptable	Spring 05	Acceptable
SDPII (IUS Faculty)	(n=46)	98%	(n=30)	83%
SDPIV (P-12 Supervising Teacher)	(n=40)	98%	(n=30)	97%

Source: SOE 0058

Secondary BSED dispositions are reviewed prior to admission to the secondary program, at the conclusion of general methods, and at the conclusion of student teaching at SDPIV. The initial secondary education program has systematically collected dispositional data beginning Spring 2002. **Table 31** indicates overall “acceptable” ratings of dispositions by university faculty and school supervising teachers for 2004-2005:

Table 31: Secondary BSED Disposition Assessment

Spring 02	Spring 03	Spring 04	Spring 05
P-12 (n=38) 97%	P-12 (n=53) 96%	P-12 (n=65) 89%	P-12 (n=53) 87%
Faculty (n=36) 97%	Faculty (n=41) 100%	Faculty (n=63) 98%	Faculty (n=54) 98%

Source: SOE 0058

Surveys are also used to assess candidate dispositions. The Employer Survey conducted in 2005 (n=47) indicates that 89% of responding administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares novice teachers to “*be a caring professional*” [1.6.g]. **Table 32** represents the Themes Survey candidates “agree” or “strongly agree” response to #2 that their program makes a positive difference in their abilities to be a “*caring professional who is concerned about students, colleagues, and the community.*”

Table 32: BSED Candidate Response to Dispositions

Response to Item #2	Agree or Strongly Agree
Elementary (n=126)	95%
Secondary (n=94)	90%
Special Education (n=25)	92%

The Elementary Supervising Teacher Survey also informs unit and program operations regarding professional dispositions of candidates at the conclusion of student teaching [1.6.h]. Comments from the school supervising teachers are divided into two categories: strengths and weaknesses. Qualitative data reported about candidate dispositions include comments such as: “excellent,” “great,” “fulfills part of the characteristics needed,” “open-minded,” “knew appropriate interactions,” “very aware of dispositions,” “wonderful positive disposition with children and very professional with staff and parents, the mood or tone displayed was superb.” Weaknesses related to dispositions include comments such as: “needs to arrive a little earlier for the day and be prepared,” “appropriate dress,” “saying yes instead of yeah.” [1.6.i].

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 a *caring professional*. 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. Data has been aggregated with initial program candidates.

Before beginning the first field experience, successful candidates for special education BSED 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 [1.6.j].

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program are assessed on the eight dispositions outlined in the CF and a key element of *educators engaged in growth*. Assessment of *caring professionals* engage candidates in higher levels of application and self-assessment of dispositions both formatively and summatively at various points within each program. 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.

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program are licensed teachers and expected to exhibit appropriate teaching dispositions upon entrance to the program. Aligned to the NBPTS standards, advanced candidates are assessed on their abilities to reflect on disposition growth and areas for continued improvement at SDPI, SDPII, SDPIII, and SDPIV.

Admission at SDPI and at program completion of SDPIV requires advanced program candidates to self-assess dispositions. A 2003-2004 content analysis of SDPI data (n=147) indicates that candidates self-report “concerns” upon entering the program in professional dispositions involving personal management, a commitment to inquiry, and database decision making. A SDPII content analysis in 2003-2004 (n=13) indicates that candidates at SDPII self-reflect growth areas as professionalism, effective communication, and abilities to collect and analyze data and that time management is an on-going challenge. SDPII data on dispositions for 2004-2005 (n=37) indicate that 100% were assessed as “complete” on the writing project. However, 30% of those successfully completing SDPII were required to submit clarification of this writing. Additional clarification writing (14%) was required in areas of citing and explaining disposition strengths and weaknesses prior to program admission, anecdotal evidence of why disposition growth is connected to standards, and explaining areas of disposition growth that are hard to overcome and create conflict [1.6.k].

The program determined that candidate disposition writing assessment following the completion of all four core courses resulted in weak personal examinations and conclusions [1.6.l]. The SDPII disposition writing assessment requirement was modified in 2004 following the content analysis study. Beginning Fall 2004, candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program complete the disposition writing assessment in each core course (H520, J500, P507 and P510). A standardized rubric for each core course ensures consistency and fairness [1.6.m]. The disposition writing from the core courses are summatively reviewed at the completion of the core courses [1.6.n]. While a pilot survey of disposition growth conducted in 2003 showed small growth gains in pre- and post-assessment in the areas of enthusiasm and self-improvement, the program determined that the required core courses will continue to be used to assess SDPII disposition growth [1.6.o].

Elementary and secondary MSED candidates are also assessed on disposition growth at SDPIII, through the teacher as researcher project. SDPIII data from 2004-2005 (n=30)

indicates candidates completed the disposition components without resubmissions as follows: collaboration with others 100%, commitment to inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education 100%, commitment to data-based decision making and fair practices 86.7%, and continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement 100% (form SOE 0044)[1.6.p].

Surveys also document program effectiveness in advanced preparation regarding dispositions. Elementary and secondary MSED candidates responding to the Themes Survey in Spring 2005 (n=119) “agree” or “strongly” agree at 98% 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 (n=32) indicates that 94% of responding administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares advanced candidate teachers to “*be a caring professional*” [1.6.q].

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 [1.6.r].

School counseling uses formative assessments of dispositions as candidates move from SDPII and SDPIII during the first year of the clinical cohort. They are assessed in the second course G523 in the cohort and any concerns are followed with an individual conference and a remediation plan. Students receive another formative assessment in the first semester of field work (G524) and are evaluated by the site supervisor and university supervisor. In this same semester, students are evaluated by the instructor in G575 Multicultural Counseling. As candidates move from SDPIII to SDPIV, they are formatively assessed on dispositions by university and site supervisors in first semester of internship (G550). Any concerns become part of the candidate goals for second semester of internship. There were no disposition concerns at SDPIII or SDPIV for counseling candidates completing programs over the past four years (2002-2005) [1.6.s].

Educational leadership candidates are introduced to dispositions, standards, and portfolio requirements in A500 Introduction to Educational Leadership and A510 School-Community Relations. Educational leadership candidates learn about professional ethics as they pertain to school administration in A608 Legal Perspectives on Education. The program assesses candidate dispositions formatively in A653, A625/A627, A638, E536/S655 and A635. Summative assessments of dispositions are made at SDPIII and in A695 Practicum in Education Leadership. Candidates also write a self-reflection related to the dispositions as part of A695 [1.6.t]. In 2004-2005, 100% of educational leadership candidates at SDPIII (n=17) were assessed as “acceptable” on the overall rating of dispositions [1.6.u]. Educational leadership candidates evaluated in 2004-2005 at SDPIV (n=66) by P-12 educators rated candidates at 99% “acceptable” on dispositions.

Surveys assess program effectiveness on dispositions. Educational leadership practicum candidates are surveyed annually (2002-2005) and regularly self-assess proficiencies

such as “*sensitivity/diversity—in dealing with persons from different backgrounds*” as “exemplary” or “proficient” at greater than 90% [1.6.v]. The Themes Survey in 2005 (item #2) indicates that candidates in other school personnel programs “agree” or “strongly 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*” as reported in **Table 33**:

Table 33: Other School Personnel Candidate Response to Dispositions

Response to Item #2	Agree or Strongly Agree
Counseling (n=12)	92%
Ed Leadership (n =42)	100%

Element 7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

The unit strives to prepare candidates as *educators engaged in growth* who can positively impact student learning. Candidates are assessed on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support meaningful learning experiences for all students. These expectations are addressed in the conceptual framework themes. *High quality* addresses candidate ability to assess student learning through instruction. Candidate learning is connected to knowledge of content, pedagogy and assessments of developmental levels for adjustments in instruction necessary for *school renewal* initiatives to ensure that all students learn. The fourth theme, *multicultural society*, focuses on candidate knowledge about school environments that are motivational for student learning.

Initial Programs

In methods and educational psychology courses, initial BSED candidates learn assessment of student learning, use multiple assessments in planning, and adjust instruction based upon P-12 developmental levels and prior experience. Candidates implement lessons with P-12 students and analyze their effectiveness. Lesson plan formats and assessment rubrics provide evidence of candidate impact on student learning [1.7.a].

Elementary and special education BSED candidates have experiences throughout the five professional education blocks to learn about and apply the principles of *school renewal* involving assessment, of adjusting instruction to children’s developmental levels, and of providing a positive learning environment. These are all introduced in the educational psychology block (block 1), applied and practiced in the planning and teaching components of the general and specific methods blocks (blocks 2,3, and 4), and used proficiently in student teaching (block 5). Secondary BSED candidates learn about the teaching-learning process, instructional development, standardized testing and motivation and classroom management in Educational Psychology (P250).

Initial BSED 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 [1.7.b]. **Table 34** indicates combined ratings of “proficient” and “basic” by university and school supervising teachers in areas of student learning:

Table 34: Elementary and Secondary BSED Student Learning Assessment

Elementary Standards	Semester/Number/Proficient and Basic %		
(1g)Plans for authentic assessment both formative and summative	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	98%
	S04	(n=142)	94%
	F04	(n=102)	99%
	S05	(n=68)	97%
(2a) Creates a teaching environment of respect and rapport	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n-114)	98%
	S04	(n=142)	98%
	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	100%
(2d) Manages classroom procedures	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	100%
	S04	(n=142)	100%
	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	100%
(2e) Manages student behavior	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	100%
	S04	(n=142)	97%
	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	99%
(2f) Organizes physical space	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	99%
	S04	(n=142)	96%
	F04	(n=102)	97%
	S05	(n=68)	100%
(3d) Uses assessment of student learning to shape oral and/or written feedback to the students	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	100%
	S04	(n=142)	97%
	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	99%
(3e) Demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness while teaching	S03	(n=124)	*100%
	F03	(n=114)	100%
	S04	(n=142)	99%
	F04	(n=102)	100%
	S05	(n=68)	100%
(4b) Maintains accurate records	S03	(n=124)	*98%
	F03	(n=114)	92%
	S04	(n=142)	96%
	F04	(n=102)	93%
	S05	(n=68)	99%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0081

Secondary BSED Student Learning Assessment

Secondary Standards M480 (Form 0087)	Semester/Number Proficient or Basic %		
Standard 5 Classroom motivation and management skills	S02	(n=58)	*100%
	S03	(n=105)	*99%
	S04	(n=126)	96%
	S05	(n=108)	100%
Standard 8 Assessment of student learning	S02	(n=58)	*100%
	S03	(n=105)	*99%
	S04	(n=126)	98%
	S05	(n=108)	97%

*Includes exemplary ratings eliminated in later semesters.

Source: SOE 0087 Rev002

Candidates in the special education BSED program are assessed on student learning formatively and summatively. **Table 35** represents “exemplary” and “proficient” ratings involving student learning from school supervising teachers in M470 (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004) and “proficient” ratings (Fall 2004 and Spring 2005) for the special education BSED program:

Table 35: Special Education BSED Student Learning M470 Assessment

Standards M470	F03 (n=6)	S04 (n=5)	F04 (n=5)	S05 (n=3)
Interactions to students	100%	100%	80%	100%
Classroom mgt	80%	100%	80%	33%
Handling mgt problems	80%	100%	80%	66%

Source: SOE 0090 Rev003

Candidates in the special education BSED program are also assessed on student learning in K480 student teaching [1.7.c]. Candidates in Spring 2005 were rated as “proficient” or “basic” by 100% of special education supervising teachers on student learning standards; selects, administers and interprets formal and informal assessment; creates and maintains accurate records; and communicates assessment results (form SOE 0089).

Survey data is also utilized to evaluate program effectiveness in the area of learning for all students for elementary and secondary BSED candidates. Respondents of the Employer Survey in 2005 (n=47) “agree” or “strongly agree” at 98% that IUS prepares the novice teacher to be a *“high quality educator.”* Respondents to the Employer Survey in 2004 (n=31) indicate that 94% of administrators “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares novice teacher to *“demonstrate individual and group motivational strategies”* and 87% “agree” or “strongly agree” that IUS prepares novice teachers to *“prepare formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of the learner.”* The Technology Survey for Spring 2004 indicates that 95% of candidates indicated they were “well prepare” or “somewhat prepared” in the use of technology to *“facilitate P-12 student learning and/or skill development”* and 90% indicated “well prepared” or “somewhat prepared” to use technology to *“analyze achievement data for groups of P-12 students”* [1.7.d]. The Themes Survey of Spring 2005 (n=245) indicated that 92% of initial candidates “agree” or “strongly 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”*[1.7.e]

Advanced Program

Advanced candidates learn that *school renewal* involves all students learning within a *multicultural society*. Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program are assessed on *high quality* understanding 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.

Program reviews of goals data from candidates entering the program indicate that advanced candidates seek additional information about assessment as they complete their

programs [1.7.f]. Advanced candidates have numerous opportunities to extend and refine their skills in using student data to improve instruction and student learning through formative course assessments. The required P507 Testing in the Classroom includes assessments tools/procedures for their classroom use. H520 Education and Social Issues candidates complete a diversity project that includes pre and post assessment [1.7.g].

Other content, cognate and elective courses also include candidate assessment. In W551 Education and Psychology of the Gifted and Talented and W553 Methods and Materials for Gifted and Talented, advanced candidates create curriculum units which include criteria for judging the impact of teaching on student learning. Candidates in the advanced Special Education program complete projects that demonstrate impact on student learning while completing field work. In EDUC M550 a data-based decision making project requires candidates to plan, re-plan and plan again based on performance data of the students [1.7.h].

Summative assessments for the MSED SDPIII teacher as researcher project demonstrate candidate ability to accurately assess and analyze student learning and make adjustments to instruction [1.7.i]. **Table 36** indicates MSED 2004-2005 assessments of student learning at SDPIII:

Table 36: Elementary and Secondary MSED Student Learning SDPIII Assessment

Teacher as Researcher Inquiry Components	Percent Complete without Resubmissions (n=30)
Data analysis (pre and post testing results)	87%
Creation of safe, effective learning environments	100%
Projects coherent vision of education	100%

Source: SOE 0044

Surveys conducted with alumni and employers also inform the unit on program effectiveness in student learning. The Themes Survey Spring 2005 (n=119) indicated that 99% of advanced candidates “agree” or “strongly 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.*” The Recent Graduate Alumni Survey in Spring 2004 indicates that 98% of elementary and secondary MSED alumni “agree” or “strongly agree” that IU Southeast “*prepared them for this job*” [1.7.j]. **Table 37** indicates ratings on the Employer Survey in 2005 (n=32) as “agree” and “strongly agree” in five areas related to student learning:

Table 37: Elementary and Secondary MSED Student Learning Employer Assessment

Standards	%
Be a high quality educator	94%
Understand how students differ in their approaches to learning	90%
Demonstrate individual and group motivational strategies	97%
Prepare formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of the learner	88%
Apply classroom management procedures (rules, transitions, instructional groupings, materials, supplies)	95%

Element 8: Student Learning for Other Professional 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 [1.8.a].

Counseling program candidates consider the developmental levels of students and obtain experience in empirically based decisions. In G550 Internship in Counseling, candidates develop assessments based on individual interventions and prepare an individual counseling case report [1.8.b]. In G532 Group Counseling, candidates develop a case plan for a group of students and audiotape the sessions. They identify a “close the gap” project, design a set of strategies, implement them and assess the impact on student learning [1.8.c]. A final project and portfolio are completed as the culmination of SDPIV. **Table 38** indicates SDPIV rated as “complete” with cohorts completing programs in 2004 and 2005:

Table 38: Counseling MSSED SDPIV Completion Rates

Year	(cohort number)	Completion Rate
2003	(n=14)	100%
2004	(n=14)	100%
2005	(n=12)	92%

Source: SOE 0125

In the educational leadership program candidates study school data and write and critique a school improvement plan [1.8.d]. In A625/A627, A638, A653 and E536/S655 candidates analyze test results and determine effective instructional leadership strategies [1.8.e]. In A638, candidates use data to develop spreadsheets to prepare a school improvement plan [1.8.f]. Standards 1-6 and 8 assess candidate abilities to promote the success of all students with 100% of 2004-2005 candidates rated as “proficient” or “basic” on these standards.

Surveys are also used to evaluate program effectiveness in student learning for other school personnel. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 (n=55) indicated that 95% of counseling and educational leadership candidates “agree” or “strongly 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*” [1.8.g]. The Recent Graduate Alumni Survey in Spring 2004 (n=11) indicates that 91% of counseling alumni “agree” and “strongly agree” that “*IU Southeast education prepared you for this job*” [1.8.h]. Educational leadership practicum candidates are surveyed annually (2002-2005) and consistently self-assess proficiencies such as “*problem analysis--to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information*” and “*motivational leadership—ability to get others involved in problem-solving situations*” as “exemplary” or “proficient” at greater than 90% [1.8.i]. The counseling employer survey in 2005 (n=11) indicates that 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 on a rating scale of 3=proficient and 2=basic [1.8.j].

In summary, the unit prepares candidates to work effectively in schools as teachers and other professional school personnel. Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 2: Program Assessment and Unit Capacity

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

Introduction

The IUS School of Education's Unit Assessment System (UAS) is a process to collect, organize, maintain, analyze and utilize candidate enrollment, demographic and performance data for individual candidate assessment and improvement, as well as to monitor programs within the unit programs. The development of the assessment system has evolved with stakeholder involvement over several years and continues to be reviewed and modified through annual cycles of review. The assessment system was designed to assess candidates on **high quality, caring dispositions**, and on their abilities to engage in **school renewal** and to work effectively in a **multicultural society**. The UAS is monitored by the PAUE Quality team. Minutes are archived and provide additional information about the work of this group

Element 1: Assessment System

The unit began implementing the assessment transition plan in **2000-2001** to comply with NCATE 2000 standards and the new Indiana licensing standards. The unit engaged in a multi-year redesigning initiative for initial and advanced programs directed towards a performance-based assessment system with transition points and major assessments. The mission, goals, belief statements, themes, and dispositions were reviewed and aligned with one another. Programs engaged in curriculum audits and mapping to determine what program modifications would be needed. Program summative decision points (SDPs) and a unit rating system were developed. Electronic database systems were reviewed for campus network compatibility to track candidate progress through these major decision points and to monitor unit operations. Workdays and retreats were used to collaborate on the UAS plan, program piloting, and the conceptual framework timeline [2.1.a].

One of the first transition initiatives in **2001-2002** was to approve the revised CF to reflect changes in state licensing (Rules 2002) and NCATE 2000 standards. The unit delineated four themes (high quality educators, caring professionals, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society). The UAS was incorporated into the CF to ensure coherence and that program standards were aligned to the CF. Workdays and retreats were again used to transition the unit to the performance-based UAS [2.1.b].

An SOE assessment coordinator was appointed and released from teaching to direct and monitor the UAS and chair the newly formed assessment quality team. A part-time data

base coordinator was also hired in 2001 to work with the assessment coordinator to enter Scantron data and prepare aggregate and disaggregate data reports [2.1.c].

The SOE designed NCATE Quality Teams (Curriculum Development, Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation, Diversity, Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition, and Governance and Resources) to monitor coherence to the CF [2.1.d]. The Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation quality team (PAUE) responsibilities include:

- Oversee stakeholder involvement in the UAS.
- Ensure that the SOE CF themes are incorporated into programs through coursework and summative assessment points.
- Review major assessments for each program (dispositions, portfolios, etc.).
- Monitor processes for candidate review and remediation.
- Monitor the unit's study of rater reliability and candidate success indicators.
- Document and monitor data collection and systematic review of programs.
- Oversee the compliance of the UAS plan with Campus Assessment.
- Alert programs and dean when program assessment initiatives are out of compliance with the SOE Unit Assessment.
- Evaluate impact of changes and updates in NCATE and IPSB assessment guidelines and communicate such information to unit.

Unit programs engaged their program faculty in discussions about changes in standards and the transitioning assessment system. Stakeholder advisory groups (content faculty, program candidates, alumni and P-12 personnel) were instrumental in validating authentic teaching strategies and assessments for the performance-based system. Surveys were reviewed and revised to reflect the unit CF themes. Faculty participated in primary trait analysis training for designing assessment rubrics. Assessments were developed to address candidate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge, dispositions, and candidate impact on P-12 student learning [2.1.e]. The unit began communicating these standards and assessments to candidates.

The June 2002 IPSB Unit Assessment System Report documented the SOE plan for the assessment system that included the design for collecting, analyzing, summarizing, and using candidate assessment information [2.1. f]. Programs ensured the unit that multiple assessments were linked to the four themes of the conceptual framework and that these assessments reflected adherence to institutional, state, and national standards.

Membership for the campus Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) was redesigned so that each school could provide input into OIRA policies and procedures and the SOE Assessment Coordinator serves on this committee [2.1.g]. AAC and OIRA worked with SOE program teams to prepare and refine the electronic data forms for the collection and retrieval system for measuring candidate and program *educators engaged in growth*.

In **2002-2003** all elementary, secondary, and special education BSED program changes and the elementary and secondary MSED gifted and talented licensing area were reviewed through the IU Bloomington system. SOE programs continued piloting the assessment system with attention to the implementation of transition point assessments

and course-based performances directed towards measuring standards. The SOE rating system terminology was revised to permit better unit data aggregation [2.1.h]. The database coordinator position was upgraded to full-time. Program teams continued to engage their advisory groups to refine the assessment system. Annual reports provide additional documentation for the progress of 2002-2003 [2.1.i].

During **2003-2004**, the unit completed the second year towards implementing the assessment system plan. Programs reviewed ‘back mapping’ documents to better understand how standards were assessed and reviewed rater reliability to ensure fairness and accuracy. Programs worked to identify and eliminate redundancy in data collection. Trial runs for electronically compiled data and analyses were completed in Fall 2003 and shared with the appropriate stakeholder groups. The annual reporting timeline required modifications to align with developing campus initiatives. The Field Experiences and Clinical Practice team was added to the quality teams to ensure that the assessment system included field and clinical experiences and data collection mechanisms were planned for demographic information on field placements. By Spring 2004 the unit’s electronic-based data storage and retrieval system was operational. Raw data was entered onto Scantron rubrics by the data base coordinator to prepare tables and charts for data analyses utilizing Excel spreadsheets. Data reports were prepared primarily through the OIRA office [2.1.j].

During **2004-2005**, programs collaborated again with OIRA to ensure the AAC campus monitoring committee that program goals were assessed for program evaluation. Programs reviewed diversity and technology standards to document their inclusion into curricula and assessments. Training sessions were held for faculty on predictors of candidate success. PAUE reviewed program data collection and retrieval, program predictors of success, and syllabi documentation of how program standards were met. Data reports for 2003-2004 were prepared and shared with stakeholder groups in October [2.1.k]. Data reports were prepared primarily through the OIRA office with some coordinators preparing specific reports for their teams utilizing data stored in OIRA [2.1.l].

The unit assessment system is fully operational in **2005-2006**. Data are entered into the campus OIRA database and retrieved primarily by the data base coordinator. The first level of responsibility for monitoring the UAS resides with the School of Education faculty and professional staff. Designated program faculty and/or staff are responsible for ensuring that candidates and school supervising teachers complete the appropriate Scantron forms and that these forms are checked for accuracy and turned in to the unit assessment coordinator. Faculty and staff hold scheduled program meetings (coordinators and program faculty/staff), council meetings (program coordinators and SOE dean), faculty meetings (faculty, professional staff and SOE dean), quality team meetings (faculty and staff) and staff meetings (clerical and professional staff and SOE dean) where the assessment system is discussed. Program implementation of assessment initiatives are also discussed with program advisory stakeholder groups. SOE faculty, staff, and stakeholder groups oversee program compliance to the unit assessment system, and include assessment initiatives in their annual program goals and reporting [2.1.m].

The program advisory groups are instrumental to program reviews. Each SOE program maintains an advisory group composed of stakeholders specific to the licensure or concentration area. For example, the Special Education advisory group includes Special Education teachers, Special Education alumni, and a parent of a child with special needs. Program advisory groups meet several times each year to review program-specific assessment issues such as program data reports and proposed program and unit assessment changes. The unit engages these groups to ensure that program CF pedagogy, teaching strategies, and assessments are valid predictors of high quality professionals. Program teams confer with their advisory groups and use this information for further study and review. Some programs, such as counseling, use advisory group members to review individual candidate performance for summative decision making. Stakeholder groups from P-12 schools are a source of continuous feedback for the assessment system [2.1.n].

For example, at the Spring 2004 meeting of the special education advisory group, members discussed PRAXIS scores of applicants for the special education SEPB program. In response to the committee's decision, the program team encouraged continuation of the PRAXIS preparation pilot on campus, purchased more PRAXIS test study guides, and studied other IU campus initiatives to support candidates. During 2004, the elementary education advisory group reviewed a new version of the portfolio scoring guide while the Secondary team sought advisory group input for the 2.75 GPA change. The M.S. in Elementary and Secondary Education 2004-2005 advisory group reviewed SDPII content analysis data and recommended assessment revisions. The educational leadership advisory group discussed revisions of practicum activities in 2004-2005 and possible additional preparation needed for the higher SLLA score requirements [2.1.o].

Other professional community groups are convened by program teams at various times for purposes such as validating assessment instruments or strengthening evaluation reliability. For example, the undergraduate programs convened school supervising teacher groups to review assessment instruments. The undergraduate elementary education team involved several content faculty to prepare the design and implementation of the new diversity course. Additionally, three faculty members from the English department worked with elementary literacy faculty members in 2004 to design W300 Writing for Teachers. The secondary education program consulted with the English department on alternate writing courses and the elementary and secondary MSED program involved the English department in the development of rubrics for the summative decision point writing. The Diversity Quality Team established a separate board to review diversity issues with members from the community at large.

The Dean's Office also convenes advisory meetings with IUS deans, P-12 area school superintendents and other P-12 administrators, content faculty, and community members such as representatives from the NAACP, Metro United Way, and adjunct faculty. One group is the Council on the Preparation of Education Professionals (COPEP) which is composed of SOE and content faculty, and K-12 representatives. In Spring 2005, COPEP reviewed 2003-2004 PRAXIS scores and employer surveys and discussed strategies for increased content faculty involvement. The Spring 2005 Superintendent's Breakfast

included discussion on state initiatives involving Core 40 requirements. These endeavors allow the unit to inform our communities about the assessment initiatives and provide opportunities for P-12 and university administrators to address issues affecting their communities and the impact on student learning [2.1.p].

Major assessment changes are reviewed at program team and SOE Council meetings. The SOE Council determines if program assessment changes require review by an SOE team and/or vote by: 1) SOE faculty, 2) cross-discipline IUS Academic Policy Committee, 3) IUS Faculty Senate, 4) Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 5) IU system-wide Teacher Education Council, and/or 6) state licensing approval. Candidates are informed about changes in the assessment system in the IUS Bulletin, pre-admission program literature, at pre-admission advising sessions, in key courses within programs (such as H340 and A500), through group and individual advising at various times throughout programs, and in program handbooks. Candidates can access this information on the IUS SOE website with links to specific information such as the CF, mapping of standards, and examples of portfolio and SDP entries.

Assessment measures are used to determine admission, continuation in, and completion of programs. Formative and summative assessments, based on program standards, evaluate candidate performance within coursework as well as at transition points prior to and following field and clinical practice. Measures include assessments of dispositions as well as candidate data on standardized tests, grades, and grade point averages. Dispositions are assessed formatively within courses and at various summative decision points by all programs.

The unit utilizes a comprehensive evaluation system to monitor individual candidate performance and to improve SOE programs. Once admitted to a program of study, the first level of candidate assessment occurs at the course level. A wide variety of formative assessments are used within courses to evaluate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Performance-based assessments outline essential competencies for educators. Candidate performance emphasizes specific abilities and skills rather than the accumulation of course credit or other input measures. Formative assessments include traditional tests, portfolio requirements, individual and group presentations, reflective essays, lesson and unit planning activities, observations, case studies, and videotape-based skill evaluations. Rubrics, checklists and other tools assess candidate performance and specific feedback to candidates.

Formative assessments are prepared and administered by individual program faculty members who hold expertise in the area of instruction and/or by teams of faculty when several sections of a 'high stakes' course use multiple instructors. Course assessments are linked to the themes of the CF as well as to program standards. Continuous efforts are made for assessments to represent performance-based relevant activities related to the field for which the candidate is preparing.

The assessment tasks embedded within formative instruction prepare candidates for major summative decision points. Standards and assessments are communicated to candidates within syllabi, during information sessions, and through other printed materials. Many faculty utilize scoring guides and rubrics to ensure that formative assessments are clear and well articulated [2.1.q].

Dispositions are a key element of *educators engaged in growth*. Dispositions are included under the second CF theme of *caring professionals*. assessed at various points in programs. Faculty assess dispositions formatively within coursework. Dispositions are also reviewed at summative decision points within each program [2.1.r].

Summative reviews of individual candidates are conducted at transition points in initial and advanced programs following established program criteria for doing so. SDPI is used as the admission point. Candidates successfully progress through earlier summative decision points, successfully meeting all program standards, before a final summative decision is made to confer a license and/or grant a degree.

Detailed program tables outline the decision points for each program with specific criteria assessed at SDPs [2.1.s]. Summative candidate performance data, which are derived from a wide variety of sources at both the initial and advanced level, include subject content mastery, portfolio projects, essays, research projects, reflections, and other evidence of proficiencies, including state mandated licensure tests.

Summative decision making also includes school-based assessments. School-based assessments vary by program and include reviews such as: 1) textbooks and materials assessment, 2) audio and video tapes of field and clinical experiences. 3) critical analyses of teaching events, 4) case studies and vignettes, 5) assessments of candidate ability to assess student developmental learning, and 6) assessments of field and clinical decision making based on candidate content knowledge and the needs of individual students.

Individual candidate decision point data are reviewed by designated program faculty. Candidates are informed of their progress as they move through the assessment system and provided due process procedures to contest decision making [2.1.t]. **Tables 39 and 40** provide an overview of the unit's program summative decision point assessments:

Table 39: Summative Decision Point Overview for Initial and Advanced Programs

Assessment Forms And Criteria: Program & Decision Point Description:	G P A G r a d e s	H o u r s	C o u r s e R e s u l t s	D e g r e e s	E x t e r n a l A s s e s m e n t	D i s p o s i t i o n s	F i e l d R e s u l t s	P o r t f o l i o	P r o. S t a n d a r d s	R e c o m e n d a t i o n s	O t h e r A s s e s s m e n t	Decision Making
<u>BSED</u>												
<u>Elementary:</u>												
DP1 (admission)	Y	Y	Y							Y		Admission Committee
DP2 (general methods)	Y		Y			Y					Y	M310/311 Instructor
DP3 (adm. student teaching)	Y					Y	Y	Y			Y	Field Placement Coordinator
DP4 (exit program)	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Faculty Team
<u>Secondary:</u>												
DP1 (admission)	Y		Y		Y	Y				Y		Program Coordinator
DP2 (after P250/P255/M201)	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Program Coordinator
DP3 (after general methods)	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Content Coordinator
DP4 (exit program)	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Program Coordinator
<u>Special Education:</u>												
DP 1(admission)	Y	Y	Y							Y		Admission Committee
DP 2(exit general methods.)	Y		Y			Y			Y		Y	M310/311 Instructor
DP 2.5 (exit 1 st field exp.)	Y					Y	Y	Y				Course Instructor
DP3 (adm. student teaching)	Y									Y		Program Coordinator
DP4 (exit program)	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y			Program Coordinator
<u>MSED</u>												
<u>Elementary & Secondary*</u>												
DP1 (admission)	Y			Y		Y					Y	Program Coordinator
DP2 (complete core/18 hours)	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y	Program Coordinator
DP3 (research/30 hrs.)		Y				Y	Y		Y		Y	Faculty Assessment Reviewers
DP4 (graduation)	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y	Program Coordinator
<u>Post Baccalaureate</u>												
<u>Special Education SEPB</u>												
DP1 (admission)	Y			Y	Y					Y	Y	Program Coordinator
DP2 (exit 1 st field exp.)						Y	Y	Y				Course Instructor
DP3 (adm. to last field exp.)	Y								Y			Program Coordinator
DP4 (complete program)	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y			Program Coordinator

* Includes additional Teaching Licenses

Table 40: Summative Decision Point Overview for Other School Personnel

Assessment Forms And Criteria: Program & Decision Point Description:	G P A	H o u r s	C o u r s e R e s u l t s	D e g r e e	E x t e r n a l A s s e s s m e n t.	D i s p o s i t i o n s	F i e l d R e s u l t s	P o r t f o l i o	P r o. S t a n d a r d s	R e c o m m e n d a t i o n s	O t h e r A s s e s s m e n t	Decision Making
<i>Educational Leadership</i>												
DP1 (admission)	Y			Y						Y	Y	Program Coordinator
DP2 (adm. to practicum)	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y			Y	Program Coordinator
DP3 (courses completed)	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Program Team
DP4(recommend licensure)	Y				Y				Y			Program Coordinator
<i>Counseling MSED</i>												
DP1 (admission)	Y			Y								Program Coordinator
DP2 (admission to cohort)	Y		Y							Y	Y	Advisory Committee
DP3 (complete practicum)	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y		Y	Program Team
DP4 (graduation)	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Program Team

Summative decision point assessments are documented on Scantron scoring rubrics at both the initial and advanced levels. Summative decision point rubrics were initially developed in 2001-2002 and underwent modifications when programs deemed it necessary to do so [2.1.u].

The unit values the concept of the portfolio as both a process and a product at the initial and advanced levels. The portfolio, utilized for review at various stages in the candidate’s professional development, stimulates and strengthens reflection and practice. Portfolio requirements provide an overview of individual candidate effectiveness. Artifacts are linked to specific program standards.

Elementary education BSED candidates add specific items to their portfolios as they move through each ‘block.’ These materials are organized according to program standards which are aligned to INTASC and IPSB standards. For example, the resource unit in the elementary education general methods block is included in the portfolio to document the attainment of planning and preparation, while the behavior guidance video during the field placement for math/science methods represents program standards related to caring professions.

Secondary education BSED candidates complete portfolio requirements that are reviewed at three points in the program and organize the portfolio materials according to INTASC Standards. The final portfolio is evaluated by program coordinators for the specific academic discipline.

The special education BSED program uses a series of graduated portfolios to document evidence of meeting standards. Multiple portfolios are tailored to specific field experiences reflecting various service delivery models. These portfolios are evaluated by university supervisors.

The school counseling portfolio includes a school counseling program organization plan and the results of a ‘close the gap’ project carried out in the internship school. Educational Leadership candidates prepare portfolio artifacts collected over every course and the practicum, each tied to one or more program standards and assessed by a rubric.

Communication and reflection are strongly valued by the unit as skills needed for *school renewal* and heavily utilized in program portfolio assessments, research assignments, essay writing, journaling, discussion groups, and debates. Candidate abilities to communicate and reflect on personal and professional beliefs and practices are also assessed through written teaching philosophies and position papers on topics such as inclusion, cultural diversity, classroom motivation, and analyses of student learning. Candidates also engage in self-assessment by examining and reflecting on field and clinical experiences, disposition growth, and areas for continued growth as they move through programs [2.1.v].

Assessments used at formative and summative decision points are monitored by program teams. Program assessments undergo pilot testing, revisions and field trials. Rater training is utilized in “high-stakes” decision making. Programs train clinical and university faculty to ensure consistent and reliable ratings for high-stakes summative decision making. For example, assessment training for school supervising teachers and clinical supervisors in the undergraduate elementary education program occurs each semester. The special education program has a website dedicated to supervision. At the advanced level, the elementary and secondary MSED faculty have reviewed rating scores at summative decision points II and III [2.1.w].

Unit assessment reviews include the study of predictors of candidate success. Each initial and advanced program compiles benchmark descriptions and exemplars of candidate performance that serve as standards of comparison for evaluating quality [2.1.x]. Programs document that valid and reliable measures have been utilized to systematically determine how well candidate performance matches program expectations. Some programs, such as elementary BSED and the elementary and secondary MSED, use candidate exemplars as learning tools for other candidates and archive samples of assessments for faculty training. Programs maintain secured data on candidates who go through the formal petitioning process regarding a program decision or to lodge a formal complaint regarding grading or some other aspect related to the assessment system [2.1.y].

The PAUE team monitors program initiatives involving fairness, accuracy, and unit consistency of assessment procedures. PAUE calls for reports from programs to address these areas [2.1.z]. **Table 41** shows the process used to incorporate the CF and program changes to the unit:

Table 41: Program Revisions and Conceptual Framework

- Step 1:** Program examines data sources annually.
- Step 2:** Unit draws implications for Conceptual Framework and/or program standards from data.
- Step 3:** PAUE drafts revisions of Conceptual Framework and/or changes for program curriculum, experiences, or assessment with input from program faculty.
- Step 4:** Programs seek program stakeholder input to determine validity of proposed changes.
- Step 5:** Per policies of the SOE, campus, IU system, and IPSB, programs seek approval through appropriate governing bodies and submit needed revised assessment procedures to PAUE and database coordinator.
- Step 6:** Unit assessment coordinator works with OIRA to adjust data collection and retrieval system to reflect changes in annual program reports.
- Step 7:** Program teams inform candidates, stakeholder groups and other IUS units that disseminate candidate-level information and revise printed materials as needed.

Unit data are collected through the academic year and analyzed the following fall of each year and more often as needed. Annual aggregated data reports are prepared for review by the unit, program advisory groups, and the dean's advisory groups. The unit evaluation process also includes analyses of program recruitment, enrollment and completion data, as well as first year induction pass rates, surveys from alumni, employers, candidates, and applicants. Electronic databases are also utilized for unit-wide data in the form of faculty evaluations, information on candidate and faculty diversity, and unit leadership assessments to identify changes needed to improve operations. Candidate data, located on a secure drive that interfaces with the campus system, are retrieved by the database coordinator, the records officer, and program coordinators. The unit also maintains databases of budgets for each program in the unit, and stakeholder group contacts.

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Each program collects electronic Scantron data at the: (1) initial summative decision point for admission to the program, (2) summative decision point(s) for assessing progress of candidates within the program, and (3) final summative decision point prior to completion of the program. The program coordinator has responsibility for collecting the SDP data following established program procedures. Initial and advanced programs utilize one of two processes for summative decision making: a formula applied by the coordinator to candidate scores or sub-ratings to determine level of acceptability, or a review committee composed of members from the program team (and sometimes advisory group members from outside the SOE), who review independently and then compare ratings or collectively engage in 'holistic judgments' to determine level of acceptability [2.2.a].

Raw data Scantron forms, documenting evidence of individual candidate progress, are prepared for scanning by the program coordinator. The data sheets are bundled and routed through the unit assessment coordinator who reviews the raw data for omissions or scanning problems (i.e. torn or stapled pages). The unit assessment coordinator forwards the raw data to the data base

coordinator who scans the data using the OIRA electronic storage system. OIRA prepares program summative decision point data reports, generally during the summer. Summative data reports are used for the fall program and campus assessment reviews. The SOE data base coordinator or other designated clerical personnel compile formative data reports for programs, PAUE, or the SOE dean's office when requested to do so. Charts and tables provide an overview of the process for the annual program data review aligned to the campus assessment (AAC) initiative [2.2.b].

Data are annually compiled and analyzed to determine overall program success and areas in need of attention. After the 2002-2003 data reports were compiled and presented, it was determined that the 2003-2004 data reporting should occur earlier in the fall to accommodate the campus OIRA processing timelines and AAC campus reporting. PAUE requested that the 2004-2005 program reports (on 2003-2004 data) utilize a standardized format documenting SOE goals assessed, standards measured, assessment instruments used, procedures for administering, report of who reviewed the data, and program feedback regarding changes. Data collected in 2003-2004 were reviewed with stakeholder groups in early Fall 2004 and reports presented to the November 2004 faculty meeting [2.2.c]. PAUE analyzed the data reports for compliance, inconsistencies, and clarity in reporting [2.2.d]. Program assessment reports are due November 10 to the campus assessment committee (AAC).

Both internal and external sources of data are collected and reviewed by the SOE. Annual program reviews conducted in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 included data analyses such as: 1) candidate portfolio analyses, 2) rater reliability, 3) predictors of success, 4) external reviews of standardized testing, 4) dispositions analyses, and 5) other program-specific assessments [2.2.e]. In addition to individual candidate data which are assessed formatively and summatively by programs, other data is routinely collected and analyzed to inform the unit regarding quality of programs and candidates. Surveys are conducted and data reports shared with appropriate program, quality team, and advisory groups [2.2.f]. **Table 42** provides an overview of external data collection:

Table 42: SOE External Data Collection 2000-2005

Group Assessed	Elementary BSED	Secondary BSED	Special Education BSED/SEPB	Elem/Sec MSED	School Counseling MSED	Educational Leadership
Program Advisory Groups Informal Input (IC)	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05	Semester 02-03 03-04 04-05
Program Applicants Group Advising (IC)	Annually 03-04 04-05	Annually (Individual Advising)	Annually (Individual Advising)	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 03-04 04-05	Annually 03-04 04-05
Current Candidates Multi-Op Evals (IC)	Each Semester 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05					
Graduating Candidate Surveys (IC)	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 02-03 03-04 04-05
Employers of Recent Grads (M)	Annually 03-04 04-05	Annually 03-04 04-05	Annually 03-04 04-05	Biannually 04-05	Biannually 04-05	Biannually 04-05

P-12 Clinical Supervisors (H)	Each Semester 03-04 04-05	Annually 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05	Annually 04-05	*	Annually 03-04 04-05	Annually 04-05
Alumni 18-24 months out (M)	Biannually** 00-01 03-04	Biannually** 00-01 03-04	Biannually** 00-01 03-04	Biannually** 00-01 03-04	Biannually** 00-01 03-04	Biannually** 00-01 03-04

*Supervision assigned only for additional licensing areas requiring practicums.

** No survey in 02-03 during transition into new program.

IC = Survey conducted on campus in coursework/class.

M = Survey conducted by mail.

H = Survey hand delivered to respondent supervisors.

Program and quality teams compile and review additional ad hoc data from candidates for additional self-study when it is appropriate to do so. These ad hoc surveys are often initiated from the Dean's Office, prepared by the unit assessment coordinator, reviewed by the appropriate program and quality team, and distributed through coursework to candidates. Examples of ad hoc data collection since the last NCATE visit includes surveys involving technology, diversity, dispositions, graduate studies summer planning, H340 experiences, and CF themes. Data analyses for these data sources are handled similar to other data sources, i.e. reviewed by PAUE and by appropriate program and stakeholder groups.

If a program candidate is accepted on probation or under conditions, the program team reviews her/his interim progress. Summative decisions about candidate performance are 'high stake' evaluations and determine whether a candidate moves forward, requires additional remediation prior to advancing, or is discontinued from the program. All candidates receive written or verbal feedback regarding progress at major summative decision points. Program assessment rubrics include an area for qualitative comments and care is taken to accurately inform candidates regarding specific unsatisfactory performance.

The unit utilizes remediation and due process procedures. Denying continuance is based on a cumulative record of substandard performance. Programs follow detailed improvement and remediation plans [2.2.g], including formal procedures for candidates to petition and appeal decisions [2.2.h].

Candidate complaints, including those against faculty (when the accusation does not violate university policies), are initially handled by individual programs. More serious violations, covered under the IU Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct and accessed at <http://dsa.indiana.edu/Code/index.html> are handled through IUS Procedures found at http://www.ius.edu/StudentAffairs/pdf/IUSCode_2005.pdf. Programs review candidate complaints about program decisions, provide overviews to their respective program teams, and inform advisory groups of general findings [2.2.i].

Program personnel at the initial and advanced level record summative candidate data on electronic Scantron forms. Some programs also utilize Scantron data collection for program-specific formative data. Rubrics, rating sheets, and other data are compiled on hard copies when it is more efficient for programs to do so. Scantron data are collected and stored in Excel spreadsheets on limited-access network drives. Data are secured through the OIRA office and are confidentially maintained.

OIRA provides annual summative data analyses to programs and more frequently upon request. Once the data is electronically stored, it can be retrieved by the data base coordinator, or other designated program coordinators to study trends and prepare reviews. The unit assessment coordinator and the data base coordinator are in direct and routine contact with the OIRA and alert PAUE, program teams, and the Dean's Office when concerns arise.

Access to confidential candidate data is limited to unit program key personnel, the unit assessment coordinator, the SOE records officer, the database coordinator, and two individuals from OIRA. Data can be retrieved by the database coordinator, records office, and program coordinators to track the progress of individual candidates.

Program teams also request OIRA reports from individual summative decision points for additional program reviews. Analyses of such data are reported to stakeholder groups. Program teams, with consultation and input from stakeholder groups, propose revisions to programs. Program coordinators review SOE policies to determine what action must be taken to obtain approval for proposed revisions and forward to the appropriate level.

Candidates have traditionally been able to view their progress through the IU Care IUIS data-management system. The IU system has converted to the SIS (Student Information System) which utilizes vendor-delivered data management (PeopleSoft). PeopleSoft will track summative decision points and allow individual candidates to access their assessment progress [2.2.j].

The electronic campus-wide database collection system continues to involve review and revisions. The challenges at this point include aligning SOE documentation with the campus initiative and adapting to the new campus-wide Student Information System.

Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

The unit utilizes internal and external data to evaluate candidates, courses, programs, and clinical experiences. A fall review of the previous year's candidate program data begins at the faculty/staff retreat in August and concludes with advisory group, unit, and campus reviews in November. Each program advisory group engages in the program assessment review in early fall and provides input and guidance to program teams. The 'feedback loop' includes documentation of program changes based on the data reports. Programs document (through meeting minutes and SOE faculty meetings) the rationale and stakeholder involvement in program changes based on assessment reports.

Data collected (2003-2004) was analyzed by program stakeholder groups and reviewed by the unit faculty resulting in the following program changes:

- Based on data analysis, the elementary education BSED changed the questions on the student teacher and school supervising teacher survey and eliminated the use of the W131 grade because it was already used as part of the evaluative criteria at an earlier summative decision point. Data collected from a review of syllabi indicated that diversity was not consistently addressed in the program which led to a new diversity course. The Elementary Program strengthened the student teaching seminar with a more structured and consistent format and a 1-credit hour behavior management course [2.3.a].
- The secondary BSED reviewed two years of data from student teaching candidates that indicated a need for more information and knowledge about classroom management. This resulted in a mid-semester classroom management seminar for student teachers in Spring 2004 [2.3.b].

- Special education reviewed data from a summer fellowship project to revise portfolio requirements. Over a series of three semesters, the special education program adjusted its formative assessment to incorporate three rather than two practicum-specific portfolios. The program included additional preparation in school supervising paraprofessionals, using assistive technology, and now places stronger emphasis on behavior management in K205 [2.3.c].
- The elementary and secondary MSED program reviewed disposition and professional engagement surveys and will continue the SDPI and IV self-assessment of disposition requirement. A content analysis review of SDPII and III resulted in changes in data collection and rubric modifications [2.3.d].
- Counseling data identified a discrepancy between evaluations of individual counseling tapes by practicum and internship supervisors. The program reviewed data that led to further collaboration with internship supervisors and a rubric for scoring individual counseling tapes now used in a three-course sequence in the program (with higher expectations of candidate competency). The rubric was first used in Spring 2004 and there was a much closer correlation of scores [2.3.e].
- Aggregated data from ETS Leadership Series Institutional Report was used to modify the Educational Leadership assessment of ISLLC standards and Summative Decision Point II and III revisions. The program prepared clearer ratings for performance-based activities, established application deadlines to better monitor admission, and condensed information/application packets to make the assessment process more easily understood. A seminar was held to prepare for the test and a trend analysis of ISLLA was conducted. The program improved the emphasis of the CF and standards in A500 and A510 [2.3.f].

Predictors of Success Overview

The unit reviewed 2003-2004 data to identify indicators of success or failure for program candidates. PAUE reviewed each program's findings and found no clear unit correlation could be drawn between indicators and programs from 2003-2004 data.

- Elementary Education: The elementary team found patterns among the five candidates who failed in the program. Problems with H340, low GPA at SDP II, and dispositions issues were identified. The SDP II juncture holds promise as an effective indicator of candidate success or failure [2.3.g].
- Secondary Education: Data for program candidates were analyzed. Low GPA correlated with student teaching problems. Dispositions review points were modified. GPA requirements were increased from 2.5 to 2.75. Results of this change were analyzed with 2004-2005 data [2.3. h].
- Special Education: Special Education tied key factors influencing candidate success to each special education option (undergraduate, post-bac and second license options) to better understand the dynamics of admission requirements [2.3.i].
- Elementary and Secondary MSED: Adjustments to SDP II were implemented in Fall 2004 in the belief that these changes would be stronger predictors of candidate SDPII success. Content analysis of SDP III identified areas that needed better rubric descriptors. Predictors of candidate success at SDP IV included a GPA of 3.0 in all coursework, 36 hours of coursework (aligned to standards) completed, and self-assessment of dispositions and goals established upon entering the program [2.3.j].
- Counseling: The program was unable to draw any conclusions at this time. However it was noted that candidates who discontinued from the program left at the end of SDP III in the spring of the first cohort year. Eighty-seven percent of the candidates for the Counseling Program completed their degrees [2.3.k].

- Educational Leadership: With one candidate withdrawal in 2003-2004, the program noted that the candidate was admitted to the Educational Leadership program conditionally in Fall 2002 due to incomplete letters of recommendation. Based upon data reporting candidate success (ISLLC scores, completion of program) methods used to select initial candidates were verified as appropriate [2.3.1].

In summary, the unit has developed an assessment system, with initial and continuing input from stakeholder groups, including P-12 personnel. The assessment system is dynamic and evolving as the unit engages in continuous improvement in the preparation of *high quality, caring professionals* to engage in *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*.

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.

Introduction

Unit field and clinical experiences are developed, delivered, and evaluated in collaborative initiatives between SOE programs and service area professional school communities. Unit program faculty provide leadership involving state and national standards. School personnel validate the increasingly intensive school-based learning opportunities, assessment of candidate knowledge and application of skills, and provide on-going input into unit and program quality and improvements of field experiences. While candidates work to demonstrate performance-based skills centered on the CF themes of *high quality* and *caring professionals* engaged in *school renewal* within a *multicultural society*, the unit also recognizes that the ultimate stakeholders of field experiences are the P-12 students in these school settings.

Element 1: Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

P-12 teachers and administrators were instrumental in the assessment design of field and clinical experiences and program advisory groups continue their involvement in program revisions such as modifications to assessments, scoring rubrics, and portfolio requirements related to field and clinical experiences. Program teams and their advisory groups discuss and engage in decision making regarding field and clinical experiences. Program teams generally meet monthly while program advisory groups that include K-12 personnel meet several times each year. Program and advisory meetings include discussions and decision making on field and clinical components such as the validation of effectiveness of placement policies and assessment measures. These stakeholder groups ensure on-going collaboration and communication in efforts to continuously strengthen field and clinical experiences for candidates and the necessary relationships with the service area school partners [3.1.a]. Minutes are archived and provide additional information about roles and responsibilities with regard to field and clinical program development and delivery [3.1.b].

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

Initial Programs

Initial BSED program teams maintain close relationships with specific schools selected as models of best practices. Elementary education and special education candidates complete early field experiences in schools such as Mt. Tabor Elementary School (inclusion school), Galena Elementary School (extensive technology integration), Farnsley Middle School (extensive technology integration), and Coleridge Taylor Elementary School in Jefferson County Public Schools (large population of ESL students). Secondary education candidates complete field experiences in locations such as Jeffersonville High School and Hazelwood Middle School (diversity and high quality special needs programs), and New Albany High School (large offering of advanced courses).

The field placement coordinators work jointly with school administrators who are designated to collaborate with the IUS SOE field placement office to place student teachers in high quality classrooms appropriate to the licensing area. The special education program coordinator places candidates in special needs settings in collaboration with area special education directors to ensure that special education candidates have field and clinical experiences with high quality teachers at different developmental levels, with a variety of disabilities, and in a range of service delivery models.

The initial program stakeholder groups have been instrumental in decision making regarding field and clinical experiences in various ways. The initial elementary program advisory group was instrumental in developing the required diversity course and identifying new field placements with growing ENL populations. The secondary advisory group has been instrumental in assisting the program in decision making regarding raising program GPA requirements and revising course content [3.1.c].

Advanced Programs

The elementary and secondary MSED candidates complete field and clinical experiences in their school of employment, when applicable. The H520 Education and Social Issues 5-hour service learning project is completed outside of the school setting in respective communities. Advanced candidates, adding an additional license area, collaborate with program faculty and the field office coordinators for their practicum placements.

The elementary and secondary MSED program team engages its advisory group several times each year in decision making regarding design, delivery and assessment of clinical experiences. In 1999, prior to incorporating the teacher as research project into SDPIII of the assessment system, several area teachers in Jeffersonville (Indiana) piloted teacher research in their classrooms and disseminated their findings locally and nationally [3.1.d]. The graduate studies advisory group has reviewed SDPII and SDPIII data that resulted in 2004-2005 assessment modifications. Technology applications used in school settings have also been reviewed with the program advisory group [3.1.e].

Counseling MSED candidates complete G550 Internship in Counseling in the school of employment, when applicable. Candidates must have approval from the building administrator regarding required activities and time commitments [3.1.f]. The program coordinator places non-teaching candidates for longer internships in school settings in collaboration with experienced school counselors. Non-teaching candidates take additional coursework (P570 and K505) and have at least two years of recent experience working with K-12 youth prior to applying to the clinical cohort.

School-based counselors often provide additional input to the program team through biannual program advisory meetings. The program advisory group also includes the student services director for Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) who is working on the Education Trust Transforming School Counseling Initiative. Program faculty and JCPS counselors have made joint national presentations about how IUS prepares counselors to make advocacy leadership responsive to school achievement [3.1.g]. The counseling advisory group has helped faculty review field placement activities, develop new assignments, and redesign rubrics for assessing individual and group counseling tapes [3.1.h].

The A695 Practicum in School Administration is completed in candidate’s school of employment, when applicable, with approval from the school superintendent regarding activities and time commitment requirements. Area administrators serve on the program team’s advisory group that meets several times each year. The educational leadership advisory group has reviewed clinical practice data and provided recommendations for program improvement [3.1.i].

Element 2: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Field and clinical practices provide opportunities for program candidates to demonstrate proficiencies as outlined in the CF document and themes. Programs prepare candidates through a wide variety of sequenced field-based learning experiences. Field-based experiences are designed to assess multiple indicators of candidate performance and abilities to impact student learning. Performance on standards in field experiences are developed and then assessed collaboratively by P-12 educators and IUS faculty. Field and clinical guidelines regarding supervision and assessments are documented through handbooks, the IUS SOE website, and additional meetings and training sessions so that all stakeholders are informed of procedures and assessments. **Table 43** describes the field experiences and clinical practices required in each program:

Table 43: Field and Clinical Practice by Program

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 w/small groups, plan & teach two lessons (social studies &	M500 (Reading 2 & Student Teaching)—16	775 hrs.

	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.	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: 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	A695: 100+ hrs: serve on school committees, participate in community organizations, and administer school regulations. Total: 100 hrs.	150-160+hrs.

Initial Programs

The elementary, special education, and secondary BSED program designs include three or more field experiences prior to the clinical practice of student teaching. Candidates are placed in a variety of educational settings, to include racially and ethnically diverse populations, students with exceptionalities, and students at different developmental levels. The field and clinical experiences are constructed for initial candidates to take on increasing responsibilities to demonstrate competence for their professional roles as *educators engaged in growth* [3.2.a].

All initial BSED program applicants take H340 Education and American Culture prior to admission. This 30-hour field experience provides opportunities for candidates to understand the role of schools in society and to observe exemplary practices involving motivation, management, assessment, and content-specific teaching. Students experience urban teaching, attend board meetings, and observe and interview teachers [3.2.b].

Once admitted to initial programs, candidates in M201 Laboratory Field Experiences are engaged in a 30-hour focus on INTASC and Indiana teacher standards involving reflectivity on pedagogy, educational psychology, and child or adolescent development. Elementary and special education candidates study and apply motivation strategies, classroom management, and assessment while tutoring and working with small groups. Secondary candidates complete 30 hours in a middle school or junior high setting in a classroom based on their teaching major. Secondary BSED candidates observe and reflect on physical, emotional, social and cognitive development and gain experience teaching whole classes, small groups, and individual students [3.2.c].

In the social studies and language arts block, initial elementary BSED candidates maintain a reflective log on their practicum teaching (six sessions, six entries) and write reflections based on these as well as on a video self-critique (of their teaching) following program guidelines for the reflection logs [3.2.d]. In E341 Methods of Teaching Reading II (10 sessions in field placement), candidates teach and reflect on tutoring sessions and lesson design.

In secondary education M301 Laboratory Field Experiences, candidates complete a reflective writing assignment. In M452 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School English, candidates work with Farnsley Middle School students over a period of three months, paralleling the elementary education project at Farnsley [3.2.e].

Student teaching is the culminating clinical experience for BSED initial programs. In M425 Student Teaching in the Elementary School (16 weeks), M480 Student Teaching in the Secondary School (10 weeks), and K480 Supervised Teaching in Special Education (16 weeks), candidates become members of instructional teams in the schools and are active participants in professional decisions. Clinical school-based faculty are accomplished school professionals as indicated on survey results [3.2.f]. Student teaching candidates collect and analyze data and demonstrate effectiveness in improving student learning [3.2.g]. Summative assessments measure candidate performance in student teaching. Portfolios are submitted and assessed by program faculty during the student teaching semester [3.2.h].

Elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T) candidates also progress from observation to full teaching responsibilities, although T2T candidates experience more compact and intense field and clinical experience. T2T candidates meet the same program standards, including disposition evaluations, as their corresponding initial programs [3.2.i].

Elementary T2T field experiences include a 45-hour summer practicum in a rural, urban or suburban setting in which candidate work with large and small groups of students, observe developmental stages of students, and analyze social, cultural, ethnic and socioeconomic factors of students. Candidates complete a 90-hour fall practicum that includes reading and language arts methods, math methods, and the development of classroom management plans, management strategies, and organizational methods. Candidates complete a six-week spring field placement applying teaching and language arts strategies and 10 weeks in regular student teaching experiences.

Initial program special education BSED candidates complete the elementary education field experiences mentioned previously plus a full semester of student teaching split between two special education classrooms. In addition, candidates engage in three, graduated 90 clock hour practica in a variety of schools and service delivery models and with students of different ages and abilities [3.2.j]. Unless already employed as a special education teacher, post-bac initial license special education candidates complete 180 clock hours of practicum prior to 16 weeks of student teaching.

Each initial program has established criteria for the selection of clinical faculty [3.2.k]. Initial programs collect and maintain information on each school supervising teacher regarding degrees, years of experience, and license level to inform programs of accomplishments of school personnel [3.2.l]. The field experience quality team surveyed field and clinical supervisors in Spring 2005 and provided reports to the appropriate teams and programs [3.2.m]. Roles and responsibilities of the school partnerships are detailed in contracts housed in the field placement office [3.2.n].

As programs moved to performance-based assessments, advanced clinical faculty (both University and P-12) continue to be retrained for their roles as mentors and supervisors. Multiple assessments and raters necessitate rater training to ensure that assessment procedures are followed consistently. **Table 44** indicates the training provided with clinical supervisors in initial programs:

Table 44: Initial Program Clinical Supervisor Training

Elementary BSED	The undergraduate elementary education program and field office conduct a two-hour orientation/training session at the beginning of each semester for university supervisors and supervising teachers to review assessment documentation utilizing videos, handbooks, discussions and sample ratings. Two sessions are held for supervising teachers (one for experienced supervisors and one for new supervisors) with more comprehensive information for beginning supervisors.
Secondary BSED Secondary T2T	Program and field office provide supervisor training for consistency, clarification and understanding of standards and assessment measures.
Special Education BSED Special Education SEPB	Special Education faculty meet individually with field supervisors and use a program website to clarify expectations for supervisors regarding responsibilities and assessments.

Regular and continuous support is provided to student teachers. University supervisors of initial BSED and T2T program candidates make at least 5 visits during student teaching. The elementary team conducts 7-8 (one-hour) teaching seminars each semester to provide procedural information, problem solving and reflection activities, and 16 hours of classroom management activities [3.2.o]. The secondary program holds an orientation and final meeting for student teachers each spring. Secondary classroom supervisors and university supervisors hold on-site

building-level meetings several times during the semester. The special education program conducts an orientation at the beginning of each field experience for procedural information.

Technology is also utilized for communication among the university, the supervisors and candidates. Many university-based clinical faculty require candidates to use Oncourse (Indiana University's online course management system) to access field and clinical handbooks, announcements, course requirements, and portfolio evaluations. Clinical faculty also utilize e-mail communications, on-line assessments, websites, weblogs, web blogs, and electronic portfolios. The special education program has piloted several communication strategies utilizing technology in field placement supervision. These studies report continued variability in area school technology, administrative structures that slow technology utilization, and time constraints facing special needs teachers [3.2.p].

Feedback is sought each semester from classroom supervisors, university supervisors and candidates regarding the effectiveness of support and communication. This information is collected and reviewed by program teams and advisory groups [3.2.q]. The elementary program has systematically collected data from school supervising teachers since Fall 2001 to assess school supervising teacher satisfaction. The Supervising Teacher Survey in Spring 2005 (n=32) indicates that 94% of school supervising teachers "agree" or "strongly agree" that their experience as a school supervising teacher was satisfactory and 91% "agree" or "strongly agree" that they were satisfied with the assessment process for the teacher candidate (form SOE 0006).

The secondary BSED program utilizes qualitative feedback from classroom supervisors that has been systematically collected and reviewed annually. Secondary program changes based on this information include adding a classroom management seminar in Spring 2005 and moving a portfolio review from general methods to educational psychology.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the elementary and secondary MSED program are *educators engaged in growth* in field-based assignments incorporated into advanced coursework aligned to NBPTS standards and the CF. A 5-hour field-based service learning project is completed in H520 Education and Social Issues, which is taken within the first 18 hours of coursework. The project is completed in field settings such as homeless shelters, clothing banks, food kitchens and drug rehabilitation units. J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum requires candidates to evaluate and reflect on classroom curriculum and instruction. P510 Psychology in Teaching requires candidates to reflect on actual classroom/student situations dealing with student motivation and learning. Candidates in P507 design assessment measures to use in P-12 instruction [3.2.r].

Candidates complete the field-based capstone teacher as researcher inquiry project (SDPIII) no later than 30 hours into the program. Candidates prepare the project utilizing key components of the documentation required for National Board Certification. Candidates prepare a descriptive account of an inquiry-based problem statement involving a teaching/learning issue to be addressed, the context for the inquiry, a literature review related to the teaching practice under inquiry, a description of the application to teaching related to P-12 standards, the use of technology applications, collaboration with colleagues on the project, self-analysis of video, data analysis and reflection of the project [3.2.s]. Early development of the teacher as research project is prepared in core courses, such as J500 and P510, under the assistance of the course instructor. Assigned program faculty assessment advisors also meet individually with candidates requesting assistance as they develop and prepare SDP III documentation. Written feedback is provided to

candidates within several weeks of submitting the project regarding any additional required clarifications or omissions to the documentation [3.2.t].

Advanced candidates seeking additional teaching areas such as gifted education, special education, kindergarten, or middle school to their licenses also meet state licensing standards through practicum experiences [3.2.u]. For example, gifted and talented education includes a 3-credit hour, summer practicum in which candidates provide direct instruction to various developmental levels of high ability students under the supervision of university clinical faculty.

In the second year of the program, candidates in school counseling complete a 100-hour field experience, G524 Practicum in Counseling, involving individual counseling cases, group counseling experiences, and a school data report. When candidates successfully complete program requirements, they enter the third year culminating experience, G550 Internship in Counseling, which involves a 300-600 hour internship that includes completion of a multicultural counseling case, counseling an ENL student, career counseling, group counseling and classroom guidance. Each advanced program site supervisor and field experience candidate is visited by one of the full time faculty members early in the field placement to answer questions and go over the site supervision and field experience manual [3.2.v]. Counseling students receive weekly written feedback from site supervisors and meet with their university supervisor regularly for oral and written feedback. In addition, summary evaluations are reviewed by site and university supervisors with the candidates at the end of each field experience semester [3.3.w].

The educational leadership clinical experience includes a 100-hour practicum, A695 Practicum in School Administration, at the completion of five or more of the required graduate-level courses and successful completion of field-based and professional development projects. The practicum includes nine areas of proficiencies pertaining to the role of school principal and delineated through program standards and CF themes. Examples of practicum related activities include an interview of the principal on scheduling, school policies related to scenarios, and reviews of school achievement data to address diversity issues [3.2.x]. Candidates must log five hours of the practicum in the use of technology as an administrator. The educational leadership candidate is mentored by a certified building administrator approved by the superintendent and is supervised by educational leadership faculty. Qualities of a good mentor are listed in the practicum manual and the superintendent approves the placement. The university faculty supervisor meets with the candidate and mentor at the beginning and end of the practicum and as needed. The practicum manual is provided to the mentor prior to the practicum. Two seminars are provided for candidates on taking SLLA and Kentucky testing and other topics such as interviewing and developing a school safety plan.

The school supervising teachers assigned by the SOE and schools in advanced programs are accomplished school professionals who understand the importance of, and have the ability to engage in effective communication with candidates regarding instruction, supervision and assessment. As programs moved to performance-based assessments, both university and P-12 educators continue to be retrained for their roles as mentors and supervisors. The assessments during field-based experiences are designed to evaluate multiple indicators of candidates' performances and abilities to impact student learning. Attainment of program standards is documented through assessments completed by P-12 school supervising personnel in field placements and IUS faculty. Multiple assessments and raters necessitate rater training to ensure reliability. School supervising teachers for advanced programs are trained on the use of the assessment instruments and also provide feedback to the initial programs on the appropriateness

of the assessment activities and evaluations through advisory group and ad hoc meetings. **Table 45** provides an overview of training for advanced programs:

Table 45: Advanced Program Clinical Faculty Training

Elementary/ Secondary MSED	Graduate teaching faculty evaluate the dispositional and SDPIII teacher as researcher inquiry-based writing. Graduate faculty meet monthly as a team and often include scoring and rater issues. Assessment advisors meet at other times when necessary.
Counseling MSED	The coordinator visits each internship candidate and supervisor in the fall and reviews the supervision manual. Another faculty member visits each practicum student and supervisor to review the practicum supervision manual. Emails are also used to stay in contact with supervisors. (These visits are key to Kentucky placements as many of these supervisors, unlike the area Indiana supervisors, were not licensed through the IUS program.)
Ed Leadership	University supervisors hold individual sessions with school supervisors during their first meeting at the school setting. Candidates provide mentors with handbooks and materials prior to the meeting.

The evaluation of the unit’s advanced field and clinical experiences are integrated into the unit assessment system through the annual unit assessment review in which initial programs analyze and review data from the previous year with program advisory groups and report this information to the unit [3.2.y]. Additional input into the design and implementation of clinical experiences is documented through survey data.

Service area schools also participate in professional development with the unit. The unit strives to strengthen the quality of schools and educators in the service region through numerous *school renewal* initiatives. Collaborative grants, conducted with P-12 teachers in the IUS service area and often involving SOE and content faculty, impact both initial and advanced field and clinical experiences for SOE candidates and forge stronger links with school partnerships:

- Ameritech Electronic Enhancement of Supervision Project (EESP) (2000) provided area school special education practitioners and faculty with new understandings of the capabilities and limitations of using technology to provide communication between area rural schools and IUS.
- IPSB Reaching Standards by Retaining Teachers grant (2002-2003) piloted mentor teaching in Scott County to prepare master teachers to work more effectively with novice special education teachers, resulting in certified teachers facilitating mentor training in other area school corporations.
- Indiana Commission on Higher Education Middle School Grant (2003-2005) has provided New Albany Floyd County middle schools with stronger alignment to state P-12 standards.
- National Writing Project (2003-2005) advances writing and language arts skills with P-12 teachers in the service area.
- Indiana Commission on Higher Education Partnership Grant (2004-present) focuses on Indiana student standards with Scott County teachers and administrators.
- Transforming School Counseling partnership with Jefferson County Public Schools (2001-2004) was integrated school reform into counselor training.
- JCPS/IUS LEAD project (2005-2006) promises additional collaborative effort between Educational Leadership and JCPS schools [3.2.z].

Element 3: Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Candidates are placed in field and clinical practices where they have opportunities to engage with students from varying geographical areas who represent diversity in race/ethnicity, socioeconomic levels, and exceptionalities. An electronic Scantron form now collects specific

data on candidate placements as they move through respective field and clinical experiences to provide better assurance that candidates are prepared to help all students learn [3.3.a].

The unit has improved candidate opportunities to work in school settings with diverse students as a result of changing demographics in Southern Indiana and new relationships with the Louisville school community. The 2000 Census data indicates that two of the largest Indiana counties in the service area -- Clark and Floyd -- increased in non-white population by 50% between 1990 and 2000. Newly formed partnerships with the urban Louisville area schools also hold promise for SOE candidate engagement with diverse P-12 students.

Indiana's incidence of special education (2004-2005) P-12 students was 17.7% while schools in the IUS service area, such as New Albany-Floyd County Consolidated Schools and Greater Clark County Schools are reporting 18.6% and 21.3% respectively. Because Indiana has diminished its reliance on pull-out special education services, IUS candidates have many opportunities to work with students with exceptional needs. Specific focus on exceptional needs occurs in the educational psychology block for elementary and special education, and in educational psychology general methods and student teaching for secondary candidates.

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 [3.3.b].

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. A survey of candidates completing H340 in 2005 included comments from candidates such as, "*I learned the most by doing my field experience at the inner city schools*".... "*I saw how students differ and how teachers can also differ.*"

The initial elementary, secondary, and special education programs incorporate H340 school-based assessments for decision making in SDPI. As many as 50 BSED initial elementary candidates (2-5 special education) move as a cohort group through each decision point. General methods for elementary and special education BSED candidates include 30 hours of experience in diverse school sites. 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 conducts SDPII reviews following general methods. SDPIII 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 5 standards involving planning, classroom environment, effective teaching strategies, professionalism, and application of elementary K-6 standards. Candidates complete programs with high evaluations. For example, Spring 2005 field-based clinical supervisors rated all candidates "proficient" on all five standards. Dispositions are

formally evaluated in M310 by university-based clinical supervisors for SDPII and by school-based clinical supervisors for SDP IV [3.3. c].

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). Feedback from assigned classroom teachers and university instructors in the laboratory/field experience in general methods plays an important role in completion of SDPII requirements. 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 [3.3.d]. 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 also assessed by the school supervising teacher, also at mid-term and at completion of the experience [3.3.e].

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 capstone clinical experience, 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 [3.3.f].

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 GPA 3.0 or higher for each course) [3.3.g].

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 [3.3.h]. 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 [3.3.i].

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 IIPSB standards is assessed by university and site supervisors in the first semester of internship and is used to set goals for *educators engaged in growth* for the second semester of internship [3.3.j].

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. Cohort groups (between 13-16) 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. Internship in Counseling (G550) is a two-semester, 6-credit hour, field experience taken in the fall and spring of the third year of the program. Internship candidates (number ranges between 12-16) 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.

All Counseling candidates complete a diverse placement. If their own school is not sufficiently diverse, candidates complete at least 25 hours in a diverse setting. (Diverse settings are defined as those with at least 20% racial/ethnic diversity, and 30% socio-economic diversity as reported on the school websites) [3.3.k].

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. Counseling candidates complete internship hours at all three developmental levels to qualify for the P-12 Indiana license [3.3.1].

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 the Practicum in Educational Leadership (A695). Practicum candidates (ranging from 15-30 per semester) 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, students 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% 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. The university supervisor is responsible for informing candidates of any concerns and developing a remediation plan as directed by program team guidelines [3.3.m]. Candidates demonstrate proficiency on state required assessments, dispositions, and 3.25 GPA for the license application at SDP IV.

In summary, the unit programs extensively use field experience and clinical practice that are designed and implemented in collaboration with its school partners. Candidates are evaluated by school supervisors and university faculty on their knowledge, skills and dispositions for **high quality** performance, dispositions of **caring professionals**, best practices that support **school renewal** for all learners, and purposeful placement in **multicultural** settings to help all students learn. Field practices were highlighted at the 2004 and 2005 share fair/student conference [3.3.n].

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.

Introduction

The IUS School of Education is committed to the preparation of candidates to ensure that all students can learn. The unit mission statement highlights the vision to prepare candidates for a diverse world and the CF commitment to diversity is found in theme four, **multicultural society**. The mission and the CF provide direction for a long-range commitment to diversity through the SOE Diversity Plan embedded into the SOE Strategic Plan. **Multicultural society** is a major CF focus of **educators engaged in growth**. The unit has experienced a renewed energy as a result of diversity infused into coursework, updated curriculum materials addressing diversity, new faculty representing diversity, and partnerships with schools experiencing diversity.

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. The SOE Diversity Plan is based on these beliefs:

- The future of society depends on the valuing and success of each person.
- Education is a life-long process that includes the creation of new avenues for learning, access, and opportunities for all people.
- Student success is possible when educators, stakeholders, and communities provide support, and address varied learning needs, as well as create an environment that values diversity, multicultural, and global education.
- As educators, we are more effective and productive when we respect and value cultural differences, and accept multicultural and global education as valid perspectives.

The SOE Diversity Plan contains four goals with objectives aligned to INTASC, NCATE, IPSB, and NBPTS standards. The goals cover four areas impacting the work of the unit and include:

- **Curriculum and Instruction:** All curricula, instructional resources, and clinical experiences utilized by the SOE reflect and support the development of the individual student with specific attention to the inclusion of diversity, pluralism, multicultural and global perspectives and strategies.
- **Educational Access, Recruitment, Participation, and Retention:** The SOE examines, addresses, and makes every effort to remove barriers within the SOE environment in order to create access, opportunity, and fairness for all students, faculty, and staff.
- **Culture, Climate, and Community Outreach:** The SOE improves the educational climate for candidates, staff, faculty and the surrounding community by fostering an environment that is pluralistic and inclusive.
- **Professional Development:** All SOE faculty and staff participate in professional development on a variety of issues relating to multicultural education, diversity, and global awareness.

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 CF diversity theme and to NCATE Standard 3. This quality team includes SOE faculty and convenes an advisory board which 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. Program teams have also focused efforts to increase the diversity of program advisory groups to accurately reflect the needs and perspectives of diverse populations within the service area.

Element 1: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Educational initiatives aimed at improving student learning are critical to IUS and the unit. Curricula as well as community and school-based experiences emphasize the importance of learning for all students. Diversity, as defined in the CF, includes race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, socioeconomic status, exceptionalities, religion, sexual orientation and geographical area. A consultant was hired in 1999-2001 to work with individual teaching faculty on integrating diversity into curricula [4.1.a]. Following a review of the CF by a second outside consultant in 2003, English as a New Language (ENL) was added to the knowledge and concepts of the CF [4.1.b].

Diversity knowledge bases are articulated through program standards and evaluated through assessment measures to ensure all candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions on diversity [4.1. c]. The AACTE diversity knowledge bases are utilized by the initial elementary,

elementary and secondary MSED, and educational leadership programs. Secondary education draws on the Banks framework and other sources. Special education utilizes standards from the Council for Exceptional Children and AACTE. Counseling incorporates the American Counseling Association standards. Diversity in course syllabi has been reviewed and diversity knowledge bases mapped within programs.

Coursework stresses diversity as a key element of the mission established by the unit. Initial candidates prepare to establish a classroom climate that values diversity and inclusiveness responding to the learning needs and exceptionalities of all individuals. Advanced programs refine educator skills and engage in new diversity theories and practices in the field. Coursework at the initial and advanced levels include elements of diversity and assessments involving group projects, presentations, service learning, and cultural immersion [4.1. d].

Three of the eight CF professional dispositions (# 1, 2, and 3) 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*” [4.1.e].

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. Candidates are also informed of requirements and expectations on diversity through course syllabi and program handbooks [4.1.f]. Programs assess candidate diversity knowledge, skills and dispositions using formative coursework and at summative decision points (SDPs) [4.1.g].

Initial Programs

IU Southeast 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 will complete two or more 3-hour diversity courses from a broad selection of campus coursework [4.1.h]. 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 increases to two or more diversity courses (English education majors complete three courses of world literature and language coursework beyond the two courses required of all secondary candidates and social studies majors complete a minimum of five diversity courses).

The course H340 Education and American Culture is completed by initial BSED candidates prior to SOE admission and 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 and on gender issues in the classroom, research-based approaches to individualizing instructions and readings and video presentations addressing Afro-centrism in schools. M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society, piloted in Spring 2004, is required in block 1 for elementary education. This

interdisciplinary course includes team teaching with content faculty from social sciences, and arts and letters. This course includes gender, world religions, world cultures, and sociology of education, service learning and research. Candidates are assessed through written responses to readings, journaling and reflection papers on tutoring and a research paper on critical policy issues on diversity education [4.1.i].

Block 2 of the elementary BSED program includes knowledge and skills directed at preparing candidates for culturally responsive teaching [4.1. j]. Block 3 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. Candidates use cultural instructional kits, create cultural resources, and develop an “adopt a country” project. They engage in E-pal activities with classrooms from around the globe, develop community service activities with diverse populations, and engage in various other processes conducive to increasing diversity and global awareness. Candidates in E325 are assessed on the inclusion of diversity and cultural resources contained in their unit and in their teaching. E339 Methods of Teaching Language Arts/E340 Methods of Teaching Reading incorporates multicultural children’s literature, and literacy initiatives related to ESL/ENL and other diverse learners. Candidates are evaluated on their abilities to address diversity in their planning, make adaptations for ENL students, and demonstrate inclusive and effective teaching [4.1.k].

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 [4.1.l].

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 [4.1. m]. Candidates’ knowledge and ability to use diversity content is assessed utilizing tests and writing assignments completed in M201 field experiences. In M314 General Methods for Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Teachers, diversity assessment includes presentations and reflective assignments addressing ENL, the needs of minority students, multiculturalism, and students with special needs. Secondary candidates also attend and reflect on a professional development session on diversity and its impact on teachers.

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; they 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. In M446 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Science, candidates apply multiple intelligences to develop lessons for a multicultural school environment. Candidates utilize the text, *Multicultural Science and Math Connection: Middle School Projects and Activities* to include science and math global activities and units. Candidates also address the concerns of new English Language Learners by

reading selections from *Learning English and Science*, a National Science Teachers Association publication. In M457 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Mathematics, candidates examine issues related to gender differences in learning mathematics, participate in daily read alouds with emphasis on minority authors and are assessed on their abilities to adapt instruction with attention to individual differences and multicultural integration. In M464 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Reading, candidates examine learning styles, modality strengths, the impact of poverty, and strategies for working with young adolescents in low socioeconomic groups. Candidates read and discuss literature written by minority authors, apply learning styles and multiple modality approaches to instruction, view and discuss videos on stereotyping, and learn strategies to foster caring communities in the classroom [4.1.n].

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. Candidates are challenged to look at diversity holistically and as multi-faceted. Initial candidates complete professional education block courses (except M300) with their peers in the elementary BSED program and meet the same diversity requirements as in that program. In K205 Introduction to Exceptional Children, emphasis is placed on definition, characteristics, and educational provisions within thirteen disability areas and the study of how race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and language, influence the under and overrepresentation of students in special education placements. The course K345 Academic and Behavioral Assessment of the Mildly Handicapped includes testing bias and impact of high stakes testing on students. K490 special topics (assistive technology, TBI, and autism) includes the history and impact of stereotypes [4.1.o].

Diversity experiences for T2T candidates are generally similar to the initial BSED programs. Elementary T2T candidates have a field experience at Farnsley Middle School. This 15 hour experience is designed for candidates to work with diverse student populations. T2T candidates also communicate via e-mail with their assigned students.

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. Candidates are provided feedback on their performances in the area of diversity directed at improving learning for all students at various points in programs, including each summative decision point evaluation. Feedback on fieldwork, according to a rating scale and with comments of the candidate performance regarding diversity, is regularly utilized by programs [4.1.p].

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% of M425 elementary education student teaching candidates and 98% of M480 secondary student teaching candidates scored “acceptable” (the highest rating) on combined dispositions #1, #2, and #3 as rated by P-12 educators [4.1.q].

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% that IUS “*prepares teachers to understand how students differ in their approaches to learning,*” at

75% “to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners,” and at 90% to “demonstrate positive relationships with school colleagues, parents, and the community” [4.1.r]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 indicated that 97% 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*”[4.1.s].

Advanced Programs

The elementary and secondary MSED program utilizes the AACTE Diversity Knowledge Bases. 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 3 candidates out of 52 (in 3 sections) scored below the ‘target’ 21 points on the assessment rubric for the H520 Diversity Project [4.1.t].

J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum incorporates multiple intelligences and effective teaching strategies for inclusive classrooms [4.1.u]. 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. Candidates in P507 Testing in the Classroom are assessed on methods to modify and adapt testing and assessment materials to meet individual student needs [4.1.v].

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. Approaches to encourage language development and integration of second language learners are incorporated into both E545 Advanced Study in the Teaching of Reading in the Elementary Schools and E549 Advanced Study in the Teaching of Language Arts in the Elementary Schools [4.1.w].

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 [4.1.x]. The MSED SDPIII teacher as researcher inquiry project focuses on meeting the needs of P-12 students. Teacher as researcher inquiry projects address the varying needs of students, accepting and adapting to difference in learning styles and individual capabilities, and facilitating learning for students with disabilities or with exceptional capabilities. Candidates often include research on multiple intelligences, differentiated curriculum, and motivation related to P-12 standards. Content analysis of SDP III writing samples indicate that the fourth CF theme of *multicultural society* is addressed through this field-based project [4.1.y]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 also indicate that 99% 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.”

School counseling candidates complete H520 Education and Social Issues as well as a counseling course, G575 Multicultural Counseling. G575 examines the skills and techniques for counseling in a multicultural society and candidates are assessed on a variety of experiential exercises in differently constructed groups, i.e. dyads, small groups and class discussion. For their primary reflection and analysis paper for G575, candidates review the American Counseling Association Standards and reflect on their knowledge and skills regarding multicultural competence and what they seek to learn about themselves with regard to diversity. This course also includes counseling techniques for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered youth and most recently ENL students, as the school counselor is often the person who advocates for these youth [4.1.z]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 also indicate that 91% of counseling 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”*[4.1.z.a] The educational leadership course, A500 Introduction to Educational Leadership, includes a diversity booklet assignment and scenario response. Candidates research and report on school practices and prepare plans for ensuring that all cultures are valued. Candidates complete a demographic analysis of their school. In A510, candidates develop a power structure analysis of a school’s community. In A608 Legal Perspectives on Education, candidates identify and reflect on court cases related to “culture clashes.” Instructors provide scenarios that demonstrate violations of student and parent rights in the areas of language, religion, special needs, and gender. Landmark court cases, with legal implications in regard to diverse populations, are used for developing awareness and understanding of discrimination and examination of Civil Rights implications. In A625 Administration of Elementary Schools, A627 Secondary School Administration, and A653 Organizational Context of Education, candidates read and discuss *Leading for Diversity* and identify effective school strategies. Candidates link these strategies to school demographics and complete reflective writing assignments. In A635, candidates analyze and reflect on Title I budgets. In A638, candidates establish a school improvement for a Title I school. In E536/S655, candidates research how leaders can impact NCLB subgroups [4.1.z.b]. Educational leadership candidates are summatively assessed at SDPIII on standard 8 on multicultural leadership. Practicum candidates surveyed in 2004-2005 self-assessed multicultural leadership as “proficient” or “basic” at 100% [4.1.z.c]. The Themes Survey in Spring 2005 also indicate that 98% of leadership 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”* [4.1.z.d].

Other initiatives [4.1.z.e] have taken place since the last NCATE visit that impact the implementation of diversity within the curriculum for initial and advanced programs:

- In coordination with the Professional Development Quality Team, faculty members have conducted brown bag lunch sessions for their SOE peers on research topics exploring ways of addressing diversity through the curriculum. Topics range from re-segregation, ENL, students with special needs, and experiences on multicultural curriculum. Minutes are archived and provide detailed information about activity.
- The Curriculum Resource Center in the campus library provides additional cultural resources for use in the classroom. The SOE is pro-active in identifying ENL curriculum materials and has systematically acquired professional literature and children’s books on topics regarding diversity and pluralism.

- A 2001 grant added 100 titles on peace and tolerance related issues in 2005 a Consulate of Mexico in Indianapolis donated 50 textbooks and children’s literature. Numerous other resources have been added to the Center for Cultural Resources in the library by international community members.
- The IUS Center for Cultural Resources (CCR) located in the IUS library houses more than 80 cultural kits that faculty, candidates, and area teachers utilize for teaching and learning about diversity and global themes (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 1.3). Through the years, faculty and candidates have created and enriched these cultural kits.
- SOE alumni and faculty hold board membership and one SOE faculty member is the current CCR president. SOE candidates often serve as CCR interns, and all elementary education candidates receive specific training on using the kits. Faculty and candidates showcased curriculum development materials during the Spring 2005 library open house, and introduced school and community stakeholders to these facilities.
- An ad-hoc committee was formed in 2003 to identify strategies for ENL program initiatives. Programs engaged in discussions on how to address ENL to respond to the CF theme of *school renewal* regarding English language acquisition. One of the results of these discussions was an application for campus academic excellence funding. “Responding to the Education Needs of our New Neighbors through Culturally Responsive Teachers” (abbreviated as “New Neighbors”) received funding to prepare pre-service and in-service teachers to effectively work with ENL students and involve new *school renewal* collaboration between SOE and School of Arts and Letters faculty.
- Faculty members report annually on the implementation of diversity teaching and learning in their courses, and often set goals for the following year on this area.
- A survey, conducted Fall 2004, regarding teaching concepts and practices addressing diversity was an important step in this area. The results indicated faculty infuse diversity in courses through lectures, activities, case studies, research, field experiences, and other teaching strategies. Responses on the Faculty Diversity Survey 2003-2004 using the Banks model of multiculturalism curriculum transformation and infusion indicate that faculty use an additive approach in teaching diversity, a transformational approach, and an action approach. Approximately 25% incorporate all three approaches.
- Unit programs completed curriculum mapping and content alignment.
- The design and successful implementation of the Explorations on Diversity Education summer abroad project has opened new doors to dozens of candidates for a hands-on transformational experience in the area of diversity and global awareness. The project, in its fourth year, involves full immersion, teaching, research, service and reflection. Candidates spend several weeks in Ecuador developing firsthand learning experiences about cultures, school system and environment, teaching models, and learning a great deal about themselves as educators and as world citizens. Two SOE faculty have accompanied the facilitator and study groups. Returning candidates conduct numerous presentations on campus, at undergraduate research conferences, and at state, national and international professional meetings.
- Year-round campaigns now include active involvement of SOE candidates in gathering school supplies and equipment for rural communities in Ecuador and strengthened diversity and global education at IUS (SOE Diversity Plan 2.6), and partnerships with schools, grassroots, and international organizations involving the entire University and local community.

Element 2: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Candidates have opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, exceptionalities and religion in campus classrooms and in community P-12 schools. 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. SOE candidates engage in learning facilitated by faculty who represent and articulate African American, Asian, and Latin American experiences. Candidates working with faculty members from varied backgrounds receive firsthand learning experience on the process of adapting for diversity in the classroom.

The faculty at IUS has increased by 17% over the last seven years while minority representation has increased by 38% over this period and 20% over the last year. IUS minority faculty represent 16.1% of all assistant professors, slightly below the national representation of 17.8%. Minority representation at the associate professor rank has more than doubled over the last seven years to 10 members representing 21.3% of all associate professors at IUS. This representation exceeds the national representation of 14.9% 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% of all full professors are minority compared with 11.1% nationally. African American representation at the associate professor rank at IUS has doubled over the last seven years to four members representing 8.5% of all associate professors. This is above the national African American representation of 5.3%. Asian American representation among the faculty at IUS has increased by 71% over the last seven years and 33% over just last year to 12 faculty members representing 8.8% of the faculty. There is one Hispanic faculty member at IUS, representing .7% of the faculty and 2.1% of all associate professors. At the associate professor rank, Hispanic faculty account for 2.7% of all faculty nationally. There has been no Native American representation among the faculty at IUS since the last NCATE visit [4.2.a].

The SOE faculty is primarily European-American (85.7%) and African American (7.1%). Faculty 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. **Table 46** indicates the diversity of full-time faculty [4.2.b]:

Table 46: Diversity of Full Time SOE Faculty

Category	Fall 1999		Fall 2000		Fall 2001		Fall 2002		Fall 2003		Fall 2004	
	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 as increased steadily. Representing 38.7% 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% of the faculty at IUS, compared with 22.4% nationally. Similarly, women make up 40.4% of all associate professors at IUS, compared to 36.9% nationally. At the assistant professor rank women represent 48.4% of the faculty at IUS compared to 44.8% of all assistant professors nationally [4.2.c].

SOE faculty vitae indicate previous P-12 teaching experiences in a wide range of U.S. school settings (public and private, rural and urban, urban African American, urban Hispanic, and international schools). Several faculty members have extensive teaching, travel, and presentation experience outside the U.S. in Bulgaria, Canada, Central America, China, Ecuador, France, Germany, India, Japan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, and Spain. All these experiences enhance the multiple perspectives that benefit candidate understanding of the complexity of diversity as described in the CF. The SOE faculty also represent a wide range of previous P-12 teaching experiences with a variety of students (HeadStart, gifted, special education, and private) [4.2.d].

The local demographics represent a challenge to efforts in finding qualified minority faculty [4.2.e]. Oftentimes, one or more sections of a course will be taught by minority faculty who contribute to the knowledge base for other faculty teaching the same course. For example, one or more sections of the required initial license course H340 and advanced license course H520 are routinely instructed by African Americans who hold full-time employment in other school settings. **Table 47** indicates the diversity of adjunct faculty:

Table 47: Diversity of Adjunct SOE Faculty

Category	Fall 1999		Fall 2000		Fall 2001		Fall 2002		Fall 2003		Fall 2004	
	n=	%										
Male	17	40.5	17	47.2	16	42.1	15	37.5	16	35.5	11	34
Female	25	59.5	19	52.7	22	57.9	25	62.5	29	64.5	21	66
TOTAL	42		36		38		40		45		32	
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
African American	3	7.1	3	8.3	1	2.6	1	2.5	2	4.4	3	9.4
European American	39	92.8	33	91.7	37	97.4	38	95.0	42	93.3	29	90.6
Foreign Latin American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foreign Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foreign Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.5	1	2.2	-	-
Total Minority & Internat'l	3	7.1	3	8.3	1	2.6	2	5.0	3	6.6	3	9.4

Faculty support the SOE Diversity Plan (Objective 1.2) by inviting international and minority guest speakers to present topics related to specific courses or broader educational issues and through collaborative presentations. For example, community and international speakers present current social trends and challenges in our service area communities through presentations on homelessness, child abuse, refugees, world religions, international education, and local law enforcement on drug and gang activity [4.2.f].

The unit also engages in joint efforts with IUS content faculty. Examples of these endeavors include the social studies unit that accompanies an exhibit on Native American heritage implemented by arts and letters faculty and students. The curriculum guide that accompanies a DVD on local historical research about the Underground Railroad developed by social sciences faculty in collaboration with a community organization is another example. The co-teaching of M300 described earlier is another positive example of concerted efforts with faculty from content fields [4.2.g].

Diversity in higher education is a challenge shared across the IUS schools. The unit, in collaboration with the campus, has worked to improve faculty diversity since the last NCATE visit [4.2.h]:

- A consultant was hired from 1999-2001 to identify a pool of SOE applicants for tenure-track positions.
- IUS has increased advertising and implemented a minority database list of future minority applicants.
- Tenure-track faculty positions have been advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Minority and Women Directory, The Chicago Tribune and newspapers such as the Louisville Courier Journal, Nashville Sun Times and Cincinnati Enquirer.
- All faculty candidate pools must be reviewed by the Equity and Diversity Office to ensure that faculty pools are diverse.
- An Indiana University initiative provides additional base resources to enhance salaries for hiring of minority faculty candidates.
- The campus provides in-service training sessions for new faculty before classes begin and during the first year of employment in efforts to enhance retention.
- The SOE has adopted questions related to the teaching of diversity used in candidate interviews.
- The SOE assigns a faculty mentor within the unit to new faculty to support instruction and guidance in preparing syllabi and other unit documentation.

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. Schools such as Farnsley Middle School, Goldsmith Elementary School and Coleridge Taylor Elementary (Kentucky), and Mt. Tabor, New Albany High School and Jeffersonville High School (Indiana) are examples of multicultural environments where candidates develop a wide range of field experiences in direct contact with diverse master teachers. At the Americana Community Center (Louisville) and at Mt. Tabor Elementary School candidates observe and work with ESL/ENL instructors who are minorities and/or represent different nationalities. Student teachers are increasingly placed in Louisville schools where school-based school supervising teachers are more diverse. Candidates participating in the Explorations (summer in Ecuador) have had opportunities to work with international teachers in public and private schools.

The tuition reciprocity agreement with three counties in Kentucky has brought closer relationships between IUS and Jefferson County Public Schools and increased opportunities to place candidates in urban Louisville with teachers who have considerable experience and expertise in working with diverse learners, many of whom are from minority groups, particularly African American. The Field Experience Quality Team reviews demographic survey information about K-12 teachers who work with the unit's candidates [4.2.i].

Element 3: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Candidate diversity in the IUS School of Education has fluctuated within the last three academic years (2002-2005) as follows: 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 socio-economic statuses. Many candidates are first generation college students [4.3.a].

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 IUS campus recruitment officer participates in SOE Diversity Quality Team meetings, and works intensively with the unit to attract more minority candidates from area high schools who can successfully complete program requirements for professional positions in schools [4.3.b]:

- The secondary BSED program has worked with high school students in Jeffersonville, Indiana, and Doss and Atherton High Schools in Louisville to build curriculum and educational experiences in the hopes that minority students in these schools will express interest in teacher education at IUS (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.1.3.). IUS is currently negotiating to offer graduates of the JCPS magnet program six college credits if they attend IUS and pursue teaching. There are five minority students in the JCPS program. IUS currently offers graduates of the Cadet Teaching program 1-credit hour for completing the Cadet Teaching Course at Jeff High Schools; that program currently has one minority student.
- The Field Experience and Clinical Practice Team reviewed the PLATO system and other learning tools to assist low-scoring candidates with preparation for PRAXIS testing. One faculty member has provided preparation workshops (started Fall 2003, serving over 100 candidates).
- The campus Mentoring Program pairs students to create positive relationships with volunteer faculty, staff and alumni.
- Focus groups involving minority students were convened by the IUS campus in Spring 2002, and elementary and secondary MSED program candidates in Spring 2004 (n=9). The focus groups reported a positive climate at IUS and provided additional suggestions for student social interactions.
- The Diversity Quality Team conducted a pilot survey with candidates from initial and advanced programs in 2003-2004. Encouraging results indicate that the SOE offers a pluralistic, inclusive, and welcoming environment. The survey was conducted again in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 with students attending entry and exit courses in each program.
- The Diversity Quality Team has worked with area schools on identifying more diverse student populations. They have worked with New Albany High School (NAHS) to explore additional options for working with diverse students. Charlestown Middle and Charleston High are also being reviewed.
- In Spring 2005 the quality team, the secondary education program, and representatives of NAHS discussed a mentoring program and a course carrying university credit for the school chapter of Cadet Teachers.
- A survey in Spring 2005 (n=98) identified only two minority (an African American and an Asian American) enrolled in H340, both of whom indicated they would continue into SOE programs.

Overall, the unit has undertaken numerous initiatives aimed at increasing the number of diverse candidates in its programs. Some results may not be seen in the short term but are expected to strengthen the diversity of candidates in the near future.

Element 4: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 School

According to data from the Indiana Department of Education, students with limited English in Indiana have increased approximately 150% 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 48** indicates the ENL student population increases in Southern Indiana schools:

Table 48: 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 in our area, but also to provide more opportunities for our candidates to work with ENL students within a changing *multicultural society*. Information has been gathered by the Field and Clinical Experience Quality Team during the 2004-2005 academic year regarding potential new ENL field placements to further support candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions with this population of learners [4.4.a].

Candidates in field and clinical experiences are placed in school settings where they will have opportunities to develop and practice their work with students representing diverse backgrounds. The Field Experience Quality Team has worked to more effectively document individual candidate field experiences utilizing the demographic data Scantron form [4.4.b]. The form was piloted in Spring 2004 and implemented in all programs in Fall 2004. Candidates complete a demographic documentation of each field and clinical placement. Candidates access the demographic information from the state websites. By documenting the demographic information regarding their placements, candidates use technology to become more knowledgeable about the demographics of their placements. Programs use the information to prepare trend data on minority populations occurring in area schools, including changes in the number of students with special needs, and those representing low socioeconomic backgrounds [4.4.c].

All initial program candidates complete one H340 field experience in a diverse setting, specifically in Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), Kentucky (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.4.). The 15 hours of diverse field experience required for the H340 takes place in urban schools with greater than 30% of racial diversity [4.4.d].

The elementary BSED candidates are placed in two diverse settings for the M301 practicum field experience corresponding to the required course, M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. The course has a minimum of five working sessions with children who have English as a second language. These sessions are in different settings and contexts: in local schools working one-on-one tutoring in coordination with the Language Minority Specialist of New Albany Floyd County Schools, one-on-one tutoring to students from different district schools who participate in the ESL program at Mt. Tabor Elementary School, and small group literature-based lessons for immigrant children attending the ESL program at the Americana Community Center. The course also includes visits to temples, mosques, and synagogues, and study trips to ethnic art exhibits. Additionally, M300 requires a service-learning component with diverse populations [4.4.e]. Candidates in M325 (social studies methods) choose a service project focused on tutoring for English new learners in local schools or at the Americana Community Center. This is one of three service projects for candidates at this stage of the program.

All candidates in block 1 (P250/P251/M201) of the elementary and special education BSED programs are assessed on pedagogical content standards in P-12 schools with special needs populations above 30%. As part of block 3 (social studies and language arts/reading methods) candidates tutor ENL students in area Indiana schools and Farnsley Middle School in Kentucky. Candidates in E339 Methods of Teaching Language Arts/E340 Methods of Teaching Reading are assigned to work with diverse students on student writing portfolios at Farnsley. The candidates assist Farnsley students on writing ideas/development, researching topics for feature articles, and improving language skills. Candidates meet face-to-face with the middle school students and correspond via e-mail to further support student writing abilities. Farnsley's non-white population is approximately 40%, and free and reduced lunch is above 60% [4.4.f]. Systematic collection and aggregation of demographic field and clinical placements began in Fall 2004. In Fall 2004, E339 candidates completed field experiences in a school setting with 27% non-white, 21% free and reduced lunch, and 10% special education elementary students. Candidates in E341 completed a field experience school setting with 24% non-white and 87% free and reduced lunch students. In Summer 2005, E341 candidates were placed in school settings with 24% non-white and 87% free and reduced lunch students [4.4.g].

In M425 Student Teaching in the Elementary School, the unit has made considerable progress in providing additional opportunities for experiences with diverse students since the last visit, particularly through agreements with Jefferson County Public Schools in Kentucky. Candidates are also placed in schools with high numbers of students with special needs and Title 1 schools.

Secondary BSED candidates in P250 General Education Psychology/P255 Educational Psychology for Middle and Secondary Teachers/M201 Laboratory Field Experience complete special education resource room assignments, interview a special education teacher, work with students with special needs, and complete a reflective writing assignment on how they will use what they have learned to meet the individual needs of students. Candidates completing the M201 field experience work with minority students for at least two periods, and complete a reflective writing assignment about adapting instruction to meet minority student interest and needs [4.4.h]. Data is collected on demographics for all placements for the secondary education program [4.4.i].

All secondary education candidates complete at least two field experiences in culturally diverse schools. In H340 all candidates complete a field experience in an urban school setting in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Secondary education candidates complete one of their M301 practicum field experiences at Jeffersonville High School, New Albany High School, or a Louisville area high school. The two high schools in Indiana are the most diverse high schools in Southeastern Indiana. New Albany High School's student population is 19% minority and 35% in the free or reduced lunch program. Jeffersonville High School's student population is 26% minority and 32% in the free or reduced lunch program. Both schools contain students from a variety of ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds as well as a range of students with special needs.

Special education BSED candidates in the undergraduate program experience the same diverse opportunities in Education and American Culture (H340) as Elementary and Secondary Education candidates. Candidates complete three 90-hour field experiences in classrooms with students exhibiting various disabilities. For example, a candidate completing practicum A could be placed at an elementary school working with students with mild mental disabilities and subsequently be placed in a high school to work with students with emotional disabilities in practicum B. Since students with high incidence disabilities are disproportionately from families in economic need, the majority of field experiences for special education candidates have experiences with students from poverty. Candidates also complete activities involving diversity as part of the field placement portfolio [4.4.j].

Advanced program candidates also have multiple opportunities to work with diverse students in a *multicultural society*. H520 Candidates complete a required service learning field experience outside their school settings, such as in homeless shelters, food kitchens, clothing banks, drug rehabilitation centers, etc. This field experience gives candidates first hand experiential knowledge on social issues impacting schooling today [4.4.k].

During internship, Counseling candidates not teaching in diverse schools are required to spend 25 hours in a school with at least 20% racial/ethnic diversity. The diversity school average for G550 candidates in Fall 2004 was 21% non-white students. The diversity school average for G550 candidates in Spring 2005 was 30% non-white students [4.4.l].

Many candidates in the Educational Leadership advanced program work in diverse settings and therefore have the opportunity to make connections between course content/activities and concrete ethnic, racial, cultural, and socio-economic realities. Practicum candidates are also required to complete a shadow experience in a second school to develop an understanding of the differences in school student populations from the assigned practicum experience school [4.4.m]. In summary, the unit has made significant progress in the area of diversity. The unit has experienced a renewed energy as a result of the CF focus on *multicultural society*. This theme can be found in diversity infused into coursework, updated curriculum materials addressing diversity, new faculty representing diversity, and partnerships with schools experiencing diversity.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best 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.

Introduction

The unit CF includes **high quality** as one of its four themes. This theme reflects the SOE mission of **educators engaged in growth**. Qualified faculty and staff are themselves educators engaged in growth who model **caring professional, school renewal** and **multicultural society**. The Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition Team monitors program compliance to Standard 5 for the unit. Quality team minutes are archived and provide additional information about the work of this group.

Element 1: Qualified Faculty

The 21 full-time tenure track professional education faculty members in Fall 2005 have earned doctorates in their education specialty. Five tenure-track faculty hold the rank of assistant professor and the remaining 16 hold the rank of associate or full professor. The eight full-time professional education lecturers have exceptional qualifications including advanced degrees in their specialty field, licensures, and accomplishments and recognitions in the areas they are assigned to teach [5.1.a]. All SOE professional education faculty have P-12 experiences and hold or have held teaching and/or administrative licenses [5.1.b].

Full-time faculty positions are filled utilizing a search committee made up of SOE and other content faculty and include K-12 personnel when the position involves extensive fieldwork. Applicants are interviewed by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the SOE, and the search committee. Applicants are often requested to make short presentations and/or demonstrate teaching in a classroom setting with actual SOE program candidates who provide feedback regarding the applicant's teaching abilities [5.1.c].

Full-time lecturers have been appointed to the SOE under the Indiana University Board of Trustees system-wide goal to reduce the number of adjunct faculty. The unit utilizes procedures similar to the review for tenure-track faculty positions. This initiative has resulted in the SOE acquiring highly qualified educators from our service area with exemplary experiences in school settings to be employed full-time by the unit. **Table 49** provides an overview of full-time faculty qualifications:

Table 49: Faculty Qualifications: Full Time

Highest Degree Earned	MS	MS +	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Number of Full Time Faculty	4	4	10	11

Rank	Full Professor	Associate	Assistant	Lecturer
Number	10	6	5	8

Date of employment at IUS	Before 1980	1980-1989	1990-1999	2000-2005
Number of Full Time Faculty	3	6	8	12

Number of P-12 years experience	<5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	>24
Number of Full Time Faculty	3	9	6	4	3	4

Number of years in Higher Education	<5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	>24
Number of Full Time Faculty	4	9	3	2	3	8

Number of Licenses Held During Career	1	2	3	4	>4
Number of Full Time Faculty	8	9	8	1	3

The unit employs adjuncts when: 1) full-time faculty loads necessitate doing so, 2) a workshop or course requires expertise not held by SOE faculty, or 3) faculty are awarded sabbaticals or grants that necessitate release time from teaching [5.1.d]. IUS has a policy on hiring adjunct faculty and the unit has implemented a procedure based on that policy [5.1.e]. Applicants for adjunct positions are selected based on letters of recommendation, coursework completed, vitae, and interviews. Credentials are reviewed by faculty in individual programs. Letters of recommendation are used to document outstanding performance as recognized by others in the profession. Transcripts document appropriate academic preparation for the position sought. Adjunct faculty appointments, reappointments, and reviews are outlined in the IUS Faculty Manual and the unit has an implementation procedure [5.1.f].

The SOE benefits from a cadre of excellent adjunct faculty who provide valuable practical perspectives and expertise. Most of these individuals have served the unit for a number of years and include practicing master teachers, curriculum directors, counselors, principals and superintendents. SOE candidates respect and profit from the practical application of educational theories and pedagogical skills that these adjuncts provide. Adjuncts often established a relationship with the unit through earlier collaborative projects: a principal who served as an exemplary mentor for an Educational Leadership candidate, an award-winning teacher who supervised student teachers, a highly respected P-12 special education coordinator. Other adjunct faculty bring expertise unique to the courses they teach. For example, the executive director of the Louisville Coalition for the Homeless teaches a Saturday workshop, E518/S512 Homeless and Migrant Families. The coordinator of a drug rehabilitation program teaches a Saturday workshop, E518/S512 Drug and Substance Abuse. A pre-school director with a terminal degree teaches E506 Curriculum in Early Childhood.

Adjunct teaching is monitored by the unit. Fall 1999 coursework was compared to Fall 2003 and Spring 2000 coursework compared to Spring 2004. The number of sections of courses for initial programs taught by full-time faculty increased from 61% to 74% for the fall and from 61% to 68% for the spring. The gains for advanced programs were from 53% to 58% for fall and 55% to 58% for spring [5.1.g].

It is important to the coherence and integrity of the programs in the unit to integrate adjunct faculty into the unit's information and communication network. Each adjunct faculty member is provided with SOE information and invited to orientation meetings and annual updates conducted by the SOE dean. Adjunct faculty are given full access to university e-mail services, full access to internet services through university computer labs, and full access to university library privileges.

The appropriate program coordinator, or designee, supports each new adjunct faculty member by examining syllabi, providing resources, and involving them in programmatic discussions when possible. Adjunct faculty often serve on program advisory committees, providing input into the program operations and assessment. Adjunct faculty are required to submit the electronic multi-op student evaluations of teaching. Aggregated data on candidate evaluations of adjunct faculty are reviewed by program coordinators and the dean [5.1.h].

The SOE clinical faculty who are assigned to field and clinical supervision responsibilities have prior experiences in educational settings such as P-12 teachers, principals, supervisors, counselors and central office staff. The majority of SOE faculty have field and/or clinical supervision as part of their assigned load. **Table 50** represents an overview of higher education clinical faculty:

Table 50: Higher Education Clinical Faculty 2004-2005 Summary

Number in Each Program	Elementary	Secondary	Special Education	Counseling	Leadership
Full Time	9	5	3	2	2
Adjunct	5	4	0	2	0

Types of Contemporary School Experiences	P12 Employment in Last 5 years	Participates/ Directs/ Coordinates Special Projects	Volunteers/ Services in Classrooms or Schools	Provides Training In Schools	Consults in Schools	Mentors in Schools
Full Time	2	17	6	8	5	7
Adjunct	6	2	4	0	0	0

Number of Years Supervising	<5	5-9	10-15	>15
Full Time	4	6	4	7
Adjunct	4	6	0	1

Number of Licenses Held During Career	1	2	3	4	>4
Full Time	3	8	2	5	3
Adjunct	4	3	4	0	0

Types of Supervision	Undergraduate Field Work	Initial Clinical Experience	Graduate Clinical
Full Time	7	14	4
Adjunct	0	9	2

Additional higher education clinical faculty are selected by the Office of Field Experiences for supervision when: 1) higher education clinical faculty are reassigned, and/or 2) when cohort numbers increase requiring additional supervisors. These supervisors have outstanding performance as recognized by others in the profession and appropriate academic preparation for the position for which they are employed. Tables also provide overviews of adjunct status university clinical supervisors [5.1.i].

School-based supervising teachers hold masters degrees, have experience in the area they supervise, and are licensed in the area they teach. The Field Placement Office verifies this information for the undergraduate programs by collaborating with service area administrators to select school supervising teachers who meet these requirements. Other school personnel programs work directly with school sites for appropriate field placements.

Element 2: Modeling Best Practices in Teaching

The campus has established broad guidelines for the criteria to be considered for tenure and promotion under teaching [5.2.a]. The SOE strongly believes that teacher educators must be excellent teachers themselves. “Evaluating students’ learning through short and long term feedback and making subsequent coursework revisions” is included in the unit’s definition of teaching in the criteria for tenure and promotion [5.2.b]. Reflection and documentation on course revisions are an expected element of faculty’s annual reports and discussed during faculty’s annual reviews with the SOE dean. The dean responds to the quality of teaching on the annual report forwarded to the VC of Academic Affairs. Full-time faculty teaching is also

reviewed by the unit School Review Committee (SRC) at the third and sixth year of teaching for tenure and also for promotion decision making [5.2.c].

SOE faculty demonstrate high quality levels of content knowledge. The first level of faculty content knowledge review is in the application and interview process described in Element 1 and in the IUS Faculty Manual [5.2.d]. Program coordinators complete a second level of review through the study of vitae and syllabi and discussing content knowledge with faculty before assigning teaching coursework.

The third review of faculty content knowledge is completed each semester. Candidates evaluate teaching faculty at the end of each semester using a 30-item, 5 point Likert-type multi-op rating system (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree). Content-related statements include, “*My instructor makes the subject interesting,*” “*Course assignments help in learning the subject matter,*” and “*Announced course objectives agree with what is taught*” [5.2.e]. Full-time faculty are permitted to select multi-op questions from a wide range of statements while adjunct faculty are required to use a standard set of questions [5.2.f]. The final content knowledge review is conducted within the annual faculty evaluation and tenure-promotion procedures at the third and sixth year.

Faculty reflect adherence to the conceptual framework in multiple ways. Programs have aligned coursework to the unit conceptual framework themes and to program standards based on best practices. A review of knowledge bases utilized in syllabi will reflect the historical perspective of the field as well as current research and findings. Additionally, syllabi reviews reflect that at least three of the four themes are incorporated into all syllabi [5.2.g].

High quality teaching is monitored by individual programs and SOE quality team initiatives through program and unit reviews of standardized testing, external surveys conducted with candidates and outside stakeholder groups, and internal reviews of program results. The second theme, **caring professional**, is monitored through specific items on the multi-op candidate evaluation of faculty [5.2.h]. The third theme, **school renewal**, is demonstrated by a current knowledge base as well as the inclusion of technology in courses as reflected in the course mapping of the technology standards.

The unit believes that its candidates must be prepared for professions in a diverse and **multicultural** world. Faculty are informed about diversity and address diversity topics including cultural awareness, New Language Learners, power relations, leadership and diversity, cultural diversity in literature genre, Supreme Court cases, values and culture, student alienation based upon racial/ethnic prejudice, and cultures and behavior [5.2.i]. These areas of diversity are further delineated on diversity mapping documents prepared by programs [5.2.j].

In Spring 2005 a survey was conducted to ascertain additional information on how faculty demonstrate they value candidate learning. Trend data reveals that faculty regularly review candidate evaluations (multi-op forms) and reflect on the feedback to make course adjustments to ensure learning. Faculty also demonstrate the importance of candidate learning through strategies such as individual candidate conferencing, class discussions, reviews of tests and assessments, reviews of re-teaching, analyzing pre-and post-test data, and reviews of project resubmissions [5.2.k]. SOE faculty are **educators engaged in growth**.

Full-time and adjunct faculty report that their teaching assignments and assessments encourage candidate reflective critical thinking and problem solving. Faculty engage candidates in

reflective writing assignments, applications of knowledge to authentic school settings, projects, and presentations; self-evaluation; and portfolio assignments [5.2.l].

All faculty report they use a variety of instructional strategies. The Spring 2005 survey confirmed that full-time faculty use at least 30 or more high quality teaching strategies (aligned to best practices of the conceptual framework) while 22 faculty use at least 40 different strategies. Adjunct faculty reported a range of 10-78 different teaching strategies. Strategies such as peer review of service learning and reflective listening promote the caring professional theme. Multicultural society is promoted by modeling multiple intelligence teaching and assessment strategies. The array of best practice modeling by SOE faculty promotes school renewal as faculty model instructional strategies such as collaborative and cooperative teaching practices to candidates who in turn utilize these practices in P-12 classrooms [5.2.m].

Full-time faculty address best practices teaching in the documentation of their annual reports [5.2.n] as well as evidence for excellence in teaching in their dossier for promotion and tenure [5.2.o]. Faculty use data sources such as peer reviews, candidate course and instructor multi-op evaluations, formative and summative written feedback from candidates, analysis of candidate assessments, unsolicited comments from candidates, analysis of candidate comments on field experience surveys, exit interviews, self reflection, and conference participation directed at teaching and learning. Adjunct faculty report that they use journals, feedback on daily instruction, course and instructor evaluations (multi-ops), written feedback, discussion with other faculty, candidate interviews, and self-reflection to assess their own teaching [5.2.p].

The Spring 2005 faculty survey also described the instructional use of technology such as: “Oncourse,” on-line library resources, state department of education websites, web blogging to revise writing, student data reports, an electronic portfolio, websites to support instruction, software to create student data reports, and tools to communicate information [5.2.q]. Several programs utilize technology mapping to further delineate where technology is embedded in coursework [5.2.r].

Faculty report the use of a variety of methods to assess the performance of candidates in formative evaluation of coursework. Twenty-one of 29 full-time faculty use rubrics; eleven use checklists; six use other types of forms; and eleven use portfolios. Fifteen report using other forms of assessment: tests and exams, journals, candidate interviews, and peer feedback on projects. Adjunct faculty report using rubrics, checklists, forms, and portfolios. Other forms of assessment include journals, presentations, and exams. Of the full-time clinical faculty, 12 use rubrics, 8 use checklists, 9 use forms, and 9 use portfolios. Additional forms of assessment include observations, feedback from the classroom teacher, reflection logs, videotapes, and discussions [5.2.s].

The campus and the SOE provide clear direction to SOE faculty regarding documentation of quality teaching [5.2.t]. The SOE recently strengthened its teaching guidelines and now requires an ‘outstanding’ rating for teaching from the SOE committee for a promotion and tenure recommendation. While peer review of teaching by SOE and/or content faculty was encouraged in the past, and often included in dossiers, the revised guidelines require peer review [5.2.u]. The campus Institute of Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE) office provides peer reviewers and training on the use of faculty as peer reviewers.

SOE faculty are also recognized as outstanding teachers by their university peers. Six SOE faculty have been named for outstanding university teaching to the Faculty Colloquium on

Excellence in Teaching (FACET). Six faculty are Trustee Teaching Awardees and two have received the Metroversity Teaching Award. Four faculty have received the IUS Distinguished Teaching Award, the highest award for teaching at IUS. One adjunct has received the IUS Distinguished Teaching Award for adjunct teaching [5.2.v].

The unit is also interested in how faculty display caring dispositions towards candidates. The Recent Graduate Alumni Spring 2004 survey (n=139) indicates that 90% “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*If I had to do over again, I would choose IU Southeast*” and 92% “agree” or “strongly agree” that “*the quality of teaching by faculty in my major was high*” [5.2.w].

Element 3: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

The campus has broad expectations for scholarship and each school on campus then develops specific guidelines for its faculty [5.3.a]. The SOE defines scholarship as the “*systematic inquiry or performance, attainment of a level of expertise, and communication of that expertise to others. An effective scholar has identified areas of expertise which are related to teaching and service, contribute to these areas through a systematic body of work, and share contributions with professionals beyond the campus.*” Applied research may involve policy studies, curricular development, the use of best teaching practices, parent involvement, helping schools obtain accreditation, and many other creative endeavors which expand the knowledge base in the education profession [5.3.b].

Evidence for scholarly activity for a promotion and tenure dossier includes publications, presentations at professional meetings, consultations, application of expertise to applied situations, in-service and professional development activities related to scholarship, and grants or awards applied for and/or received. Full-time tenure track faculty participate in scholarly work as defined by the unit.

Tenure track faculty are allocated 3 hours of reassigned time each semester for scholarly activity. This time is reviewed every third year by the SOE School Review Committee. Adjunct faculty also participate in scholarly activities to maintain their expertise [5.3.c]. **Table 51** and **52** categorizes the type and extent of scholarly work for full-time SOE faculty as outlined in IUS/SOE and by NCATE criteria:

Table 51: Faculty Scholarship 2000-2004 Based on IUS SOE Criteria

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

Table 52: Faculty Scholarship 2000-2004 Based on NCATE Criteria

Type of Scholarship	Number
Refereed 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

The unit's scholarly activity includes: counseling texts translated into six languages, an invitation to be one of 25 participants for the National School Counseling Research Summit, an invitation to teach in China, and an invitation to present at the Paris 2005 29th International Congress on Law and Mental Health Conference. Peer reviewed papers have been presented at state, regional and national levels of professional organizations such as: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Association of Teacher Educators, National Staff Development Council, and International Reading Association.

Element 4: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

As is true with scholarship, the campus has expectations for service and each academic unit on campus develops specific applications for their school [5.4.a]. The SOE defines service as "active involvement and leadership in: the School, the campus, the university system, and the external community." Additionally, service is defined as "the involvement and leadership in local, state, regional and national professional organizations related to one's discipline(s) and to the education profession" [5.4.b.] The service that faculty provide related to practice in P-12 schools includes, but is not limited to, the following examples:

- Consulting with schools on Even Start, school improvement strategies, curriculum development, and test data analysis;
- Providing inservice and professional development opportunities;
- Serving as judges in social studies contests, speech contests, history days, learning fairs, and science fairs;
- Assisting with issues related to special education regarding instruction and program management;
- Planning a local high school's concert tour to Ecuador;
- Mentoring across disciplines to improve the retention of novice teachers;
- Facilitating tutoring of ENL students in local schools;
- Serving as a grief counselor in local schools;
- Providing supervisor and mentor training for practicum supervisors;
- Participating in an "amigo program" at a local high school; and
- Assisting with the preparation of grant proposals.

In addition to the service provided to local P-12 schools, the faculty provide service to other levels and audiences including professional organizations. The education-related service includes, but is not limited to, the following: [5.4.c]:

Local:

- Conducting a focus group of parents to provide input to their school district on after-school programs;
- Sponsoring candidate professional organizations such as Kappa Delta Pi, Pi Lambda Theta, and Student Education Association;
- Serving as officers in local chapters of various education organizations and as key leaders for the local Phi Delta Kappa chapter;
- 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, the Carnegie Center, and the Cultural Resources Center which is housed in the IUS Library;
- Serving on the Success by Six pilot team; and
- Serving as a local member of a school corporation's board of education.

State:

- Serving as State NCATE review members in various capacities;

- Serving on state boards or committees such as the Kentucky Association of School Administrators, the Board of the Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, and the Indiana Reading Teacher; and
- Serving as state officers or committee chairs, such as the Indiana Middle Level Association Conference Planning Committee, the president of the Kentucky chapter of NAEYC, the president of the Indiana Counseling Association, the co-chair of the Indiana Professional Standards Board Licensure Review Committee, the coordinator of Social Studies Council of Excellence for Indiana, chair for the Regional Indiana Middle School Association Conference Committee, chair of the Future Reading Teacher Award, vice president of Association of Teacher Educators of Indiana, and vice president and president of the Association of Teacher Educators of Indiana.

National:

- Serving on the boards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the editorial board of the Journal of Reading Education;
- Serving as a committee chair of the Association for Specialists in Group Work and an interest chair for the American School Counseling Association;
- Serving as an article reviewer for the *Mathematics Teacher* and as a national conference planner for the National Council of the Teachers of English;
- Serving as a reviewer for national conferences;
- Serving as member of the AACTE Committee on Women’s Issues;
- Serving as a chair of ATE By-Laws Committee;
- Serving as a member of the AACTE Committee;
- Serving on ATE Resolutions Committee; and
- Serving in other capacities such as the national Teacher Educator Task Force to revise the NCSS National Standards for Social Studies, on the affiliate panel for the NAEYC, as an NCATE/NCSS SPA evaluator, and as a validator for NAEYC.

International:

- Participating in international travel study facilitating the exchange of culture between candidates/students and the donation of school supplies for the students;
- Facilitating programs to provide school materials to Ecuador through UNESCO;
- Designing the “International Curriculum” Model project for UNESCO, the Afro-American Center for Development and the Municipality of Esmeraldas; and
- Serving as an evaluator of Keiza Koho Fellowships.

Table 53 is an overview of faculty service [5.4.d] from 2000-2004 utilizing the unit’s approved criteria:

Table 53: Faculty Service Based upon SOE Criteria for Service

Type of Service	Full-time Faculty
Effective Membership of the University Community which Includes Active Participation in and Leadership : Committees	319
Effective Membership of the University Community which Includes Active Participation in and Leadership : Task Forces	8
Effective Membership of the University Community which Includes Active Participation in and Leadership : Projects	12
Active Participation in Professional Organizations through Attending Meetings and Participating in the Operations of the Organization	149
Active Participation in Professional Organizations through Serving in Leadership Positions	100
Effective Student and Academic Career Advising	14
Mentorship of Colleagues and Program Candidates	36

Support for Student Organizations and other Student Related Activities	41
Service to Local Schools	50
Service to Social Agencies, Governments, and other Community Organizations	47
Recognition of Service	7

Element 5: Collaboration

Unit faculty are involved in collaboration with others involved in education at a variety of levels [5.5.a]. **Table 54** reflects the various types of collaboration with content faculty, school faculty, and others as further evidence of *educators engaged in growth*:

Table 54: Faculty Collaboration

Arena	Examples of Collaboration
P-12 Schools	School Improvement Team member Writing and implementing grants Co-presenting at in-service training and professional development sessions Program/curriculum development and alignment IPSB Mentor Faculty Trainer External evaluator for P-12 school grants
Arts and Sciences	Membership on program advisory groups Science Olympiad State math contest Underground Railroad Curriculum Project Co-teaching M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society W300 Writing for Teachers Course Development with English Department Art Department assisted program Development and Conceptualization for Course for Elementary Majors ENL Academic Excellence Grant Proposal
Other Campus Units	New student orientation with the University Division Membership on campus committees and governance Campus search committees such as chancellor and librarians Participation in FACET Peer Mentor Program Membership and participation in FACET
Broader Professional Community	Writer for state standards in Guidance Curriculum IDOE I-Read external mentor KDE Reading First grant reader Bell South Superintendents Network Phi Delta Kappa Read Aloud Co-presenting at educational conferences Indiana Network of Schools Committee

In addition to listing specific collaboration activities, faculty report how collaboration is linked to improved teaching, candidate learning, and/or teacher education [5.5.b]. The following are examples and comments from faculty about several of the activities:

- Candidate Field Experiences and Clinical Work: “For initial candidates this was an opportunity to put their knowledge and skills into practice. Nearly all advanced candidates and initial candidates in the alternative program were full-time teachers who were observed in their own classrooms. These observations lead to on-the-spot consultations regarding their instruction and program management.”
- School Review and Improvement of Learning Committees: “Both committees involved cross-unit or cross-campus members that review dossiers including evidence on effective teaching. Feedback on the dossiers is provided to unit faculty to improve their teaching while awards are given to campus faculty for effective teaching.”
- Unit Design: “The work involved co-creating a curriculum unit with a third/fourth grade teacher which proved to be invaluable to both the teacher and the faculty member.”
- The IUS/Farnsley Middle School Partnership: “This project not only improves candidates’ abilities to teach writing but benefits the middle school students as they learn how to improve their writing abilities.”

- FACET: “It provides service across campus that impacts the improvement of faculty teaching through peer mentoring and workshops on improving teaching.”
- IPSB Teacher Mentor Training: “This training has prepared mentor teachers for Southern Indiana schools which will impact beginning teacher improvement of instruction and student learning.”

Element 6: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The process for full-time and adjunct faculty evaluation is described in the IUS Faculty Manual [5.6.a]. The Manual addresses reappointment and promotion and tenure providing general guidelines under teaching, scholarship and service. The SOE unit also has guidelines for the documentation of performance for teaching, scholarship, and service used by full-time faculty in the preparation of annual reviews and annual merit pay, third year unit reviews, tenure and promotion reviews during the sixth year for tenure and promotion, and for promotion to full professor [5.6.b].

Faculty prepare annual reports of accomplishments in teaching, scholarly activity and service, and set goals for improvement for the upcoming year [5.6.c]. The SOE dean holds a confidential meeting with each non-tenured faculty, including lecturers, in which the faculty report is reviewed. The SOE dean prepares a separate annual document of strengths and areas of improvement for each faculty member. The faculty member signs the review as having had an opportunity to discuss the contents with the SOE dean and the review is then forwarded to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Office. Adjunct faculty are reviewed by the program coordinators using the adjunct faculty members’ multi-op data prior to reassignments. **Table 55** provides an overview of full and adjunct faculty evaluations:

Table 55: Faculty Evaluation

Faculty	Unit Annual Report & Review	Unit Third Year Review	Unit and Campus Sixth Year Review	Unit and Campus Promotion to Full Professor	Unit Merit Pay	Elements Evaluated
Full-time Tenured	Yes			Yes	Yes	Teaching, Scholarship* & Service
Full-time Non-tenured	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Teaching, Scholarship & Service
Full-time Lecturer	Yes	Yes	Eligible		Yes	Teaching & Service
Adjunct	Yes					Teaching & Service

*Release time for scholarly work is reviewed every three years.

Each new full-time faculty member is assigned a mentor from the unit who mentors and facilitates discussions about best practice teaching strategies, scholarly projects, and service opportunities [5.6.d]. These mentors are instrumental in assisting new faculty in the preparation of annual reports as well as directing them towards additional professional development.

Since the previous NCATE visit, 5 tenure-track faculty have been promoted from assistant to associate professor and 2 tenure-track faculty have been promoted from associate to full professor [5.6.e].

Element 7: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Full-time and adjunct faculty participate in a variety of professional development activities that are offered by both the unit and the campus. Faculty also report professional development gained

through professional organizations at the local, regional, state, national, and international levels. The following table summarizes these activities as reported by faculty [5.7.a].

The unit provides professional development opportunities for faculty related to the unit’s conceptual framework, most often associated with the CF themes and most recently involving performance assessment, diversity, and technology. The Faculty Development Quality Team is given suggested topics from other quality or program teams related to faculty needs that are then prepared and presented through “Brown Bag Lunches.” The 2004-2005 Brown Bag topics included test bias, ENL, and exceptionalities. Professional development is gained through campus-wide and system-wide workshops aligned to areas of the campus strategic plan, such as diversity and criteria-based assessment. Professional local, state, regional and national conferences are also funded for professional development. To list the conference in the area of teaching on their annual report, faculty must link new learning to improvement in teaching. Examples include incorporating learning into new course materials, adding newly learned research into the course design, designing new activities or redesigning coursework based on professional development [5.7.b]. **Table 56** describes faculty participation in professional activities, over the past five years:

Table 56: Faculty Participation in Professional Development Activities

Professional Development Activities	Number of Full-Time Faculty Activities
Unit	44
Campus	48
Local	11
Regional	42
State	64
National	41
International	15

Over the previous three years faculty reported IUS participation mapped to the CF as described in **Table 57**:

Table 57: Faculty Professional Development Related to Conceptual Framework

Description	High Quality	Caring Professional	School Renewal	Multicultural Diversity	Performance Assessment	Technology
Brown Bag on ENL	*	*	*	*		
Brown Bag Teacher as Researcher	*		*		*	
Brown Bag Test Bias	*	*			*	
SOE Presentation on Ecuador Trip	*	*		*		
IUS Diversity Conference	*	*		*		
Faculty Diversity Seminar	*	*		*		
NCATE Self Study	*				*	*
Faculty Meetings				*	*	*
PeopleSoft Training	*	*	*			*
Oncourse Training	*	*	*			*
FACET Seminars on Performance Assess /Grading	*		*		*	
FACET Seminars on Critical Thinking/ Brain Compatible/ Questioning	*					
SOE Summer Retreat	*				*	
ILTE Faculty Learning Communities	*	*	*			*

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.

Introduction

The School of Education (SOE) at Indiana University Southeast 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 of *educators engaged in growth*. The unit governance and resources are committed to *high quality, caring professionals*, engaged in *continuous school renewal* within a *multicultural society*. The SOE is fortunate to have access to resources of a well-established university system, Indiana University, including one of the finest academic libraries in the world. Although IUS and the system are autonomous (within IU governance) they operate within a system-wide infrastructure.

The Indiana University Academic Handbook and the IUS Faculty Manual provide system-wide and campus administrative oversight. The IUS Strategic Plan (<http://www.ius.edu/aboutIUS/StrategicPlanningProject/>) was recently revised with committee membership from the SOE Dean and two SOE faculty.

The University Dean of Education at the Indiana University Bloomington campus is responsible for convening and facilitating at least four annual meetings of all the Schools of Education deans to discuss common issues, policies, and procedures. The IU Dean of Education also provides an evaluation of faculty relative to tenure but does not evaluate annual reviews or promotion. Changes in programs, degrees and courses have specific administrative paths at the unit, campus, system and state level.

The IU Education Council (composed of Education faculty representatives from education programs at all the IU campuses and chaired by the University Dean of Education) provides general curriculum oversight responsibilities for *high quality* curriculum as defined by its constitution and by-laws. Members meet two or more times each year to approve curricular issues pertaining to one or more of the campuses.

Given the foundation above, the unit is provided leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate *high quality* programs of study. The following descriptions focus primarily on SOE internal governance and resources available within the unit, on the IUS campus, and in the educational community. Standard 6 is monitored by the Governance and Resources Quality Team (GR). Quality team minutes are archived and provide additional information about the work of this group.

Element 1: Unit Leadership and Authority

The SOE Dean of Education assumes the leadership and authority for the unit. The dean serves as an administrative liaison with the IUS campus and the IU System. Program coordinators direct the work of assigned faculty in program design, implementation, and evaluation in accordance with unit assessment guidelines. The program coordinators serve on the SOE School Council in an advisory capacity to the Dean and assists in setting the agendas for faculty meetings and facilitating dissemination of information to program faculty [6.1.a].

To further insure shared leadership and authority, there are six quality teams composed of various program faculty and professional staff which are congruent with the six standards for NCATE [6.1.b]. Program and quality teams document annual goals aligned with the Unit's Strategic Plan, Diversity Plan, and CF. The NCATE Steering Committee, composed of quality team chairs, further coordinates the work of the quality teams [6.1.c]. Ad hoc committees are also formed for further input and study.

The SOE supports a Student Services/Field Placement Office with two full-time professional staff members and a full-time secretary. These individuals hold membership on program and quality teams, and work closely in the coordination and implementation of field and clinical standards, candidate progression through summative decision points related to field and clinical experience, certification, advising, and career and job placement.

These councils, committees, and teams refer concerns or issues to the appropriate group for further study or for the development of strategies relative to the issue. This structure allows the unit to effectively manage and coordinate *high quality* programs aligned to the CF and established standards. The SOE Policy Manual [6.1.d] is updated annually and contains archived information for a historical record. The Governance and Resource quality team monitors the unit for compliance to NCATE Standard 6.

The SOE provides additional mechanisms for collaboration between unit faculty, content faculty, and P-12 professional communities. Each program has an advisory committee whose members come from P-12 schools, the community, IUS content faculty, current candidates, and recent graduates of the program [6.1.e]. Each advisory committee meets during an academic year to review program practices, field and clinical assignments, assessment data, and other pertinent issues [6.1.f].

The Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP) was established in 2004 to coordinate input on the preparation of educators from other members of the professional community, including faculty from other disciplines. COPEP includes representatives from the schools of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts and Letters, and Business, selected SOE program coordinators, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and community representatives. The SOE dean also annually convenes other administrative groups such as P-12 superintendents and curriculum coordinators.

In an effort to recognize members of the educational community engaged in *school renewal* and provide outstanding guidance and service to the SOE, an annual awards reception is held [6.1.g]. Faculty, professional staff, and candidates nominate individuals, schools, or school corporations for the following areas: Community Contribution to Education, Friend of the School of Education, Outstanding School Partner, Outstanding Supervisors, and School of the Year. These awards support the SOE commitment to collaboration with groups outside the unit.

Admissions policies are described in the official *IUS bulletin* at <http://www.ius.edu.bulletin/bulletin2005-2007.pdf> and through SOE program brochures. The SOE Diversity Plan includes specific strategies for recruiting more minority and unrepresented groups from our *multicultural society*. Particular details regarding academic calendars, grading policies, and many other issues relative to academic success are available through the IUS and SOE websites, maintained through the Campus Media Services and an assigned SOE staff person.

Newly matriculated undergraduate candidates to IUS are assigned to the University Division (UD) for advisement <http://www.ius.edu/UD/>. A professional staff member in UD specializes in advising SOE candidates and maintains contact with program coordinators so updated information is relayed to candidates. Once accepted into the SOE, initial candidates in elementary and special education programs are assigned to program faculty advisors. Secondary education candidates have advisors assigned by content area. Special education faculty often co-advise candidates in UD who have expressed an interest in the program as a retention strategy that reflects the program’s goal of preparing more special education teachers for the region.

Group orientation sessions are held several times each year for advanced candidates interested in the elementary and secondary MSED program, counseling MSED or educational leadership. Attendees are provided information on admission guidelines, course offerings, grading policies, and the program assessment reviews. Advanced program candidates are also advised individually by the graduate advisors, assessment advisors, and program faculty.

SOE candidates may access additional information through the on-line website for the campus as well as links to the SOE. Additional services for candidates include personal counseling <http://www.ius.edu/UD/PersonalCounseling/>, disability services <http://www.ius.edu/UD/DisabilityServices/>, mentoring through the Center for Mentoring and Outreach <http://www.ius.edu/mentoring/>, financial assistance and academic support through Student Development at <http://www.ius.edu/SDC/>.

Element 2: Unit Budget

Budget allocations of the Unit permit faculty teaching, scholarship, and service to extend beyond the unit to P-12 schools. The SOE base budget has increased by 67% from 1999 to 2004, as shown by **Table 58**:

Table 58: Base Budget

Fiscal Year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Salaries for Faculty & Support Staff	\$1,545,266	\$1,774,477	\$1,972,919	\$2,097,014	\$2,449,094	\$2,598,043
General Expenses	\$ 78,518	\$ 104,518	\$ 103,768	\$ 103,768	\$ 125,069	\$ 120,069
Travel	\$ 12,525	\$ 12,625	\$ 14,125	\$ 14,125	\$ 14,125	\$ 13,217
Total	\$1,636,309	\$1,891,620	\$2,090,812	\$2,214,907	\$2,588,288	\$2,731,329

Since 1999, the SOE has received 68% more funding to hire additional full-time faculty and to increase salaries for faculty and staff. General expenses have increased 53% over the same time period. Whereas travel funds increased about 13% from 1999 to 2003, there has been about a 6.5% drop in travel funds from 2003 to 2004 due to state and institution budget constraints. Travel includes both faculty travel funds for professional development and allocations for travel to field placement assignments in P-12 education for all programs. Funding allows each full-time tenured-track faculty position to request up to three hours reassigned time per semester for scholarly endeavors [6.2.a].

SOE faculty actively pursue both internal and external funding, often aligned to CF themes of *school renewal* or *multicultural society*. Funding for faculty projects has more than doubled

over the past two academic calendar years. The campus ILTE has also provided \$2800 to the SOE faculty from 1999 to 2004 for faculty teaching and learning partnerships [6.2.b]. **Table 59** represents the increased level of internal and external support through grant activity since 2000:

Table 59: SOE Grant Activity

Academic Calendar Year	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
External Grants	\$161,207	\$153,386	\$435,357	\$367,695
Matching Funds	-0-	\$ 25,282	\$ 37,988	\$ 86,638
Internal Grants	\$ 2,626	\$ 9,916	\$ 7,900	\$ 15,900
Total	\$163,833	\$188,584	\$481,245	\$470,232

Technology is used to monitor the unit's budget operations. **Table 60** compares allocations of the SOE with other academic units at IUS:

Table 60: IUS Budget by School—Six-Year History

School	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Arts & Letters	\$2,411,464 (33) [5]	\$2,521,588 (36) [5]	\$2,799,014 (39) [5]	\$3,004,708 (40) [5]	\$3,156,991 (43) [5]	\$3,357,024 (41) [5]
Natural Science	\$2,522,204 (32) [3]	\$2,712,295 (36) [5]	\$3,160,028 (40) [5]	\$3,617,126 (43) [4]	\$3,860,182 (45) [4]	\$4,058,956 (43) [4]
Social Science	\$1,817,577 (24) [3]	\$1,868,898 (27) [3]	\$2,005,824 (26) [3]	\$2,059,146 (27) [3]	\$2,270,644 (28) [3]	\$2,366,296 (30) [3]
Business	\$2,769,475 (28) [5]	\$2,902,376 (28) [6]	\$2,996,089 (28) [6]	\$3,127,811 (28) [6]	\$3,338,878 (30) [6]	\$3,621,207 (32) [6]
Education	\$1,636,309 (22) [6]	\$1,891,620 (22) [5]	\$2,090,812 (23) [7]	\$2,214,907 (28) [7]	\$2,588,288 (28) [7]	\$2,731,329 (29) [6]
Nursing-BS	\$831,418 (12) [2]	\$933,654 (11) [2]	\$969,705 (11) [2]	\$1,004,958 (11) [2]	\$1,053,553 (12) [2]	\$1,073,066 (12) [2]
Totals	\$11,988,447	\$12,830,431	\$14,021,472	\$15,028,656	\$16,268,536	\$17,207,878

Note: number of full-time faculty in () and full-time staff in brackets []

Element 3: Personnel

University workload policy requires all faculty to carry a 1.0 FTE semester load (the equivalent of 12-credit hours). However, tenure-track faculty have a .25 FTE semester release (the equivalent of 3-credit hours) for scholarship and creative activity. Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty to effectively engage in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advising, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service. Coordinators receive three hours of reassigned time for administrative duties per semester or for other reassigned duties as directed by the SOE dean. Summary data of workloads are maintained in the electronic database system [6.3.a].

A unit policy allocates supervision of clinical practice. A formula is used that includes the field site's distance from campus, number of candidates, number of supervisory visits, and number of different sites [6.3.b]. Supervision of candidates in the capstone experiences is based on a specific formula that assures supervision of less than 18 candidates [6.3.c]. A three-hour course assignment is given for each faculty member conducting supervision at the advanced level.

The unit has significantly increased the number of full-time faculty positions from 22 in Fall 2000 to 29 in Fall 2004, decreasing the number of adjunct faculty. **Table 61** below provides an overview of the additional faculty by program and rank:

Table 61: Full-time Faculty Positions Added 2000-2005

Faculty	Program	Hiring Rank	Position Type
Bowles	Elementary	Lecturer	New position
Harshfield	Elementary	Lecturer	New position
Pinkston	Technology	Assistant Prof	New position

Simms	Secondary/Found	Lecturer	New position
Daily	Special Education	Lecturer	New position
Brewer	Graduate Studies	Lecturer	New position
Camahalan	Graduate Studies	Assistant Prof	New position
Lewellen	Graduate Studies	Assistant Prof	New position
Hottman	Educational Leadership	Lecturer	New position
Murray (Dean)	Secondary	Associate Prof	New position prior to becoming Dean

The institution supports professional development activities that engage faculty in dialogue and skill development related to emerging theories and practices, including technology. Professional development outside IUS is encouraged through annual allocations from the unit of approximately \$400 per faculty member for travel. Additional money for presentations at national and international conferences is often secured through the Office of Academic Affairs. Other financial support is available to faculty through the IU system such as summer fellowships and through the IU Foundation [6.3.d]. The university supports the SOE mission of *educators engaged in growth*.

Faculty in the unit are also supported by five full-time positions assigned to various responsibilities within the unit. The work of the support staff allows faculty to focus on their primary tasks of teaching and mentoring candidates. The unit has re-designed duties of various support staff to ensure that all administrative areas are covered to support the unit assessment system. The addition of a full-time data base coordinator and a part-time receptionist has greatly enhanced support for the assessment system. The number of part-time student receptionists has also increased over the last two years, providing valuable assistance to candidates needing general information or directions. The physical environments for support staff have also been upgraded. Support staff meet routinely with the SOE dean to ensure that the administrative work needed to support the mission and CF of the unit is done effectively and efficiently [6.3.e].

Element 4: Unit Facilities

The unit has adequate facilities on campus and in the community and capitalizes upon those of partner schools to support candidates in meeting the standards for each of its programs. Campus teaching classroom are assigned through an electronic campus scheduling system. Several sections of advanced program coursework are held at the McCauley-Nicholas Graduate Center. Technology is available to all instructors at both locations through Media Services.

Two of the classrooms used by the SOE in Hillside Hall (208 and 212) are considered fully equipped technologically, and the other classrooms have access to mobile presentation technology. The SOE also has use of a fully equipped distance learning classroom (HH102). McCauley has two classrooms fully equipped technologically and a small computer lab with a technician available for assisting candidates. There are also two offices at McCauley for faculty to use, which are equipped with computers. Additionally, the 2005-2006 Hillside Hall upgrade involves comprehensive technological enhancements such as smartboards, network wiring, and instructional stations [6.4.a].

Each faculty member has a private and individual office space equipped with a personal computer. Faculty computers are replaced and/or upgraded every three years and supported by highly qualified technicians from the Office of Information Technology. Additional software is available to faculty upon requests. In 2001, the Elementary and Secondary Science Laboratory was moved into the newly expanded and renovated Life Science Building. The suite includes a spacious, state-of-the-art laboratory with a small science library and computer stations, faculty offices, and a meeting/preparation room.

To further evaluate and eventually enhance the overall facilities of IUS and the unit, a campus-wide Classroom Committee was established [6.4.b]. Its mission is to gather and evaluate current and projected needs of students and faculty. The formation of this committee demonstrates the institution's commitment to technology and updated facilities. Indeed, the Unit is extremely fortunate in that regard.

Element 5: Unit Resources Including Technology

The unit allocates resources across programs. Programs are allocated a budget each year [6.5.a]. Programs use their budgets to purchase instructional materials for faculty, small equipment for a program, technology software, and to fund additional faculty travel [6.5.b]. Additional monies are provided by programs through the bookstore initiative that pays programs up to \$500 per semester for book orders turned in on due dates [6.5.c].

The new IUS Library, with the SOE Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) and Center for Cultural Resources (CCR), opened in January 2005. A "grand opening" celebration for both the CRC and CCR was held on February 24, 2005. The CRC houses a large collection of P-12 textbooks, fiction and nonfiction tradebooks, reference books, many "hands-on" materials for all content and grade levels, and many other collections pertinent to the preparation of educators. The CCR contains more than 50 different culture kits in large tubs which are available to SOE candidates and the educational community [6.5.d]. Part of the responsibilities of a full-time librarian is to oversee the CRC operation, the acquisition of resources, and to serve as a liaison with the SOE. The library website includes a link to this site: <http://www.ius.edu/library/curriclab.cfm>.

To enhance and refine CRC resources, the Governance and Resource Committee conducted a "March Make-Over" of the existing CRC in the "old" Library during Spring 2004. The purpose was to cull outdated resources from the CRC as well as the general research collection and to identify areas that need additional resources. Faculty members were assigned particular content or subject areas to review. During the initial review period initiated by SOE faculty in 2004, outdated materials including 1350 books from the professional collection, 753 books from CRC collection, and 146 kits and other assorted media materials, were withdrawn. This is now an ongoing project that has strengthened the materials and resources available to our candidates in all programs. Finally, all full-time faculty members have ongoing access to placing book orders for the Library's general collection and the CRC via the Library website. Since 2000, SOE faculty have ordered and increased the size of the collection dedicated to education by 1024 volumes in the CRC, and over 700 volumes in the area of professional books.

Excellent technology labs in various locations across campus provide candidates with access to approximately 850 computers. Significant upgrades on all hardware are ongoing. One laboratory located in Hillside Hall, HH205, is specifically designed and equipped for the instruction and preparation of professionals in Education. A second Hillside Hall laboratory is equipped with the same HH205 software so that candidates may use and practice their skills when not attending technology classes. The website <http://www.ius.edu/> provides further information about computer labs, public computer stations, and services provided through the Office of Integrated Technology. The campus IT Committee allots \$1000 per year for faculty members to order software and provides opportunities to apply for additional funding [6.5.e].

Numerous manipulatives for mathematics, artifacts for social studies, and resources for special education teachers have been purchased from the WHAS Crusade for Children grant and housed in the SOE. (A Louisville television station sponsors the multi-million dollar Crusade to raise

money to improve the education of students with exceptionalities and provides scholarships for graduate candidates to receive training in special education) [6.5.f].

Another favorite and treasured resource for candidates and faculty *engaged in growth* is the extensive collection of over 7000 pieces of children's literature housed in the personal collection of a faculty member in Hillside Hall. These books are available as resources and also for candidates to use in lessons presented to P-12 students, thereby extending the collection's benefits.

The unit assessment system has also required additional funding to develop and implement the assessment system. Additional money has been allocated to the unit to fund release time for the unit assessment coordinator [6.5.g]. A full-time database coordinator now handles the data entry and analyses. The unit budget has funded travel to NCATE-related conferences to ensure compliance with the assessment system. Files and other storage units have been purchased.

In summary, the SOE unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet standards and to be able to aggregate candidate data for program decision making and improvement. Faculty and other stakeholder groups participate in program design, implementation and evaluation of these activities. The unit budget adequately supports campus and clinical work essential to preparation. The unit has adequate campus and school facilities and updated information technology.